

Annelies Häcki Buhofer

Editorial

Dear readers,

It's been eight years now since the European Society of Phraseology published its first yearbook with the aim to benefit its members and others interested in phraseology. This year, we are pleased to present to you once again numerous contributions, hoping that these will encourage ongoing stimulating discussions.

The discipline of phraseology has always displayed a strong interest for methodological and theoretical matters. In this yearbook, Christian Pfeiffer (University of Augsburg, Germany) pursues the question how occasionality may be positively determined theoretically and empirically. The author claims that usuality cannot be determined along the criterion of lexicographical registration alone and that there is an indispensable need to take frequency data into account. In fact, current lexicographical works are produced by utilizing usage and frequency data as well, even though the compilers' intuition remains crucial and implies an individual, decisionistic factor on the background of a rich language experience.

For quite some time now, the connections, similarities and differences to construction grammar have constituted a major theme of phraseological research. With regard to phraseological constructions, too, it is possible to connect aspects of exemplariness to the central research questions of phraseology regarding metaphoric motivation. This is done by Dmitrij Dobrovolskij (Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia) and Elisabeth Piirainen in this yearbook by way of a multi-layered motivation type of intensional determinative compounds. These are structures with a uniform semantic scheme which come about through the "mixing" of mental spaces. A connection with Pfeiffer's article on occasionality is established not least through the possibility of an extended co-occurrence: "Die Schusstiefel anhaben, vergessen haben", but also: "schnüren, an den Nagel hängen". Still, one may ask what exactly is meant when it is said that language participants process such constructs "without any difficulty". Adults seldom reveal that they are struggling with everyday language. The same is true for children, even though due to different cognitive reasons. Primary language is and ought to be dealt with very naturally. What this entails for cognitive processing represents, beyond a blending, an empirical research question that depends as much on the individual as on the structure of language.

Phraseological units have been viewed as dynamic structures with their own productivity, which despite their fixedness interact with more general syntactic rules, for a while already. In this context, Antonio Pamies-Bertrán (University of Granada, Spain) in his article on grammatical metaphor and functional

idiomaticity investigates which theoretical concepts shed light on the interfaces between fixedness and syntactic regularity.

The two contributions by Attila Cserép (University of Debrecen, Hungary) in this yearbook show that at the interface of phraseology and lexicon/grammar it is also possible to work with a focus on idiom variation and idiom dissolvability/decomposability. The author tests the hypothesis on the decomposability of idioms and examines whether the degree of decomposability correlates with the extent of possible verb variations and the possible variations of nominal phrases, respectively. It is hoped that the question regarding the possibility to assess decomposability will be taken up and pursued further on the empirical background of speaker concordance. At the same time, the statistical verification of connections such as decomposability and variation are highly welcomed. And yet, the semantics of the phraseological unit and its parts certainly also plays a role in determining what number of variation possibilities makes sense contextually.

Multiword lexemes such as “das Kap der guten Hoffnung”, “der Dreissigjährige Krieg” and “der rechte Winkel” actually are phraseological units just like any other, because they are made up of several words but nevertheless constitute a lexicological unit. They can be viewed as special due to their name-like and terminology-like nature (the two are not the same). Whether, as Hilke Elsen (University of Augsburg, Germany) claims in her article, multiword lexemes should be viewed as phenomena with an intermediary status or even as word construction phenomena or not will surely stimulate lively discussions.

By far not all existing languages have been researched with the same intensity, be it with regard to phraseology or other aspects. According to Sunil Sharma (Jawaharlal Nehru University, India), metaphorical concepts of happiness in the phraseology of Hindi (following Lakoff und Johnson) promise new specific comparative and general insights. As it is, central concepts including HAPPINESS IS ABOVE and HAPPINESS IS LIGHT, which occur in English and Chinese language, are also found in the phraseology of Hindi. However, Hindi additionally uses other source domains, such as PHYSICAL EXPANSION, VEGETATION and FOOD, while the concept HAPPINESS IS ABOVE is limited because the concept HEIGHT ABOVE THE GROUND is associated with arrogance and false superiority in Hindi. It is to be expected that metaphorical concepts, just like all aspects of language, are marked by culture. Future studies will surely incorporate further languages into comparisons and thus complement and expand the Eurocentric focus.

The series of articles concludes with a lexical case study on Spanish. On the background of corpus analyses Belén López Meirama (University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain) examines the proposition whether and to what extent phraseological units are characterized by a particular polysemy and to what extent the frequency distribution of different meanings varies spatially from Spain to

Latin America to Mexico. The analysis of several pertinent corpora reveals that the expected differences indeed exist.

This year's articles manifest an intense theoretical discussion and a readiness to undertake corpus work aiming at empirical legitimization, which both appear as pleasant marks of current discussions. Any disagreements among the readership regarding the hypotheses and results brought forward will certainly provide interesting starting points for further scholarly debates.

Unfortunately, our community has suffered a great loss this year: Our dear, merry Barbara Wotjak is no longer with us. We are grateful to Antje Heine and Jarmo Korhonen for writing an obituary to honour the memory of this doyenne of phraseology.

Finally, the book reviews at the end of this volume introduce important recent publications, promoting an exchange of information beyond individual languages and networks, and beyond the circle of phraseologists. They certainly provide an incentive to acquire the recent literature for faculty libraries and seminars and to integrate it into one's own and supervised works.

Zug – Summer 2017

