

secuestrado y golpeado, "¿qué chillidos, qué pantanos espinosos cruzarán sus propias mujeres?" Entonces :

Me parece natural, más bien urgente, que las indígenas zapatistas hayan exigido una ley especial para mujeres; de sólo mirar sus cotidianidades una se pregunta por la historia, si pasó sin detenerse, con los ojos cerrados. Lo que han hecho las *enmontadas* es despedirse de su mundo (221)⁴.

Y así se entiende y lo entiende Camila cuando Paulina dice: "Quisimos empezar a vivir con mayúsculas" (221).

¿Y que duda hay? que: "Cada mujer que se libera de su historia en Chiapas vale por muchas esperanzas, si han logrado romper el asfixiante asedio de cientos y cientos de años" (222).

Camila acepta su condición de huérfana, una huérfana más del Apocalipsis al lado de las mujeres zapatistas, al lado de sus compañeros dispuestos a romper toda clase de esclavitud, Camila se jura a sí misma aceptar con ellas "a la huérfana que soy" (240).

Luego su regreso apresurado a Chile. Cuando perdió su libertad, cuando se recuperó a medias de su secuestro, entendió que la libertad perdida sólo la recuperará volviendo al lugar donde nació.

En Chile, con su experiencia vivida "una semana" en la "selva oscura" y en la vivencia de la universal y reiterada Apocalipsis, empieza su informe a la revista. Lo inicia, lo borra, y lo empieza otra vez:

Había una vez una mujer. Se llamaba Reina Barcelona. y aunque nació en Uruguay, llegó a a las montañas del sureste mexicano a pelear su guerra (270).

Borra lo escrito y empieza otra vez:

Había una vez una mujer que al dormir transformaba su cuerpo en un ovillo y se tragaba el llanto. Su nombre era Reina Barcelona (270).

Es lo que está en mi corazón...

⁴ Enmontadas: mujeres zapatistas, mujeres que se han ido al monte para luchar por los zapatistas.

Reviews and Notices

Arndt, Marie. *A Critical Study of Sean O'Faolain's Life and Work. Studies in Irish Literature*, 5. Lewiston, New York, Queenston, Ontario and Lampeter, U.K.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2001. xv + 290 pp. Price £ 74.95 or \$ 119.95 ISBN 0 7734 7410 2

The Irish writer and youthful IRA volunteer and publicist Sean O'Faolain (1900-1991) deserves to be remembered as a short-story writer of genius and perhaps also as an iconoclastic cultural critic. But he has less academic attention than he deserves. Dr Marie Arndt's comprehensive critical study usefully reminds us of the range, variety and generally high quality of his output in a literary career which spanned six decades. In addition to the volumes of short stories and his famously acerbic study of national character *The Irish* (1947, revised edition 1969) he wrote novels, biographies, autobiography, travel books, a film script, plays, poems and literary criticism. In the difficult years of 'the Emergency' which the rest of Europe called the Second World War he resisted cultural isolationism and narrow nationalism by founding the most important literary magazine in Ireland, *The Bell*, and editing it from 1940 to 1946.

The helpfully chronological organisation of this book makes it possible to detect common concerns running through different kinds of writing at any given period. The extensive bibliography helps the reader to trace his career from articles for the *London Review of Books* in the early 1980s right back to contributions in the 1920s to *The Irish Statesman*, edited by Yeats's friend George Russell ('AE') but already moving beyond the romantic Celticism of the Literary Revival to anticipate the cultural pluralism of *The Bell*. Dr Arndt shows that his complex quarrel with the autocratic Eamon de Valera, his conservative vision of the new Ireland (a 'dreary Eden') and Irish Catholicism, denounced as Puritanical and inhumane, developed gradually, mainly in the wake of his return to Ireland after a period of studying and teaching in America and England. The first book on de Valera, published in 1933, managed to be reasonably positive and patriotic though his later study, published in 1939, was much more hostile. This mounting hostility invaded and energised every aspect of his literary output. Even when he was ostensibly compiling an anthology of Irish poetry in English translation, as in *The Silver Branch* (1938), or writing historical biography, as in the studies of Daniel O'Connell (*King of the Beggars*, 1938) or John Henry, Cardinal Newman (*Newman's Way*, 1952), he was still engaging in cultural critique of the political, intellectual and religious condition of the Ireland of his own time. But, like Joyce, his well-informed impatience with the romantic Irish nationalism and conservative Irish Catholicism which had contributed so much to his own formation did not drive him into the opposite camps of Unionism or Protestantism: as Dr Arndt points out, he never renounced his ancestral faith, though he searched long and hard for a more digestible variety of it.

Dr Arndt's treatment is mainly expository, sometimes a little dull and dutiful, but she is not uncritical, accusing O'Faolain with some justification of periodic self-contradiction and intellectual snobbery and a defective historical sense, an inability at times to distinguish between past and present. His career is presented as a sustained, ambivalent, would-be rationalist engagement with romanticism, with realist and idealist impulses in constant tension. Less convincingly, perhaps, he is also introduced as 'a product of the colonial periphery'. This gestures towards recent moves to establish Frantz Fanon as the new patron saint of Ireland and some fairly indiscriminating attempts to cram all parts of Ireland at all periods into the catch-all categories of colonial or post-colonial. It is perhaps unfortunate that this modish but arguably rather unhelpful and unnuanced paradigm is given prominence at the beginning of the book when so little space can be found in what follows to present more than very brief sketches of the complex, changing social and moral context of the often rather unlovely developing nation-state which simultaneously frustrated and stimulated O'Faolain as a writer. Dr Arndt consistently acknowledges the ambivalence in O'Faolain's Irishness, disillusioned yet residually romantic and

idealistic, struggling to balance emotional and nostalgic engagement with a detached, cosmopolitan modernity. This is a plausible and persuasive account of a prolific and still under-rated man of letters. Dr Arndt's conclusion, which links his inner conflicts and contradictions with the politically urgent contemporary search for 'a more complex notion of Irish identity' intriguingly implies that O'Faolain has a claim to be regarded as the exemplary modern Irish writer.

Norman Vance

Deuter, Margaret, James Greenan, Joseph Noble and Janet Phillips (eds). **Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English**. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2002. 912 pp. Paperback. ISBN 0 19 431 2437. Price: GBP 12.

What is grammatically correct in a language is not necessarily acceptable to the speakers of that language, as has often been pointed out.¹ For a learner of a language, a solid knowledge of its grammar is necessary if he is to speak it in a fluent and nativelike fashion, but this is not enough. In addition he has to master the use of its lexicon, which is very far from an easy matter. It involves knowing the words for all sorts of objects, concepts, processes, relations and so forth, but, just as importantly, it involves knowing how those words are strung together and which items go with certain other items. In other words, it involves knowing the collocations of the language. This is a tricky field to move about in, with only few rules to guide the speaker. If, for example, a learner of English should want to refer to what berries grow on, he should distinguish between e.g. mulberry trees, gooseberry bushes, strawberry plants, grape vines and raspberry canes. On other occasions he will have to know that you catch a cold, develop an allergy, come down/go down with appendicitis, contract HIV but suffer a stroke, or that you make plans, set the agenda, but draw up the programme. It is obvious that guidance is needed in such a maze.

There exist a few dictionaries of collocations aimed at learners of English, the most comprehensive of which is *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English* (1986). Now Oxford University Press publishes *Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English*, which comprises 887 pages and is about three times as large as the *BBI*. It is a welcome and impressive addition to this rather small range of dictionaries; it is in many respects a magnificent work. It lays emphasis on being a students' dictionary, which is evident in several ways. One of them is that it includes a special section called "Study Pages", where the student is shown in a pedagogical manner how to make optimum use of the different types of entries. Another is that it has a number of special topic pages on things like fruit and music and also extended usage notes on various subjects like currencies, meals, languages, etc. Thirdly, and more importantly, its approach to its material is pragmatic rather than theoretical. The criteria the editors used in their selection of material are formulated as questions: "[I]s this a typical use of language? Might a student of English want to express this idea? Would they look up this entry to find out how?" We shall look at some consequences of this approach below.

The main source of the material is the British National Corpus — it would be unthinkable today to produce a work like the present one without recourse to a corpus. One consequence is that the suggestions in the dictionary occasionally lead to interesting conflicts with the recommendations given by grammar checkers, serving as a corrective to them. One such conflict concerns the passive voice. Grammar checkers often warn against the use of the passive. *Oxford Collocations Dictionary* on the other hand says, "Use the collocations systematically and you become more aware of the extent to which English makes use of the passive, an aspect of grammar that even advanced students may be reluctant to put to full productive use" (p. viii). The language variety chosen is naturally British English, so that we get for instance *defence* and *colour* rather than *defense* and *color*.

A collocation is defined in the following way in the *Dictionary*: "Collocation is the way words combine in a language to produce natural-sounding speech and

writing" (p. vii). It appears from the examples given in the *Dictionary* that there is one element missing from the definition, viz. that a collocation, as used here, is somehow grammatically structured. There are no combinations like *on the, and him, a very, etc.*, which certainly "combine ... to produce natural-sounding speech and writing", but which do not make up grammatical constituents. As I see it, this grammatical constraint, here implicitly imposed, is both natural and sensible.

Collocations are regarded by the editors as constituting a continuum, from fairly weak (*see a film*) through medium-strength (*see a doctor*) to strong (*see reason*). "Totally free combinations are excluded and so, for the most part, are idioms" (p. viii). Given the criteria for selection, it is clear that this results in a certain arbitrariness. For example, is it really true that you *work on* a thesis but not on a dissertation? Or that you say *remind gently* and *point out tartly*, but not the other way round? Or that the President *vetoes* and *intervenes* but does not *address, announce, appeal, approve, attack, attend, authorize, etc.*? That is, is *the President intervenes* less of a "free combination" than *the President authorizes*?

The arbitrariness just referred to is particularly striking in the *Dictionary's* treatment of idioms, which are not defined in the work. As we saw, the editors say that idioms are excluded for the most part. Conveniently, Oxford University Press also publishes a companion volume, *Oxford Idioms Dictionary for Learners of English*, but not even in this work, explicitly devoted to them, is there a definition of idioms. It now turns out that a large number of combinations, with the same meaning, occur in both volumes. Such examples are

alive and kicking
cut short
dead and buried
dead and gone
drag your feet
drink like a fish
easy money
get away with murder
in safe hands
let loose
on the spot
put money into sth
throw money at sth

There is therefore a great deal of overlap between the volumes. One may then wonder what kind of distinction the editors draw between collocation and idiom. If we accept the traditional view of idioms², it is also puzzling why phrases like

the anchor leg
cutting a new tooth
in the teeth of evidence

occur in the Collocations volume and not in the Idioms one. All this shows, I think, that it is a mistake to regard idioms as being in a category of their own, totally separated from that of collocations.³ Both idioms and (other) collocations are syntactically variable to a greater or lesser extent, so the distinction hinges on their semantic transparency. Within the class of what are generally called collocations there is variation with regard to semantic transparency, from totally transparent to semi-transparent or semantically obscure collocations. The meaning of *to nod one's head, to shake hands* or *to wipe one's feet* should be obvious even to those who have not seen or heard the phrases before, whereas *to have a head for (figures), to get one's hands on (the money)* or *set foot in (Australia)* are less immediately comprehensible to those who are not familiar with them as phrases.⁴ There is hence no clear demarcation line between semantically transparent and semantically non-transparent combinations. On the collocational cline envisaged by the editors, idioms can thus be regarded as representing the extreme end, gradually blending

with other collocations. That this view is not entirely foreign to the editors appears from their discussion of "strong collocations that are slightly idiomatic" (p. x). So looked at in this way, idioms *are* collocations, and, in the terms of the editors, the strongest type of collocations. They would have deserved more space in the *Dictionary*.

The *Dictionary* is corpus-based, but the editors have not made full use of the corpus or corpora, probably because of their avowed aim of producing a dictionary for students. There is thus no indication of the frequencies of the alternatives given, which is a pity as even a student might be interested in finding out for instance which out of an assortment of variants is the one most frequently used, which are more peripheral, etc. "The corpus also supplied many of the example sentences" (p. viii), but many of the examples given nevertheless make an unnatural impression and seem to have been made up or doctored for pedagogical reasons. Here are some such examples:

The teacher turned a deaf ear to the boy's swearing,
The pedestrian who had nearly been run over reported the incident to the police.
The actress is asking the court to protect her from an obsessive fan who is making her life a misery.
Their dream turned into a nightmare as the cruise ship began to sink.

The *Dictionary* makes a determined effort to be politically correct and non-sexist.⁵ He does the washing up and dries the dishes while she holds the rank of captain and is promoted to the rank of colonel or made chairman of the board or managing director. Even if some such examples may look a little strained, they do let in a breath of fresh air into the traditional world of lexicography.

No work of this kind, or perhaps of any kind, can escape some minor infelicities. There are some here, to be sure, but they are decidedly minor.⁶ The general impression is rather, as could be expected from a product of the OUP, one of well thought-out design and organisation.

It is only fairly recently, in terms of decades, that the importance of collocations for the natural use of language has come to be recognised more widely. The editors of the present work have a point when they say that general dictionaries are good for understanding language, while collocation dictionaries are good for producing language. Knowledge of collocations is indeed essential to language users, and both the wealth of material contained in the *Dictionary* and the way it is presented go a long way to helping beginners and very advanced learners alike in their struggle to produce acceptable and even nativelike English.

Göran Kjellmer

References

- Benson, Morton, Evelyn Benson & Robert Ilson, (eds.) 1986. *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English: A Guide to Word Combinations*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Crystal, David (1985) 1987. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. London: Blackwell /Deutsch, 2nd ed.
- Oxford Idioms Dictionary for learners of English* 2001. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pawley, Andrew, & Frances Hodgetts Syder 1983. "Two puzzles for linguistic theory: nativelike selection and nativelike fluency." In J.C. Richards and R.W. Schmidt (eds.) *Language and Communication*. London: Longman, pp. 191-226.

⁵See for instance Pawley and Syder (1983).

⁶E.g. as "a sequence of words which is semantically and often syntactically restricted, so that they function as a single unit. From a semantic viewpoint, the meanings of the individual words cannot be summed to produce the meaning of the 'idiomatic' expression as a whole." (Crystal (1985) 1987: 152)

⁷Cf.: "All these combinations, apart from those at the very extremes of the cline, can be called collocation" (p. vii). (My emphasis.)

⁴They are all given as collocations in the *Dictionary*.

⁵The very first sentences run, "Imagine a student writing an essay on the environment. She knows the themes she wishes to cover ..."

⁶Inconsistency: the verb rather than the point of the compass is denoted by the swung dash (p. 217).

Inaccuracy: p. 619 should be p. 618, p. 731 should be p. 730 (p. iv).

Spelling error: *disaese* for *disease* (p. 341).

Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners. International British edition, 2002. ISBN 0-333-95786-5 (paperback edition; available also in cased editions; CDRom available separately or included). Price: GBP 13.99 (paperback + CD: GBP 15.99).

Teachers and learners of English may have thought that a point of saturation had been reached around the turn of the century as far as dictionaries for advanced learners were concerned. In order of first appearance, there were *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, with its roots in the 1940s, *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, with a first edition published in 1978, *COBUILD* (with slight variations in the title for each new edition), which was first presented in 1987, and *Cambridge International Dictionary of English*, new in 1995. These "big four" will henceforth be referred to in this review as *OALD*, *LDOCE*, *COBUILD* and *CIDE*. It takes a brave publisher to try to squeeze in a new product, but an attempt was made in 2002 by Macmillan Publishers Limited. The newcomer, which is under review here, is called *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*. Interestingly, MED comes in two editions, one with an emphasis on British English and one with American English as its starting-point. The principle is that in either version, lexical items typical of (or idiosyncratic to) the "other" variant are treated more briefly or even not at all. What is being reviewed here is the dictionary proper (not the CDRom) in its British edition.

Like the other four dictionaries for learners, MED is corpus-based, but the corpus used, viz. "The World English Corpus" (200 million words), the core of which is "The Bloomsbury Corpus of World English", has not been part of the basis for any other learner's dictionary. Additions to the Bloomsbury Corpus include ELT material and learner errors. A corpus of 200 million words places the dictionary in the COBUILD class in terms of evidence, and above the other three.

Coverage as measured in terms of "references" is said to be over 100,000. Whatever "reference" is taken to mean, for all practical purposes the size of MED is on a par with the other four, although a blurb on its back cover says "with more entries than any other".

Headwords are defined syntactically, i.e. a word like *back* is presented as four entries (adverb, adjective, noun and verb, in that order). Apart from the order, this mode of presentation is identical with that found for *back* in LDOCE. Homonyms are kept together under the same entry as long as they belong to the same word class. Thus, *box* in the sense of "tree" is to be found under the headword dominated by "container" senses. Subsenses that are felt to be too closely related to be separated under different numbers are marked by lower-case letters. In the case of *box*, the "container" sense is 1 and the "contents" sense is 1a (*We ate the whole box of chocolates*). The system is not a branching hierarchy, so there may or may not be a 1b.

A feature that MED shares with LDOCE 3 and COBUILD 2/3 is the marking of frequency, but the system and the scope are different. Whereas LDOCE has three frequency bands for the top 3,000 words, including a division into spoken and written, and COBUILD has five bands and a coverage of the 14,600 most frequent items, MED has placed itself in the middle, with a coverage of the top 7,500 words and a division into three classes. These words appear in red, with 1-3 stars to indicate the three frequency bands.

Like OALD, LDOCE and CIDE, MED makes use of a limited defining vocabulary (2,500 words). "Normal" inflectional forms of the items in the list are also allowed in the definitions.

The defining style of MED is eclectic and mixes traditional synonymy style with the method associated mainly with COBUILD, "the way one ordinary person might explain it to another". Thus we find *bandage* explained as "a long thin piece of cloth that you wrap around an injured part of your body" (i.e. synonymous paraphrase, which seems to be the standard for nouns) but *banal* as "something that is banal is boring because it contains nothing new, original or unusual", *modular* as "a modular course of study is divided into separate sections called modules" (thus providing a collocation at the same time), *jealously* as "if you guard something jealously, you look after it very carefully because you do not want anyone else to have it", and the verb *disgust* as "if something disgusts you, it is so bad or immoral that it makes you angry and upset". There are also cases where usage or currency points are made part of the definition: *maidservant* is described as "an old word meaning 'a woman employed as a servant'".

Like OALD, LDOCE and CIDE, MED sometimes supplements definitions with drawings and pictorial surveys (for instance 16 colour plates featuring things like houses, animals and plants).

Like LDOCE and, to a very limited extent, COBUILD, MED uses a menu system, i.e. an introductory listing of the main meanings or uses of a word with five or more subsenses. For instance, the article for the noun *joint* begins with the following list (without any definitions or examples): (1) part of your body, (2) connection, (3) piece of meat, (4) restaurant, bar etc. (5) cannabis cigarette.

In a 20-page section called "Language Awareness", eleven different topics are treated, for instance phrasal verbs, academic writing, computer words, pragmatics, sensitivity (avoiding offence), business English, word formation. (Similar surveys are to be found in CIDE under "Language portraits", in OALD as "Language study pages" + Appendices, in LDOCE in Appendices, and in COBUILD in the pages preceding the dictionary proper.) These headings turn up at some of the entries, for instance "Academic writing" under *identify*, with a list of expressions thought to be useful in connection with identification and categorization.

Some entries have their most typical collocates listed in a separate box: for *seriously*, to take one example, the list consists of the adjectives *damaged*, *hurt*, *ill*, *injured* and *worried*. (For the same effect, OALD and COBUILD rely on the vocabulary of the examples, LDOCE on boldface.) Idioms and other fixed expressions, if any, are listed at the end of the article.

Not unlike CIDE, which states the source when a famous quotation is used as an example, MED sometimes provides the background to an expression or mentions cultural issues related to it. For instance, after the definition of *fourth estate*, you find "From the idea that journalists are equally important in public life as the three traditional 'estates' of society: the aristocracy, the Church, and the ordinary people", and under *gun control*, "In the US, the issue of gun control is the cause of much political disagreement, because the constitution gives people the right to own weapons, but many people feel the level of violence in the US is too high".

Moving on from the descriptive to the evaluative part of the review, it should be noted at once that the coverage of new words seems to be very good. MED is alone in having registered, for instance, *chick flick* "a film intended especially for women, often about a romantic relationship" (labelled *informal*, but with no indication that the word is normally derogatory), the music style *drum 'n' bass*, and *Aga saga* "a novel about the lives of middle-class women living in British country villages" (with the "etymological" note "From *Aga*, a type of oven that these women would typically own").

There are some inconsistencies in the treatment of "families" of words: *beer* and *whisky* are described as basically uncountable but with a countable subsense "a glass of ...", whereas with *schnapps* there is a shortcut: "[C/U] a strong alcoholic drink from Germany, or a glass of this drink". The noun *euro* is included and

adequately defined, but *franc* is still (in 2002) described as "the unit of money in France" and *Deutschmark* as "a unit of money used in Germany", with a cross-reference to *mark*, where it says "the unit of money used in Germany before the euro". The Latin abbreviations *i.e.* and *q.v.* are not only explained as to their use but also provided with notes as to their etymologies (Latin *id est* and *quod vide*), whereas the etymological mysteries associated with *viz.* are not touched upon and the link with *namely* is not mentioned; the definition is not very enlightening either: "used, especially in writing, when you want to give more specific information about something you have just mentioned". The academic marks *cum laude* and *summa cum laude* have cross-references to each other and to *magna cum laude*, which is defined as "the second highest" but with no cross-reference – a reader may well want to know what number 1 and number 3 are called. Besides, *summa cum laude* is classified as "adj, adv" and marked "AmE", *cum laude* as "adv" only and "US" mentioned in the definition, and *magna cum laude* as "adv" and no mention of the US.

Some of the word classes are notoriously difficult in English, and debatable classifications may make a dictionary less user-friendly, particularly if it applies the principle of having a separate entry for each new word class that an item can belong to. In the dictionary under review, you find the example *knockout victory* under the noun entry for *knockout* but *knockout blow* and *knockout drops* under the adjective; with *free*, you find *I'll keep a day free* under the adjective but *I wriggled one hand free* under the adverb; for *flat*, the sample sentence *She was flat on her back asleep* is placed under the adjective (naturally) but ... *she's not comfortable lying flat* under the adverb.

As with other frequency counts, it is systematically unclear in the cases of homonymy to what extent each different sense contributes to the frequency indicated. The noun *bank*, for instance, has three stars (= very high frequency), but it also has three senses: "a financial institution ...", "a raised area of land along the side of a river" and "a large number of things in a row ...". If the frequency has been calculated collectively, it is not very interesting. A related problem has to do with the notoriously difficult distinction between verbal and adjectival *-ing* forms and *-ed* forms. This reviewer doubts, for instance, that *dying* as an "adj [only before noun]" is among the 7,500 most frequent words in English.

The triple jump is described as "a sport in which you first jump forwards on one leg, jump again on the other leg, and jump a third time using both legs". This may be vaguely reminiscent of the behaviour of Jonathan Edwards and others, but cannot be recommended as an instruction. (Incidentally, none of the learners' dictionaries manages to describe this event accurately.) Similarly, a car mechanic may question the description of *disc brakes* as being situated "inside the wheel" (reviewer's emphasis). The same goes for *brake pad*.

Under *which*, the dictionary takes a somewhat surprising stand on the age-old *that/which* issue. As for the situation in restrictive relative clauses, it says, "It is more usual and considered better to use 'that' ..." (reviewer's emphasis). Neither statement is completely true. The truth of the former is limited to informal English. The latter is particularly interesting from a diachronic point of view, because through most of the 20th century, school teachers tended to change a pupil's *that* to the high-status *which*, whereas present-day computerized grammar checking modules not only "consider it better" but more or less order you to use *that*. On the topic of *that*, some examples under that headword must be confusing, particularly in the eyes of learners with a mother tongue that lacks the relative zero option: *Davis is the most brilliant man I've ever worked with* and *There was no one I could ask for help*. Still on the subject of relativizers, the headword *Boxing Day* is confusingly described as "the first day after Christmas Day, that is a public holiday in the UK and Canada".

Some definitions are difficult to interpret because of the defining style. Nouns are often defined by means of a superordinate term + a restrictive relative clause, which works very well in most cases: *jelly bean* "a soft brightly coloured sweet that

is shaped like a bean". However, if there are other nouns competing for antecedent-hood, the phrase becomes difficult to process, at least for the intermediate learner: *jelly baby* "a soft brightly coloured sweet with a fruit flavour that is shaped like a person". Similarly for *DOS*: "the basic software in a computer that makes it work and allows you to use a program" (in principle, to a person with limited technical knowledge, *that* could refer to the adjacent noun *computer* and *it* to *software*). Vacillation between different kinds of postmodifiers of the superordinate term seems to be the cause of the erroneous wording under *inside lane*: "on a road that has with two or more lanes ...".

In cases of homonymy, the system of listing idioms after the whole article has the disadvantage of failing to link the idiom with the right sense or clarify the metaphor involved. For instance, *barking up the wrong tree* is entered only after three distinct senses, the first (and thus the most distant) of which is the sound of a dog. Incidentally, the cross-reference from *bite* intended to lead to *sb's bark is worse than their bite* has been placed under the wrong sense of *bite*, viz. "amount of food that you bite with your teeth", instead of under "an instance of an animal biting someone".

Finally, two examples of unsatisfactory semantic content of the definitions. A non-inherent property (the current price) is included in the definition of *balsamic vinegar* "an expensive type of sweet dark vinegar". The basic semantic definition is missing in the noun *matey* "used by men for talking in a friendly or threatening way to other men".

To sum up, in spite of a number of minor shortcomings of the kind that I have mentioned, I find this dictionary a welcome addition to the market. Its excellent coverage of present-day vocabulary and its undogmatic user-friendly defining style are features that have made me add this dictionary unhesitatingly to the list of recommended reference material used at my department.

Arne Olofsson

Skrivregler för svenska och engelska från TNC. (TNC 100) Solna: Terminologisentrum (The Swedish Centre for Terminology) TNC, 2001. 236 pp. ISBN 91-7196-100-3. Price: SEK 275.

The last ten years or so have seen, not least in higher education, an upsurge of interest in writing, more specifically the laborious process involved in writing expository text. Different varieties of process writing have played a significant part, also at the level of upper secondary school, in highlighting what it takes to make a text good, efficient reading. At university level, regardless of subject, the ability to present facts, ideas and arguments in clear, coherent and formally correct writing is often held up as one of the overriding goals: higher education should be expected to produce good writers. In a broader perspective, it may be argued, widespread proficiency in expository, argumentative writing should be seen as an asset, even a prerequisite, in any democratic society. Ideally, good writing should not be the exclusive preserve of professional writers.

As any writer is acutely aware, producing a satisfactory text is an extremely demanding kind of activity, involving a complex interplay of linguistic levels: from semantics in a wide sense ("ideas"), via text linguistics and syntax, down to the less glamorous nitty-gritty of spelling, punctuation and other "lower-level" *formalia*. The sad fact, alas, is that beautiful ideas alone do not make a beautiful text. Formal accuracy, or correctness, is also required for a text and its content to be taken seriously and its writer's voice to be regarded as authoritative.

The formal rules and conventions of text production—to be found in, e.g., English style guides—may be subsumed under the somewhat vague cover term "writing rules", figuring prominently in the Swedish title of the book under review (henceforth *Skrivregler*). The same Swedish compound turns up in another reference work, recently published by the the Swedish Language Committee, viz.

Svenska skrivregler (Liber, second ed. 2000). The two books cover much the same ground: punctuation; the use of brackets, quotation marks, apostrophes, etc.; capital letters; the writing of compounds and abbreviations; expressions involving numbers; referencing; tables and diagrams. Other areas, dealt with in special appendices in *Skrivregler*, include mathematical symbols, the elements (chemistry) and units of measurement. *Skrivregler* also provides extensive bibliographical information. There is ample exemplification throughout.

Obviously, writing rules and graphic conventions may differ between languages, e.g. between Swedish and English. These days the global impact of English means, in a Swedish context, that many Swedes, for professional or other reasons, find themselves in a situation where they are required to write in English. As is evident from the full title of *Skrivregler*, this state of affairs, touched on in a recently published Swedish Government Official Report on the Swedish language (*Mål i mun. Förslag till handlingsprogram för svenska språket*, Statens offentliga utredningar, SOU 2002:27; English summary on the Internet), has now been granted full recognition. Thus, what chiefly sets this edition of *Skrivregler* apart from earlier ones, and from *Svenska skrivregler*, is its explicitly contrastive, Swedish-English approach. This fact alone—English writing rules presented in Swedish by a Swedish language-planning agency—makes *Skrivregler* something of a sociolinguistic landmark, as also implied in the introduction to the English part of the book. The main focus of this review will be on the English writing rules accounted for. First, however, a few words on the Swedish part are in order.

The Swedish part of *Skrivregler* takes up 115 pages, corresponding to roughly 200 pages in *Svenska skrivregler*. As indicated by these figures, the latter work is more detailed and, in some cases, covers areas not dealt with in *Skrivregler*. For example, it provides more information about matters of layout and graphic design. A related field is paragraphing, including the marking of new paragraphs, where *Svenska skrivregler* (p. 22) rightly advises against the non-use of explicit paragraph marking, i.e. without indentation or a space line, a warning of equal relevance to English. On the whole, however, as also stated in the preface to *Skrivregler*, there is good overall agreement between the two books when it comes to coverage and content. For instance, in their treatment of the semicolon, they both come down hard on its frequent misuse—also, for mysterious reasons, among professional writers, who should know better (e.g., journalists)—in contexts where a colon should be self-evident. Similarly, they both emphasize that, in Swedish, compounds should always be written as one word (e.g., *Internetadress*), another much-discussed area where confusion has become increasingly rampant since the mid-1980s. In this case, it may be noted, *Skrivregler* (p. 68) is the more explicit of the two books, even venturing some explanatory comments as to why errors involving the writing of compounds are so common nowadays, one likely reason being the influence of English. Such cases are indications of the split vision of *Skrivregler*, i.e. its contrastive perspective.

The English part of *Skrivregler* covers some 55 pages, i.e. about half the number of pages devoted to Swedish. The order of presentation follows, by and large, that of the Swedish part, which makes for easy comparison, further enhanced by observations concerning differences as well as similarities between the two languages. Frequent cross-references, especially from Swedish to English (e.g., concerning quotation marks ("inverted commas") or the use of capital letters in English book titles), provide additional contrastive guidance. Occasionally, more space and/or emphasis is given to a specific phenomenon in English than to the corresponding one in Swedish, due to the more complex English situation (or vice versa, of course). This applies, for example, to the writing of compounds (one word, hyphenation, or separate words), the use of the apostrophe and the existence of no less than four different types of dash in English.

Skrivregler provides a wealth of information on English writing rules, rules frequently violated by Swedish writers—and students—of English, often for contrastive reasons. Here only a few examples, apart from those already mentioned,

can be given, ranging from general conventions to specifics: the use of capital letters in expressions containing proper names and in names of organizations, official bodies, etc. (*Peter the Great, The United Nations Security Council*); the writing of dates, with differences between British and American English duly noted (cf. the many English variations on the distinctly Swedish 2001–09–11); the English use of a decimal point rather than the corresponding Swedish comma (0.5 or just .5 versus 0,5; cf. Engl. 5,000,000, i.e. five million); the normal English use of both opening and closing round brackets around, e.g., letters that enumerate items on a list—such as (a) and (b)—as opposed to the normal Swedish use of only a closing parenthesis, i.e. a) and b); and finally, among the true niceties, the non-use in English of the “Swedish” exclamation mark within square brackets, with or without a preceding *sic*, i.e. [!] or [sic!], to draw attention to, e.g., an original misprint in a quoted passage, where English uses only [sic] (without exclamation mark).

It may be noted that the contrastive perspective of *Skrivregler* occasionally spills over into matters of vocabulary where Swedish and English differ in devious ways. Prime examples are, of course, the well-known phenomenon of “false friends” (like *eventually*), which is briefly attended to in a separate section, together with “Swenglish” expressions (*happy end* versus real English *happy ending*). Also, in connection with abbreviations (of which there are lists in both the Swedish and the English part), it is pointed out that Swedish *obs.* corresponds to English *NB*, whereas the English abbreviation *obs.* stands for ‘obsolete’ (e.g., as a marker of certain words and/or meanings in English dictionaries, often misunderstood by Swedish readers). The writing of Swedish proper nouns (translate or not, wholly or in part?), of various kinds, is another, notoriously tricky area, where *Skrivregler* has a good deal of sound advice on offer, e.g. beauties like *the Kaknästornet Tower* and *19 Kungsgatan Street* (for Kungsgatan 19). The special section, “Ord och uttryck” (words and expressions, lacking a corresponding section in the Swedish part), dealing with the cases just exemplified, also accounts for some major differences between British and American English, not only with regard to spelling but also vocabulary (e.g., Br. *aluminium* versus Am. *aluminum*).

As pointed out in the introduction to the English part (p. 132), writing conventions for English are less standardized than those for Swedish. It is a pleasing aspect of *Skrivregler* that cases of divided usage are duly noted, e.g., as regards hyphenation and end-of-line word division, single versus double quotation marks, colon versus comma introducing direct speech, numbers in figures versus letters (12 or twelve?). Often references are given to relevant sources in the English bibliography.

As may have appeared by now, I have no major criticisms of *Skrivregler*. A reviewer in such distress may be forgiven for some nitpicking. In at least one case, *Skrivregler* fails to practise what it preaches. With regard to question marks, it is stated (p. 9) that headings (e.g., of a chapter or section) in the form of a question should end with a question mark, as in “Domänförlust – utarmning eller internationalisering?” (Loss of domain – impoverishment or internationalization?). However, in two identical headings (pp. 57 and 148), concerning the choice of upper- or lower-case letters, the question mark is conspicuously absent (“Stor eller liten bokstav”); it may be noted that the very same heading in *Svenska skrivregler* (p. 74) does have a question mark. The English bibliography includes the 1978 edition of *Engelsk universitetsgrammatik* by Jan Svartvik and Olof Sager—why not the more recent 1996 edition? In the wordlist (giving definitions as well as English equivalents of some of the terms used in *Skrivregler*), the entry *blanksteg* (space) refers the reader to the entry *mellanrum*—where, perhaps fittingly, there is nothing but empty space...

Needless to say, trifles such as these do not detract from the indisputable merits of *Skrivregler*. The book comes out as a balanced, authoritative and succinct account, presented in an accessible style, of the nuts and bolts of writing in Swedish and English. Inevitably, some readers may at times find some specific information missing, but on the whole the selection of areas covered, with varying degrees of depth, is clearly adequate to the needs of most writers. In short, *Skrivregler* is an

eminently useful handbook—not least, I would add, for students of Swedish and/or English at university level.

Sölve Ohlander

Høeg Müller, Henrik (ed.). **Reflections on Modality**. Copenhagen Studies in Language 26. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur, 2001. 127 pp. ISSN 0905-9857. ISBN 87-593-0959-8. Price: DKK 140.

Modality is an area of continuous interest to linguists as shown by the recent publication of *Reflections on modality* in the prestigious series *The Copenhagen Studies in Language*. The inspiration for the volume was a seminar on modality organized at the Copenhagen Business School two years ago. Modality is dealt with from many perspectives and on the basis of several different languages (including the contributors’ native language, Danish). Several articles focus on the divergence between form and function in the area of modality, which is a major issue as soon as we move away from the English modal auxiliaries.

The book contains four articles by different authors. In his contribution ‘Modals and modality: Some issues and some proposals’, written within the framework of situation semantics, Finn Sørensen makes the interesting suggestion that the semantic field of modalities can be organised around speaker information. Modalities are associated with possibilities which are consequences of what happens to be actual (‘motivated possibilities’). On the basis of the information context a distinction is made between deontic and epistemic possibilities.

The topic of Henrik Høeg Müller’s article is the modal auxiliaries in Spanish. It is typical of the Germanic languages, most clearly of English, that there is close correspondence between modal function and syntactic patterns. When we look at Spanish (and other Romance languages), it is much more difficult to find such correspondences and the criteria which have been given for auxiliarihood tend to be contradictory.

In Spanish as in English we have a radically expansive approach to modality (cf. Perkins 1983) competing with minimal suggestions concerning the inventory of modals. The aim of Høeg Müller’s article is to define a homogeneous group of ‘prototypical’ modals with clearly auxiliary (operator) status by applying a set of morphological and syntactic criteria defining ‘external’ and ‘internal’ modality. The article ends with the warning that it is important to first make distinctions in the semantic field of modality before attempting to establish an inventory of modal auxiliaries and that one should not let oneself be seduced by the harmony between the morphosyntax and semantics of the English modals when analysing Spanish.

The third article (Michael Herslund’s ‘Modality and the indefinite article’) discusses the specific and non-specific reading of the indefinite article in Danish. The author applies Donnellan’s well-known distinction between the referential use and the descriptive/attributive use to analyse the indefinite article. It is shown that there is a connection to modality in the non-specific use (‘I’m looking for a blue binder. It’s for my cooking recipes’) and the generic reading (‘a blue binder is the researcher’s most important tool’). Objective modality triggers a generic reading: the speaker does not express his own point of view but states a norm, a maxim, etc. Subjective modality, i.e. ‘the speaker’s evaluation of the situation’ is characteristic of the descriptive or non-specific reading.

Kasper Boye’s article has the title ‘Evidence for evidentiality in Danish’. Evidentiality has been less often discussed than epistemic modality and is not always strictly delimited from the former type of modality. The present article is an interesting description of how the broad notion of evidentiality proposed by Chafe & Nichols (1986) manifests itself in Danish, not in the grammatical system but lexicalised as adverbs and particularly as verbs with an operator or auxiliary function. Following Chafe & Nichols, the author distinguishes between different types of evidence, including, for example, direct evidence, inference, and report. Of

particular interest is the description of a class of evidential verbs, including verbs of appearance, perception and attitude as well as declaration when they refer to evidence for a proposition, as in *it is seen, it is said* (cf Noel 2001). The category of evidential verbs in Danish can be derived from lexical sources by grammaticalisation processes according to well-known principles (Hopper & Traugott 1993). The grammaticalisation analysis can, for example, explain the functional fission between related etymological forms, such as the grammaticalised *be said* and other forms of *say*.

The area of modality continues to fascinate scholars as seen from this stimulating little volume, which brings to the surface a number of problematic issues such as the scope of modality, the controversial distinction between subjective and objective modality and the relevance to linguistics of logical categories such as epistemic and deontic.

Karin Aijmer

References

- Chafe, W. and J. Nichols (eds). 1986. *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Noel, D. 2001. The passive matrices of English infinitival complement clauses. Evidentials on the road to auxiliarihood. *Studies in Language* 25 (2): 254-96.
- Perkins, M. R. 1983. *Modal expressions in English*. London: Frances Pinter.
- Hopper, P.J. & E.C. Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibson, Robert. **Intercultural Business Communication**. Oxford Handbooks for Language Teachers. Oxford University Press 2002. xii + 111 pp. Paperback. ISBN 0-19-4421805. Price: GBP 13.50.

In a globalized and to a large extent 'anglicized' world, non-English speakers are far more likely to know more about 'us' than 'we' about 'them'. With *Intercultural Business Communication*, Robert Gibson has made an informative and pedagogically useful contribution to a fascinating and increasingly important field. The book is divided into five chapters and is replete with illustrations and graphs. Of special value to students are the exercises and 'critical incidents', which appear throughout the book, and offer ample scope for analysis and class discussion.

Chapter 1 outlines the intercultural challenge, defines culture shock and warns of the consequences of not taking cultural differences seriously. The Daimler-Chrysler merger is cited as a case in point and illustrates rather handily that just because two countries (Germany and the United States) are technologically developed does not mean that they have culturally converged.

Chapter 2 offers a brief survey of the research. The work of Hall, Kluckhohn and Strodbeck, Hofstede, and Trompenaars is covered. Kinesics (body language), oculistics (eye contact), haptics (touching), proxemics (body distance) and chronemics (time perception) are also explained in very readable prose.

Chapter 3 deals with business communication, and the theoretical framework described in chapter 2 is applied to concrete situations in business life. Managing people, negotiating, socializing, advertising, presentations and applying for a job are all dealt with, and any English speaker who has worked outside his or her country and perhaps functioned in another language will recognize the pitfalls, be they cultural (being too direct with a Japanese) or purely linguistic ("Nothing Sucks like an Electrolux").

Chapter 4 examines various cultures' attitudes towards each other (how German and French managers see each other, for example), and chapter 5 gives advice on staff training and further research.

All in all, Gibson has produced a book that should be included on the reading list of any course that deals with the cultural problems encountered by business

people who are posted abroad and find themselves overwhelmed (or perhaps just mundanely confused) by their new environment. It is to be hoped that *Intercultural Business Communication* will receive the attention it deserves.

Bruce Junkin

Anderson, Linda. **Autobiography**. New York: Routledge, 2001. 156 pages. ISBN 0-415-18635-8.

Linda Anderson's *Autobiography* aims at facilitating the study of autobiography by providing "a comprehensive introduction to the forms and the uses of the genre" and introducing "the crucial questions of identity, selfhood, language and writing." Anderson follows the developments of Western autobiographical writing from Saint Augustine's *Confessions* to contemporary (women's, black and postcolonial) autobiographies as well as the changes, under the influence of De Man, Barthes and Derrida in particular, in the critical approach to autobiographical works over the last three decades, all of which is examined from a broad historical and theoretical perspective. While she seems to prioritize a discussion of relevant theoretical issues, such as the deconstruction to autobiography as a genre privileging white male subjects, followed by its potential strategic uses by previously marginalized and/or oppressed social groups, Anderson also engages in a closer analysis of several of the works included in the volume, employing the tools of psychoanalytic, poststructuralist, feminist and postcolonial criticism. This results in relatively concise, but at times unavoidably rather fragmentary readings of a number of autobiographical texts by among others Bunyan, Boswell, Rousseau, Wordsworth, Freud, Woolf, Hurston, Ondaatje and Naipaul. Throughout her book, Anderson also pays attention to non-canonical texts, often by women writers, and focuses particularly on the role of female figures—usually the marked presence of mothers—even in texts written by men. Finally, with its short but quite comprehensive Glossary, a noteworthy feature of the volume is that it provides an overview of relevant critical terminology. Without doubt Anderson has made a valuable contribution towards the further study of autobiographies and autobiographical criticism.

Maria Proitsaki

Hermann Paul, **Deutsches Wörterbuch**. 10. überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage von Helmut Henne, Heidrun Kämper und Georg Objartel. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag 2002. XXI und 1243 Seiten. ISBN 3-484-73057-9. 56 Euro.

Helmut Henne / Jörg Kilian (Hgg.), **Hermann Paul: Sprachtheorie, Sprachgeschichte, Philologie**. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag 1998. 342 Seiten. ISBN 3-484-31200-9. 48 Euro.

In einem bekannten Ausspruch von Lessing (zit. in *Moderna språk* 1993, S. 218) heißt es: „Mir ist selten genug, daß ich ein Ding kenne, und weiß, wie dieses Ding heißt, ich möchte sehr oft auch wissen, warum dies Ding so und nicht anders heißt. Kurz, ich bin einer von den entschiedensten Wortgrüblern“. Man braucht aber nicht unbedingt Wortgrübler zu sein, um von dem Paulschen Wörterbuch, dessen neunte Auflage 1992 in *Moderna språk* (S. 198 ff.) besprochen wurde, fasziniert zu sein.

Nun liegt also schon nach zehn Jahren eine neue, wiederum überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage vor. Das eigentliche Wörterbuch ist um rund 100 Seiten erweitert. Der neue Untertitel „Bedeutungsgeschichte und Aufbau unseres Wortschatzes“ verweist darauf, daß „den alphabetisch-semasiologischen Strukturen ein begrifflich-onomasiologisches Register zugeordnet“ ist. Hier findet man also die einschlägigen Wörter zusammengestellt unter Kategorien wie *Computersprache, Lehnübersetzung, Volksetymologie, Jugendsprache, Jiddisch* usw. Unter *Schwedisch* neben altbekannten Entlehnungen wie *Knäckebröt* und *Ombudsmann* nun auch *Moped* und *Alkoholismus*,

letzteres ein Wort, das offenbar aus der Übersetzung einer Schrift des Medizinprofessors Magnus Huss v. J. 1851 stammt („Alcoholismus chronicus eller kronisk alkoholsjukdom“, laut *Nationalencyklopedin* „eine Beschreibung der Krankheit, die internationale Aufmerksamkeit erregte“). – Erfreulicherweise sind fast alle Nachträge und Berichtigungen aus der Besprechung der 9. Auflage in *Moderna språk*, wiewohl dies auf S. XI nicht vermerkt ist, nun beachtet worden, so z. B. unter den Stichwörtern *Knüller*, *Konzentrationslager*, *Moped*, *Stiefmütterchen*, *Zeter* und besonders unter *Faschismus*. Der mittelniederdeutsche Umlaut, bekanntlich ein Steckenpferd des Rezensenten (in *Moderna språk* wiederholt seit 1963, S. 384, neuerdings auch in der Festschrift für Märta Åsdahl Holmberg 1999, S. 141 ff.), ist nun unter *berüchtigt* eingeführt, fehlt aber eigenartigerweise immer noch unter *anrühlich*.

Für jüngere Deutschlehrer und Germanisten ist Hermann Paul wohl heute kaum mehr als (bestenfalls) ein Name. Daher sei hier auch aufmerksam gemacht auf den vor einigen Jahren von Helmut Henne und Jörg Kilian herausgegebenen Sammelband, der Reden, Abhandlungen und Biographie dieser Zentralgestalt in der Geschichte der Germanistik enthält. Besonders aufschlußreich ist der Lebenslauf, den Paul kurz vor seinem Tode 1922 veröffentlichte. Hinzu kommen Nachrufe und Briefe von führenden Germanisten der damaligen Zeit, wie Wilhelm Braune, Carl von Kraus, Edward Schröder und Eduard Sievers. Ergänzend dazu sei erinnert an die Charakteristik von Erik Wellander, der 1910 ein Semester in München studierte und entscheidende Impulse von ihm erhielt. Hermann Paul war „sehr klein von Wuchs und äußerlich unansehnlich, in der Vorlesung sachlich bis zur Trockenheit“ (in all dem also der diametrale Gegensatz zu W.), „aber grundgelehrt, mit einem formidablen Gedächtnis und einer bemerkenswerten analytischen Schärfe“ (was in gleichem Maße für W. galt, s. meinen Nachruf auf Erik Wellander in *Vitterhetsakademiens årsbok* 1978).

Im Lebenslauf von Hermann Paul erfährt man, daß er schon „in der obersecunda von einer augenentzündung befallen wurde, die eine dauernde Schwächung hinterließ“, und daß er seit 1914 fast erblindet war. Um so erstaunlicher sein Lebenswerk, über das die imponierende Bibliographie S. 325-340 orientiert. Darunter findet sich eine bemerkenswerte Stellungnahme „Zur orthographischen Frage“ (abgedruckt S. 281 ff.) aus dem Jahr 1880, die zeigt, wie früh die sich über mehr als hundert Jahre erstreckende Debatte um eine Reform einsetzte. Wenn die für die fatale heutige sog. Rechtschreibreform Verantwortlichen Hermann Pauls Gesichtspunkte berücksichtigt hätten, wäre mancher Unfug verhindert worden.

Helmut Henne und seine Mitarbeiter haben aber diesen Hinweis nicht nötig. Ein zusätzliches Verdienst dieser vorzüglichen Neubearbeitung ist nämlich, daß sie in der alten Orthographie erscheint.¹

Gustav Korlén

¹ Zu Werk und Wirkung von Helmut Henne siehe die schöne Festschrift zu seinem 65. Geburtstag, *Sprache im Leben der Zeit. Beiträge zur Theorie, Analyse und Kritik der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2001), Vorwort S. IX-XV und S. 493-508.

Birgitta Almgren: *Illusion und Wirklichkeit. Individuelle und kollektive Denkmuster in nationalsozialistischer Kulturpolitik und Germanistik in Schweden 1928-1945*. Huddinge: Södertörns högskola, 2001. ISBN 91-89315-09-X. 439 S.

Zu ihrem Hauptforschungsgebiet im Bereich der Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Germanistik hatte Birgitta Almgren bereits zum Abschluss ihres Studiums 1968 gefunden, als sie an der Universität Uppsala die Lizentiatsarbeit *Die Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift 1929-1943. Eine Untersuchung über die Auseinandersetzung zwischen humanistischen Gedanken und nationalsozialistischer Ideologie* schrieb. Seither hat sie diese Forschungsrichtung konsequent und mit Leidenschaft weiter-

verfolgt, ausgebaut und sich mittlerweile einen geachteten Platz in der Wissenschaftshistoriografie Schwedens und auch des europäischen Auslandes erarbeiten können.

Die ebenfalls an der Universität Uppsala eingereichte und 1997 publizierte Dissertationsschrift *Germanistik und Nationalsozialismus: Affirmation, Konflikt und Protest. Traditionsfelder und zeitgebundene Wertung in Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft am Beispiel der Germanisch-Romanischen Monatsschrift 1929-1943* ist nicht schlechthin die Weiterführung des früher Begonnenen. Zum einen ist sie ein Ausweis dafür, dass die Verfasserin sich intensiv bemüht hat, die aktuelle Forschungsdiskussion zur Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus im Allgemeinen und zur Rolle der Germanistik im „Dritten Reich“ im Besonderen weitgehend zu berücksichtigen. Zum anderen ist dieser Arbeit anzumerken, dass Birgitta Almgren gleichwohl ihren eigenen unverwechselbaren Forschungsansatz in diese Diskussion einzubringen verstanden hat. Das betrifft die diskursanalytisch angelegte Untersuchung von Texten der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft in der *Germanisch-Romanischen Monatsschrift* genauso wie das Bemühen um differenzierte und differenzierende Kontextualisierungen und Wertungen von wissenschaftlichen Positionen in weiten Teilen der akademischen Germanistik in Deutschland während der NS-Zeit. Ihre Grundthese von der Unterscheidung zwischen „neutralen“, „kritischen“, „polyphonen“ und „geprägten“ Texten mag zwar als Schematisierung komplexer Sachverhalte erscheinen, ist jedoch ein durchaus gangbarer Weg, tradierte wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Pauschalurteile über die Verstrickung des Faches Germanistik als Ganzes in die Ideologie des NS (soweit es diese als ein geschlossenes Theoriegebäude überhaupt gegeben hat) kritisch zu hinterfragen. Dass eine solche nicht von ideologischen Vorannahmen und monokausalen Erklärungsversuchen diktierte Haltung mittlerweile zum Grundbestand des Wissens und des methodisch-theoretischen Instrumentariums in der modernen Forschung gehört, ist auch mit das Verdienst von Birgitta Almgren, die neben den bereits genannten Publikationen noch zahlreiche andere und nicht minder wichtige Studien und Aufsätze in Sammelpublikationen und Zeitschriften veröffentlicht hat.

Das vorliegende Buch *Illusion und Wirklichkeit* zeugt von der Kontinuität wissenschaftlicher Bestrebungen von Birgitta Almgren im Rahmen eines nach wie vor aktuellen Themas wie von ihrem Anspruch nach innovativer Forschungsleistung gleichermaßen. Hatte sie sich in ihrer Dissertation mit einem relativ abgegrenzten Gegenstand, dem Profil und den Publikationsformen einer Zeitschrift, befasst, so widmet sie sich nunmehr einem Problemfeld, das weitaus komplexer ist und das vor ihr noch nie mit einer solchen Intensität bearbeitet worden ist. Es geht um nichts Geringeres als um den Gewinn an vertieften Einsichten in den Funktions- und Wirkungsmechanismus der vom Nationalsozialismus dominierten deutschen Kultur- und Wissenschaftspolitik gegenüber Schweden und den anderen skandinavischen Ländern, um die in diesem historischen Kontext zu betrachtende Rolle von mit der auswärtigen Kultur- und Wissenschaftspolitik befassten Institutionen in Deutschland und Schweden sowie um das Wirken deutscher und schwedischer Germanisten in dieser Zeit. Die Verfasserin nennt das lapidar „deutsch-schwedische Interaktion“ (S. 20), womit sie eben nicht nur die vielfältigen Formen der Einflussnahme deutscher Germanisten sowie ministerieller und parteiamtlicher Stellen auf die Vermittlung der deutschen Kultur und die Ausbildung im Fach Deutsch an Schulen, Hochschulen und Universitäten in Schweden meint, sondern genauso die Reaktionsweisen und Verhaltensmuster schwedischer Germanisten im Bezug auf die seit 1933 veränderte Lage in ihrem Fach. Letzteres schließt nach Auffassung der Verfasserin insbesondere die Fragestellung ein, inwieweit „die frequenten Denkmuster, Stereotype und Ideologeme des Nationalsozialismus bei Germanisten in Schweden feststellbar“ (S. 17) sind oder nicht.

Insgesamt lässt sich einschätzen, dass es Birgitta Almgren in mehrfacher Hinsicht gelungen ist, das Netzwerk von vielschichtigen Gegenständen und Kontexten durchschaubar zu machen. Das betrifft zunächst ihr methodisches Vorgehen, das davon gekennzeichnet ist, dass an unterschiedlichen Fallbeispielen

jeweils markante Aspekte des Hauptthemas aufgezeigt werden und zugleich der innere Zusammenhang der Einzelaspekte im Blickfeld bleibt. Des Weiteren ist die Tatsache evident, dass im Zentrum der Arbeit die personalgeschichtliche Untersuchung exponierter historischer Akteure steht, zugleich aber die wissenschaftshistorisch relevanten Verbindungslinien zu institutionengeschichtlichen Fragestellungen sowie zu historisch-politischen Kontexten in der Analyse stets präsent gehalten werden. Was das vorliegende Buch jedoch vor allem auszeichnet, ist sein hoher Grad an Wissenszuwachs, der erst einmal dadurch erreicht wird, dass die Verfasserin eine ungemein große Fülle bisher noch nicht veröffentlichter historischer Quellen und Dokumente aus Archiven in Deutschland und Schweden in jahrelanger intensiver Recherchearbeit ausfindig gemacht, gesichtet und ausgewertet hat. Deren Darstellung und Kommentierung erfolgt vor dem Hintergrund eines breiten Sachwissens über wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Zusammenhänge im „Dritten Reich“ und mit einem hohen Maß an Verantwortung, geht es doch zuweilen um durchaus brisante Gegenstände (wie vor allem die Bewertung der Haltung von schwedischen Germanisten und auch amtlichen Stellen zum Nationalsozialismus in Deutschland sowie zu den vom NS existentiell bedrohten deutschen Wissenschaftlerinnen Agathe Lasch und Käthe Hamburger), die erstmals umfassend einer historisch-kritischen Analyse unterzogen werden und manchen Lesern in Schweden möglicherweise sogar als eine Art Tabubruch erscheinen mögen. Überdies vermittelt die Arbeit einen hohen Erkenntnisgewinn hinsichtlich der Rolle des Deutschen Akademischen Austauschdienstes (DAAD) und der Deutschen Akademie in München, die in wissenschaftshistorischen Darstellungen bislang wenig Beachtung gefunden hat. Gleichwohl muss kritisch angemerkt werden, dass komplexe und widersprüchliche wissenschafts- und methodengeschichtliche Beziehungen zur Lage im Fach Germanistik vor 1933 hin und wieder recht einschichtig und undifferenziert interpretiert werden. Das betrifft zum einen den mehrfach anzutreffenden Verweis auf die Auffassung der Brüder Grimm von der Germanistik als einer „deutschen Wissenschaft“, die in das NS-Konzept eingepasst worden wäre (Vgl. S. 19, S. 387), denn erstens haben sich nur wenige Exponenten einer nationalsozialistischen ausgerichteten Sprach- und Literaturforschung auf die Grimm-Tradition berufen und zweitens bedient ein solcher Vergleich unfreiwillig die alten Klischees in wissenschaftshistorischen Darstellungen ideologiekritischer Provenienz, auch wenn die Differenz zwischen dem Grimmschen Germanistikkonzept und dem im NS betont wird. Und mehr noch betrifft es zum anderen die Sichtweise der Verfasserin auf die deutsche Germanistik der ersten Jahrzehnte des 20. Jahrhunderts. Wenn es z. B. auf S. 37 heißt, dass die „Germanistik im Dritten Reich [...] sowohl inhaltlich als auch methodisch eine Fortsetzung der Literaturwissenschaft der zwanziger Jahre“ gewesen sei, und diese These mit dem Konzept der Deutschkunde bei August Sauer und Gustav Roethe sowie mit der Symbiose von geistesgeschichtlichen und „ethnologischen literaturwissenschaftlichen Theorien“ bei Josef Nadler begründet wird, dann werden m. E. komplexe Prozesse etwas vereinfacht charakterisiert. Abgesehen davon, dass Germanistik und Literaturwissenschaft nicht identisch sind, muss zunächst festgehalten werden, dass August Sauers Konzept einer Literaturgeschichte auf völkischer bzw. volkskundlicher Grundlage Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts nur bedingt etwas mit der Deutschkunde-Bewegung, deren Höhepunkt in den 20er Jahren lag, zu tun hat. Außerdem hatte diese fast keinen Einfluss auf den Wissenschaftsdiskurs, da sie weit stärker im Deutschunterricht Fuß zu fassen suchte. Und schließlich sollte bedacht werden, dass Nadlers stammheitliche Literaturgeschichtsbetrachtung für die an nationalsozialistischen Ideologemen orientierte Literaturforschung von nicht allzu großer Bedeutung gewesen ist. Neuere wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Darstellungen haben überzeugend nachgewiesen, dass Nadlers Modell nicht nur in der germanistischen Fachwelt vor 1933 randständig blieb, sondern auch nach 1933 (zu seinem eigenen Leidwesen) kaum eine Chance auf (fach)öffentliche Anerkennung hatte.

Ein weiterer Vorzug des Buches von Birgitta Almgren liegt in der Möglichkeit zum Vergleich der in deutschen und schwedischen Archiven aufgefundenen Quellentexte vornehmlich in den Fällen, wo es sich um die damalige Dokumentierung authentischer Vorgänge handelt. Durch dieses methodische Vorgehen wird nicht nur ein höherer Grad an Zuverlässigkeit bei der Beurteilung des Wahrheitsgehaltes der überlieferten Texte erreicht. Es bietet auch im Hinblick auf deren diskurshistorische Untersuchung die Chance für aussagekräftige intra- und intertextuelle Vergleiche. Damit fungieren die von der Verfasserin besprochenen unterschiedlichen Textsorten nicht schlechthin als wissenschaftshistorische Dokumente in ihrer Belegfunktion, sondern als Gegenstände linguistisch-semantischer Untersuchungen, die rein quantitativ einen beträchtlichen Teil der vorliegenden Arbeit ausmachen und sich dezidiert an der Kritischen Diskursanalyse der Wiener Schule um Ruth Wodak orientieren. Diese Art des methodischen Zuganges ermöglicht eine Reihe von vertieften Einsichten, wenngleich m. E. auch Problematisches damit verbunden ist. Zu den Vorzügen der Diskursanalyse gehört zweifellos, dass sie textimmanente Phänomene konsequent kontextualisiert und sie als Momente sozialer (und politischer) Praxis zu begreifen versteht, indem sie ihre Mehrdimensionalität herausarbeitet. Dadurch wird auch verständlich gemacht, dass dieselben sprachlichen Formulierungen unterschiedliche semantische Inhalte aktivieren können und dass (umgekehrt) die Verwendung von Vokabeln oder Schlüsselwörtern in Texten nicht unbedenken als Indiz für politische Gesinnung aufgefasst werden kann. (Vgl. S. 34) Insofern ist der Verfasserin zuzustimmen, wenn sie behauptet, dass die linguistische Analyse die Plausibilität einer Interpretation erhöhen kann (Vgl. S. 33), was an den von ihr vorgenommenen Untersuchungen ausgewählter Quellentexte durchweg nachvollziehbar ist, auch wenn das angewandte Analyseraster zuweilen etwas monoton anmutet. Gleichviel, der Gewinn, der hierbei zu verbuchen ist, ist beträchtlich. Einerseits erhalten dadurch die schriftlichen Überlieferungen einen wissenschaftsgeschichtlich großen Stellen- und Eigenwert. Andererseits werden getroffene Urteile und Wertungen seitens der Verfasserin empirisch nachprüfbar und haben auch ein hohes Maß an Ausgewogenheit, zumal das Bemühen deutlich wird, nicht vorschnell zu verurteilen, sondern gerecht zu beurteilen. Problematisch an diesem Verfahren ist m. E., dass die methodischen Möglichkeiten der historischen Diskursanalyse nicht voll genutzt werden. Die vorliegenden Textuntersuchungen erschöpfen sich vielfach in Stilanalysen von Einzeltexten, wo doch gerade die Methode der Vernetzung vieler Texte das eigentliche Metier der Diskursbetrachtung ist, und zwar mit dem Ziel, das Reden und Schreiben über Dinge in einer bestimmten Zeit überhaupt erst als Diskurs bestimmen zu können. Bei der Lektüre des vorliegenden Buches gewinnt man jedoch manchmal den Eindruck, als sei dieser Diskurs schon vorausgesetzt. Die Verfasserin nennt ihn den „damaligen historischen Gesamtdiskurs“ (S. 31, S. 389), ohne allerdings begreifbar zu machen, was mit diesem unspezifischen Begriff eigentlich gemeint ist.

Trotz der formulierten kritischen Einwände, die die Gesamtleistung von Birgitta Almgren in keiner Weise schmälern sollen, kann man als Fazit mit Fug und Recht sagen: Wer jetzt und in Zukunft als Wissenschaftshistoriker, Germanist oder Student zu Problemkreisen der auswärtigen Kultur- und Wissenschaftspolitik des „Dritten Reiches“ gegenüber Schweden und zur schwedischen Germanistik in den Jahren 1933 bis 1945 Auskunft sucht, wird zuerst das vorliegende Buch in die Hand nehmen müssen, um sich umfassendes Basiswissen anzueignen. Wer dies unternimmt, wird gleichermaßen sehr viele und wertvolle Anregungen finden, um sich mit der widersprüchlichen Lage des Faches und dessen Repräsentanten in Deutschland und Schweden auseinander zu setzen, und zugleich mit dem Anspruch der Verfasserin konfrontiert sein, mit dem Blick für das Wesentliche und streitbar der historischen Wahrheit auf den Grund zu gehen. Und man wird in der Ansicht bestärkt werden, dass die historisch-kritische Auseinandersetzung mit der Germanistik in der Zeit der NS-Diktatur in Deutschland nicht mehr nur eine rein deutsche Angelegenheit ist bzw. ausschließlich mit Blick auf die deutschen

Zustände und in deren Wirkung nach Außen erfolgen kann. Auch eingedenk der besonderen Verantwortung der Wissenschaftsgeschichtsschreibung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland gegenüber ihrer eigenen Vergangenheit insbesondere der NS-Zeit wird man wohl sagen können, dass diese Auseinandersetzung auch die differenzierte Beantwortung der Frage nach der Mitverantwortung von Fachvertretern in anderen europäischen und außereuropäischen Ländern für die historisch einmalige Pervertierung von Wissenschaft mit einschließen muss. Birgitta Almgrens Buch ist auf diesem Wege historischer Wahrheitsfindung ein Markstein.

Wolfgang Höppner

Dan Nosell, *Diccionari Suec-Català*, Barcelona 2001, Enclopèdia catalana/Norstedts Ordbok.

För första gången någonsin publiceras nu en omfattande svensk-katalansk ordbok till fromma för svenskar som studerar katalanska, eller arbetar i eller ofta besöker någon av de tre katalansktalande autonoma regionerna i Spanien (Balearerna, Katalonien och Valencia) eller Perpignantrakten i Frankrike eller Andorra, där katalanska är officiellt språk. Det katalansktalande området är större än vad många svenska tror. Det talas t.o.m. katalanska i staden Alghero på Sardinien som en rest av det vidsträckt katalanska väldet under medeltiden. Dessutom är lexikonet efterlängtat av den ganska stora grupp studenter i Barcelona som studerar svenska.

Ordboken omfattar cirka 35 000 ord och bygger på en ordbank från *Norstedts svensk-spanska ordbok*. Den ger grammatisk information om de svenska orden (en/ett, oregelbunden plural, verböjning m.m.) för de katalanska läsarna. Det svenska uttalet är som bekant ganska krångligt, och därför är ett stort antal uppslagsord försedda med uttalsanvisningar, där även accent 2 anges.

Boken inleds med en kortfattad introduktion till hur den är upplagd och förklaringar till de använda förkortningarna. Dessa korta kapitel ges på både svenska och katalanska. För att underlätta förståelsen och användningen av orden ges ofta hela konstruktioner som t. ex. **avge** översätts inte bara med 'donar, fer, emetre' utan förklarar vidare *avge ett löfte*, 'fer una promesa', *avge ett omdöme*, 'emetre un judici, donar una opinió'. Detta hjälper till vid förståelsen av orden och uttrycken och ökar användbarheten av ordboken. Genom att urvalet baserat sig på en väl utarbetad databank och ett beprövat lexikografiskt koncept blir resultatet en användbar och läsarvänlig produkt.

Svenska sammansatta ord är ofta ett problem eftersom de motsvarar flera ord som fogas samman med en eller flera prepositioner på de romanska språken som exempelvis **rödkindad**, 'de galtes vermelles'. Det är viktigt att dessa finns med, även om de kanske inte uppfattas som egna idiomatiska uttryck utan som i stunden gjorda sammansättningar på katalanska. Denna strukturella olikhet mellan språken orsakar annars lätt förvirring hos lexikonanvändarna. I fall, där det inte finns någon direkt motsvarighet har författaren gjort som många före honom, d.v.s. givit en möjligen funktionell men tämligen generell beskrivning som i **rödning** som översätts med '[varietetat sedentária de] salmó'. Jag har alltid i dessa fall önskat att man kunde ge det latinska namnet, så att den riktigt intresserade själv kunde gå vidare till specialistlitteraturen, men nu lämnas läsaren därhän. Detta är dock bara en liten randanmärkning. Självfallet blir det vissa brister i överensstämmelsen mellan ordförklaringarna, så att **vinglas** översätts med 'copa de vi', medan **glas** med underkategorien (*vinglas*) översätts med bara 'copa'. Detta spelar knappast någon roll mer än att det ger felfinnaren chansen och nöjet att hitta något att kritisera. Jag skall också gärna medge att jag inte saknat något ord som borde finnas med i ett lexikon av detta omfång. Så finns exempelvis 'dyrrort' med men inte 'dykdalb', och detta verkar rimligt. Likaledes finns allmänt accepterade familjära uttryck och betydelse med som 'häftigt' i betydelsen 'kul, inne, ball', och detta är viktigt för en katalansk

användare som skall läsa modern litteratur och tidningstext. Andra moderna ord som **miljöbrott** 'delicte ecològic' och **aktiefond** 'fond d'inversió en accions' finns med, vilket också är väsentligt. Detta ger ett allmänt gott intryck av ordboken.

Nosell försöker i de flesta fall ge förklaringar till synonyma uttryck, t. ex. **intetsägande** förklaras med (*innehållslös*), 'buit, sense sentit', (*ointressant*) 'sense interès' och (*uttryckslös*) 'inexpressiu'. Detta är inget ovanligt, men förtjänar att påpekas. Marknaden lär inte översköjas av svensk-katalanska ordböcker, och därför är det bra om den enda som finns är välgjord.

Med denna ordbok avslutar Dan Nosell, som sedan mer än ett decennium undervisar i katalanska vid Uppsala universitet, ett stort och beundransvärt arbete vars första del var det katalansk-svenska lexikonet som utkom 1994 på samma förlag. Det förtjänar slutligen att påpekas att även om katalanskan är ett minoritetsspråk inom Spanien, så är det ett stort och viktigt språk som talas av 6-7 miljoner människor i ett av de industriellt och kulturellt mest intressanta områdena i Europa, och att även om man kan klara sig väl på spanska i Katalonien och de andra katalanska områdena i Spanien, så kan man uppnå så mycket mer socialt, kulturellt och även ekonomiskt genom att ha kunskap i det språk som en mycket stor del av befolkningen - och administrationen - använder i dessa områden. Att sedan katalanskan är bärare av en rik och stor litteratur sedan medeltiden borde motivera till studium i detta spännande romanska språk.

Ingemar Söhrman

Tesis doctoral

Gille, Johan. (2001), *Pautas argumentativas en el diálogo espontáneo. Un estudio de conversaciones intra e interculturales*. Tesis doctoral. Universidad de Estocolmo, Departamento de español y portugués. ISBN 91-7265-229-2

El presente estudio pretende desarrollar un método para el análisis de pautas argumentativas en el diálogo espontáneo (capítulos 1-3), y aplicar este método a muestras de interacción cara a cara (capítulos 4-7). El objetivo del estudio empírico es dual: evaluar, por una parte, el método propuesto, y proporcionar, por la otra, una descripción contrastiva del estilo comunicativo de hablantes suecos y españoles en conversaciones intra e interculturales.

El estudio subraya los aspectos cooperativos y dinámicos de la argumentación en la interacción, así como la dialogicidad de cada contribución conversacional. La argumentación es definida como un proceso dinámico mediante el cual opiniones son negociadas en la interacción. El proceso argumentativo se analiza a través de la identificación de movimientos argumentativos, realizados explícita o implícitamente en la interacción. El dominio del movimiento argumentativo es la unidad de sentido.

El objetivo primordial de la argumentación se identifica en el estudio como el de hacer prevalecer una postura, tal como se refleja en una opinión expresada de forma abierta o cubierta, sobre otras posturas/opiniones posibles o expresadas. Este objetivo general engloba los propósitos interactivos más específicos de obtener la adhesión del auditorio a una postura, y de crear una disposición para actuar por parte del auditorio.

El modelo propuesto comprende una serie de movimientos argumentativos y no argumentativos, definidos a partir de cuatro rasgos distintivos binarios: [+/- nuevo tópico], [+/- acuerdo], [+/- nueva información] y [+/- postura]. Además, el modelo discrimina entre movimientos dirigidos a afirmaciones propias (*auto-*) y a afirmaciones ajenas (*alo-*).

El estudio empírico enfoca seis de los movimientos argumentativos (aceptar, rechazar, auto-apoyar, alo-apoyar, auto-refutar, alo-refutar), identificando las estrategias lingüísticas empleadas en la realización de los movimientos. Las estrategias y la frecuencia de uso de cada movimiento son relacionados con dos estilos comunicativos prototípicos: 'colaborativo' y 'autoafirmativo'. A partir de los

análisis, el estudio traza perfiles argumentativos para cada una de las cuatro categorías de participantes en cada uno de los cuatro contextos analizados. El análisis, además de indicar diferencias sistemáticas entre los distintos grupos, proporciona apoyo empírico al modelo propuesto.

Palabras clave: argumentación, interacción cara a cara, análisis del discurso, análisis de la conversación, estudios dialogales, estilo comunicativo, estudios interculturales.

Se puede bajar la tesis de la red en formato pdf: <http://lab1.isp.su.se/iis/Gilletes.pdf>

Johan Gille
Inst. f. spanska, portugisiska och latinamerikastudier
 Stockholms universitet
 106 91 Stockholm
 Correo electrónico: johang@isp.su.se

Tesis doctorales

Andrea Castro. El encuentro imposible. La conformación del fantástico ambiguo en la narrativa breve argentina (1862-1910). Departamento de Lenguas Románicas, Sección de Español, Universidad de Gotemburgo. 276 pp. Tesis doctoral presentada en la Universidad de Göteborg en febrero del año 2002.

La tesis se concentra principalmente en el análisis textual de cinco cuentos del período entre 1862 y 1910. Los cinco cuentos presentan la coexistencia de un dominio natural y otro sobrenatural, dominios incompatibles entre sí dadas las premisas racionalistas propuestas por el texto. Teniendo en cuenta que los relatos aparecen en un momento histórico en el cual la razón empírica es entendida como el medio de alcanzar la 'civilización' y el 'progreso' para el país en formación, la ambigua coexistencia arriba mencionada aparece como un desafío a la hegemonía de la razón y, en un sentido más amplio, como un desafío hacia el proceso de modernización.

Para entender cómo se construye la ambigüedad entre un dominio natural y otro sobrenatural en los textos que nos ocupan, se plantearon las siguientes preguntas: ¿En qué niveles del texto se constituye esta ambigüedad? ¿cómo se construye? ¿cómo es mantenida a lo largo de los relatos?

A través del estudio de las técnicas narrativas, y más específicamente del manejo de la voz y del punto de vista por parte de narradores y personajes, se pudo observar que la creación de los dos dominios es en gran medida un producto del acto narrativo, o sea, de cómo se narran los relatos, y no sólo de lo que se narra en ellos. Con el análisis de temas y motivos, se pudo observar que, a través de éstos, los cuentos se inscriben en la tradición gótica, contribuyendo esta inscripción a la creación del dominio sobrenatural. Este estudio permitió asimismo demostrar la importancia fundamental del motivo del umbral y su motivo asociado, el del castillo gótico, en la conformación del espacio textual en el cual se dará la coexistencia de los dominios mencionados.

Un estudio del contexto social, cultural y político en el cual los cuentos fueron publicados –realizado, en parte, a través de la prensa y de otros cuentos del período– contribuyó a un mejor entendimiento del diálogo que los cuentos del fantástico ambiguo entablaron con su contexto. El estudio de la situación editorial contribuyó a entender la posición desde la que escribían los autores de los cuentos y hacia qué tipo de público se dirigían.

Los cinco cuentos estudiados son: "Quien escucha su mal oye" (1865) de Juana Manuela Gorriti, "El ruiseñor y el artista" (1876) de Eduardo L. Holmberg, "El ramito de romero" (1877) de Eduarda Mansilla, "La corbata azul" (1904) de Atilio Chiappori y "Un fenómeno inexplicable" (1906) de Leopoldo Lugones.

Andrea Castro

CONTRIBUTORS

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Karin Aijmer | Göteborgs universitet, engelska institutionen,
Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden |
| Elisabeth Auer | Stockholms universitet, tyska institutionen,
SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden |
| Chloé Avril | Göteborgs universitet, engelska institutionen,
Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden |
| Dermot Bolger | Göteborgs universitet, engelska institutionen,
Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden |
| Synnöve Clason | Stockholms universitet, tyska institutionen,
SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden |
| Wolfgang Höppner | Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin,
D-100 99 Berlin, Germany |
| Bruce Junkin | Göteborgs universitet, engelska institutionen,
Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden |
| Göran Kjellmer | Göteborgs universitet, engelska institutionen,
Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden |
| Gustav Korlén | Storängens Strandväg 2 B,
SE-131 41 Nacka, Sweden |
| Vivi-Anne Lennartsson | Høgskolen i Stavanger, Pb 8002,
N-40 68 Stavanger, Norway |
| Moira Linnarud | Karlstads universitet, institutionen för kultur och
kommunikation (engelska), SE-651 88 Karlstad, Sweden |
| Gunnar Magnusson | Stockholms universitet, tyska institutionen,
SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden |
| Sölve Ohlander | Göteborgs universitet, engelska institutionen,
Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden |
| Arne Olofsson | Göteborgs universitet, engelska institutionen,
Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden |
| Maria Proitsaki | Göteborgs universitet, engelska institutionen,
Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden |
| Ingemar Söhrman | Göteborgs universitet, Institutionen för romanska språk,
Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden |
| Elisabeth Tegelberg | Göteborgs universitet, Institutionen för romanska språk,
Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden |
| Joe Trotta | Göteborgs universitet, engelska institutionen,
Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden |
| Norman Vance | School of English and American Studies, University of
Sussex, Arts B, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QN, England |