

PODIPLOMSKA ŠOLA ZRC SAZU

Eva Trivunović

**Biblijski frazemi v zgodovinskem slovaropisju: sinhroni in diahroni vidik**

Doktorska disertacija

Mentorica: doc. dr. Andreja Legan Ravnikar

Ljubljana, 2023

## POVZETEK

Doktorska disertacija z naslovom »Biblijski frazemi v zgodovinskem slovaropisju: sinhroni in diahroni vidik« se osredotoča na razvoj biblijskih in izbiblijskih frazemov v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku ter na njihovo slovarsko obravnavo. Biblijska besedila so v evropskem kulturnem prostoru najproduktivnejši vir za frazeme in veljajo za internacionalizme, zato je njihovo preučevanje tudi mednarodno relevantno. A kljub internacionalnemu značaju imajo v vsakem jeziku določene individualne posebnosti. Področje biblijskih in izbiblijskih frazemov je v slovenskem in tujem jezikoslovju pomanjkljivo raziskano, tudi s tem povezana terminologija še ni povsem ustaljena. V doktorski disertaciji ločujem med dvema sorodnima tipoma frazemov: biblijskimi in izbiblijskimi frazemi. Biblijski frazemi so bili v slovenski knjižni jezik iz jezikov biblijskih predlog prevzeti kot že izoblikovane frazeološke enote, torej ustrezajo definiciji frazema že v besedilu Biblije. Izbiblijski frazemi pa sicer temeljijo na Bibliji, vendar so svojo stalnost in/ali preneseni pomen dobili šele v procesu frazeologizacije v slovenskem (knjižnem) jeziku.

V prvih obdobjih slovenskega knjižnega jezika je raziskovanje biblijskih in izbiblijskih frazemov oteženo, saj prevladujejo verska besedila, v katerih se frazeološkost določene biblijske zveze težko nedvomno dokaže. Glavno vprašanje, ki se mu posvečam, je, kako v gradivu za slovenski knjižni jezik 16. stoletja ločiti različne tipe biblijskih stalnih zvez in kako dokazati osamosvojenost frazemov od izhodiščnega biblijskega besedila ter kako to vpliva na prikaz v slovarju. Predvidevala sem, da današnji biblijski in izbiblijski frazemi v tem obdobju pogosto še niso osamosvojeni od izhodiščnega biblijskega odlomka in zato v zgodovinskem slovarju ne morejo biti obravnavani kot pravi frazemi. Osrednji cilj doktorske disertacije je bil postaviti teoretično in metodološko utemeljena merila, ki bodo znotraj pretežno biblijskih in verskih besedil omogočala jasno ločevanje med pravimi frazemi in podobnimi jezikovnimi enotami v gradivu za slovenski knjižni jezik 16. stoletja, ter na njihovi podlagi oblikovati smernice za prikaz v nastajajočem *Slovarju slovenskega knjižnega jezika 16. stoletja* (SSKJ16).

V poglavju »Teoretična izhodišča« so predstavljene dosedanje slovenske in tujejezične raziskave treh področij: frazeologije sodobnega knjižnega jezika, slovenskega knjižnega jezika 16. stoletja in biblijskih stalnih zvez. V slovenski sodobni frazeološki vedi sta najbolj uveljavljena termina za poimenovanje osnovne enote *frazem* in *frazeološka enota*, ki je opredeljena z naslednjimi definicijskimi lastnostmi: 1) večbesedna ustaljena zgradba, 2) reproduciranost in leksikaliziranost, 3) pomenska celovitost ter 4) konotativnost in ekspresivna vrednost. S to definicijo so iz frazeologije izključene stalne besedne zveze s predvidljivim pomenom in strokovni večbesedni izrazi, hkrati pa taka opredelitev vključuje tudi del *paremij* ali *paremioloških enot* (pregovori, reki ipd.). Frazeološka teorija je najbolj neenotna prav na področju definicijskih lastnosti. Pri preučevanju frazeologije sodobnega jezika se je uveljavil predvsem korpusni pristop, veliko veljavo imajo tudi ankete rojenih govorcev, pregled slovarskega gradiva in upoštevanje govorjenega jezika. Vendar pri raziskovanju slovenskega knjižnega jezika 16. stoletja uporaba naštetih metod ni mogoča, zato je bilo treba razviti drugačno metodologijo. Pomembno je zavedanje, da je jezik 16. stoletja bistveno drugačen od sodobnega, zato nas lastna izkušnja jezika lahko zavede. Na podlagi ohranjenih pisnih virov ne moremo biti povsem prepričani, kateri frazemi so bili zares v rabi v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku 16. stoletja, saj nimamo podatkov o govorjenem jeziku. Če frazem v gradivu ni izpričan, to nujno ne pomeni, da ga ni bilo v rabi v drugih kontekstih ali v govorjenem jeziku. Frazeologija slovenskega knjižnega jezika 16. stoletja je redko obravnavana in je posledično precej neraziskano področje, v slovenskem jezikoslovju pa primanjkuje tudi diahronih frazeoloških raziskav, ki bi prinašale pregled razvoja frazemov skozi različna obdobja zgodovine slovenskega knjižnega jezika. Prav tako so v slovenskem jezikoslovju kljub peščici kvalitetnih

objav velike vrzeli v raziskovanju biblijskih in izbiblijskih frazemov. Slovenske in tujejezične objave o biblijskih in izbiblijskih frazemih prinašajo nekoliko različna pojmovanja (iz)biblijske frazeologije, zato se ločijo tudi v terminologiji ter prinašajo različne poudarke in delitve (iz)biblijskih frazemov. Na podlagi strokovne literature (splošno frazeološke in o (iz)biblijskih frazemih) so v zaključnem delu tega poglavja opredeljeni temeljni pojmi doktorske disertacije: *biblijski frazem*, *izbiblijski frazem*, *primarno besedilo*, *izhodiščni odlomek*, *sekundarno besedilo*, *biblijske stalne zveze*, *stalni citati*, *priložnostni citati*, *pojavitve med citatom in frazemom* in *priložnostna metafora*.

Najobsežnejše poglavje »Biblijski in izbiblijski frazemi v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku s sinhronega in diahronega vidika« prinaša sinhrono in diahrono analizo biblijskih in izbiblijskih frazemov, v katero so vključeni raznovrstni gradivski in slovarski viri. Analiziranih je 52 frazemov, od tega deset biblijskih in 42 izbiblijskih. Sinhrona analiza slovenskega knjižnega jezika 16. stoletja temelji na občnoimenski in lastnoimenski kartoteki, ki je nastala za potrebe SSKJ16, dodatno je bil vključen še en slovarski vir (Megiser: *Paroemiologia Polyglottos*). V kartotekah sem pregledala vse pojavitve besed, za katere sem predvidevala, da bi lahko bile sestavine frazemov. Mestoma sem svoje izpise in ugotovitve primerjala s prvo knjigo SSKJ16, ki je izšla leta 2021 in vsebuje gesla A–D. Ugotovila sem, da so nekateri biblijski frazemi izpričani samo v prevodih Biblije in v z izhodiščnimi odlomki tesno povezanih kontekstih (npr. razlaga izhodiščnega odlomka, citati, poimenovanja prilik, povzetki ipd.), pri drugih pa je izpričana tudi nadaljnja frazeologizacija v drugačnih kontekstih. To je razvojno pomembna razlika, ki mora biti prikazana tudi v slovarju. Od izbiblijskih frazemov sem v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku 16. stoletja mejno potrdila rabo desetih frazemov (izpričani z enim ali dvema istovrstnima zgledoma), le osem jih je prepričljivo izpričanih. Za vsak biblijski in izbiblijski frazem je podana slovarska oblika in pomen ter informacije o vseh izhodiščnih odlomkih, ki so povzete iz strokovne literature in dopolnjene z lastnimi spoznanji. Od vseh 52 analiziranih frazemov je v tem obdobju izpričana le približno polovica.

Diahrona analiza temelji na 18 slovarskih in dveh gradivskih virih. Tako tiskani kot rokopisni slovarji lahko potrdijo obstoj frazema v določenem obdobju, vendar pa je bilo predvsem do sredine 18. stoletja dokaj pogosto, da so slovaropisci sami tvorili prevodne ustreznice k tujejezičnim iztočnicam in frazemom, ki niso bili zares v rabi. Poleg tega frazemi v starejše slovarje niso bili vključeni sistematično, temveč je najverjetneje velik del frazeološkega gradiva ostal nezajet. Prisotnost frazema v starejših slovarjih tako nujno ne pomeni, da je bil takrat dejansko v rabi (to velja predvsem za slovarje do 18. stoletja), hkrati pa tudi odsotnost frazema v slovarju nujno ne pomeni, da frazem ni bil v rabi. Zato je poleg slovarjev ključen pregled besedil iz tistega časa. Za potrditev frazemov v preteklih obdobjih sem uporabljala *Korpus starejših besedil IMP*, za sodobni jezik pa korpus *Gigafida 2.0*. V korpusu IMP je delež besedil, ki so nastala pred 19. stoletjem, zelo majhen, zato so podatki tako iz slovarjev kot korpusa za to obdobje najmanj zanesljivi. Pri diahroni analizi sem bila pozorna na: 1) spremembe v pomenu, obliki in rabi frazemov (krajšanje in nastanek novih krajših frazemov iz prvotno daljših, pomenske spremembe (predvsem prehod iz verskega pomena v splošni pomen)), 2) kontinuiteto v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku, 3) razlike in podobnosti v razvoju biblijskih in izbiblijskih frazemov ter 4) ujemanja in razhajanja slovarskih in gradivskih virov, ki obravnavajo jezik istega obdobja. Analizirala sem tudi slovarsko obravnavo biblijskih in izbiblijskih frazemov, saj je bil cilj doktorske disertacije oblikovati smernice za njihovo slovarsko obravnavo v nastajajočem SSKJ16.

V podpoglavju »Značilnosti biblijskih in izbiblijskih frazemov od začetkov slovenskega knjižnega jezika do sodobnega časa« so združene ugotovitve sinhrono in diahrono analize. Rezultat obeh analiz je časovnica, ki za vsak frazem prinaša podatke o domnevnem času začetka

frazeologizacije, prvo pojavitev v gradivu in prvo pojavitev v slovarju. Pri biblijskih in izbiblijskih frazemih je opazno odmikanje od primarnega besedila in izguba očitne povezave z njim ter s tem povezano prilagajanje sodobni stvarnosti in jeziku (predvsem na ravni ustaljenih in neustaljenih leksikalnih zamenjav sestavin). Manjša razlika med biblijskimi in izbiblijskimi frazemi se kaže v korpusih, saj so vsi v korpusih nepotrjeni frazemi izbiblijski. Morda so se biblijski frazemi, kot stalne jezikovne enote že v Bibliji, prej ustalili tudi v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku in nato tudi vztrajali v rabi. Od 14 v slovarjih neobravnavanih in najredkeje obravnavanih frazemov je le en biblijski, vsi ostali so izbiblijski. Pokazalo se je tudi, da imajo biblijski in izbiblijski frazemi nenapovedljiv razvoj: glede na stanje v 16. stoletju se ne da predvidevati njihovega nadaljnjega razvoja. Pri marsikaterem frazemu so opazne spremembe v obliki, pomenu ali rabi. Med slovarskimi in gradivskimi viri se kaže velik razkorak, saj je večje število frazemov v gradivskih virih izpričanih že mnogo prej kot v slovarskih: nekateri frazemi, ki so izpričani že v 16. stoletju, so bili uslovarjeni šele v sodobnih slovarjih. Za manjše število frazemov velja ravno obratno: pojavijo se že v starejših slovenskih slovarjih, besedilne potrditve zanje pa sem našla šele v najsodobnejšem gradivu.

Nadalje me je zanimalo, kako so k problemu slovarskega prikaza biblijskih in izbiblijskih frazemov pristopili avtorji tujejezičnih zgodovinskih slovarjev, kar je predstavljeno v poglavju »Obravnava (biblijske) frazeologije v tujejezičnih zgodovinskih slovarjih«. Analiziranih je bilo deset tujejezičnih zgodovinskih slovarjev. Glavni poudarki analize so bili: katere informacije o obravnavi stalnih besednih zvez in frazemov uporabnik dobi v uvodu, skladnost načel v uvodu s slovarskim delom in doslednost slovarske obravnave. Le en slovar v uvodu pojasnjuje vse bistvene informacije. V posameznih slovarskih sestavkih sem našla dobre vzore za slovarsko obravnavo frazemov, vendar je pri vseh slovarjih (razen pri enem z bistveno drugačnim konceptom) opaznih veliko nedoslednosti.

V poglavju »Biblijski in izbiblijski frazemi v zgodovinskem SSKJ16« so predstavljeni predlogi dopolnitev načel za slovarsko obravnavo teh frazemov. Predloge sem oblikovala na podlagi pregledanega gradiva za slovenski knjižni jezik 16. stoletja, strokovne literature, tujejezičnih zgodovinskih slovarjev in različnih slovenskih slovarjev. Pri biblijskih frazemih je bilo dokaj enostavno oblikovati smernice za ločevanje med frazemi, ki so izpričani le v izhodiščnih odlomkih in z njimi povezanih sekundarnih besedilih, ter tistimi frazemi, ki se rabijo tudi v drugačnih, novih kontekstih. Prav tako ni bilo zelo zahtevno oblikovati načel za obravnavo tistih izbiblijskih frazemov, ki so nastali na podlagi jezikovnega izraza, ki ima v Bibliji dobesedni pomen, in tistih, ki so nastali na podlagi zgodbe, motiva, osebe ipd. v Bibliji, sam jezikovni izraz pa se v Bibliji ne pojavi. Nekoliko težje je bilo oblikovati načela za obravnavo izbiblijskih frazemov, ki so nastali na podlagi jezikovnega izraza, ki ima v Bibliji dobesedni in preneseni pomen. Najtežje je bilo podati predlog obravnave za tiste izbiblijske frazeme, ki so nastali na podlagi jezikovnega izraza, ki ima v Bibliji preneseni pomen, kjer sta podana dva predloga.

Čeprav je doktorska disertacija tematsko zamejena le na biblijske in izbiblijske frazeme, je relevantna tudi za diahrono frazeološko raziskavo ali sinhrono frazeološko raziskavo časovno oddaljenih obdobj na splošno, saj gre za prvo diahrono frazeološko analizo takega obsega. Gre za pomemben dosežek zgodovinske leksikologije in leksikografije, saj prinaša prvo monografsko obravnavo zgodovinskih frazemov v razvoju slovenskega knjižnega jezika, ki je zanimiva le ne za slovensko jezikoslovno znanost, temveč tudi za nestrokovno javnost in uporabnike slovarjev.

**Ključne besede:** biblijski frazemi, izbiblijski frazemi, slovenski knjižni jezik 16. stoletja, zgodovinsko slovaropisje, zgodovinska frazeografija, zgodovinska frazeologija

## SUMMARY

The doctoral dissertation entitled “Biblical Phraseological Units in Historical Lexicography: Diachronic and Synchronic Approach” focuses on the development of the biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units in the Slovenian literary language and on their lexicographic treatment. Biblical texts are the most productive source for phraseological units in the European cultural space. Phraseological units connected with the Bible are considered internationalisms, which is why their study is also internationally relevant. Despite their international character, they have certain individual peculiarities in each language. The field of biblical phraseology is underresearched in Slovenian and foreign linguistics, and the related terminology is not yet fully established. In my doctoral dissertation I distinguish between two related types of phraseological units: *biblical phraseological units* and *Bible-derived phraseological units*. Biblical phraseological units meet the criteria of a phraseological unit in the text of the Bible. The Bible-derived phraseological units are based on the Bible, but only acquired their stability and/or figurative meaning in the process of phraseologisation in the Slovenian (literary) language.

In the first periods of the Slovenian literary language, the study of biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units is demanding, as majority of the texts are of a religious nature. In these it is difficult to prove beyond doubt if a fixed expression is used as a phraseological unit. The main question of the dissertation is how to distinguish the different types of biblical fixed expressions in the 16<sup>th</sup>-century Slovenian literary language, how to prove the independence of phraseological units from the biblical text and how this affects their lexicographic treatment. I assumed that in this period today's biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units are often not yet independent from the source Bible passage and therefore cannot be treated as true phraseological units in the dictionary. The main aim of the doctoral dissertation was to establish theoretically and methodologically sound criteria that would enable a clear distinction between phraseological units and similar language units in the 16<sup>th</sup>-century Slovenian literary language, within the context of predominantly biblical and religious texts, and to use these criteria as a basis to develop guidelines for the *Dictionary of the 16<sup>th</sup>-Century Slovenian Literary Language* (SSKJ16).

The chapter “Theoretical foundations” presents the current Slovenian and foreign research in three areas: phraseology of modern literary language, 16<sup>th</sup>-century Slovenian literary language and biblical fixed expressions. The most common definition in Slovenian phraseology nowadays defines phraseological units as fixed expressions with the following features: relative stability in form, partially or fully figurative (idiomatic) meaning, expressivity and, as all fixed expressions they are an essential part of a human vocabulary, the lexicon, they are reproducible and lexicalized. This definition excludes from the field of phraseology fixed expressions with a predictable meaning and terminological fixed expressions. On the other hand, it does also include a part of paremiological units (proverbs, sayings, etc.). It is in the area of definitional properties that phraseological theory is the most complex. In modern Slovenian literary language, the majority of phraseological research is based on large corpora. In addition, the importance of spoken language and the survey method (particularly of native speakers) have been given more prominence. However, in phraseology research of past periods of Slovenian literary language (specifically the 16<sup>th</sup> century), those methods are not applicable and so a different methodology had to be developed. We also cannot rely on our linguistic intuition that we have as native speakers of the language more than 450 years after texts were produced, because it can often be misleading. Based on the preserved written sources, we cannot be sure which phraseological units were actually in use in the 16<sup>th</sup> century Slovene literary language, as we have no data on the spoken language. Therefore, if a phraseological unit is not attested in

the preserved sources, this does not necessarily mean that it was not in use in that period in other contexts or in spoken language. The phraseology of 16<sup>th</sup>-century Slovenian literary language has been rarely researched. There is also a lack of diachronic phraseological research in Slovenian linguistics, which would provide an overview of the development of phraseological units through the different periods of the history of Slovenian literary language. There are also significant gaps in the research of biblical fixed expressions, despite few quality publications. Slovenian and foreign literature on biblical phraseology and biblical fixed expressions brings to focus slightly different aspects of this topic, and therefore the literature differs in terminology and classifications. The final part of this chapter defines the basic terminology of the doctoral dissertation on the basis of relevant literature: *biblical phraseological units*, *Bible-derived phraseological units*, *primary text*, *source passage*, *secondary text*, *biblical fixed expressions*, *established quotations*, *non-established quotations*, *in-between occurrences* and *creative metaphor*.

The most comprehensive chapter, “Biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units in the Slovenian Literary Language from a Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective”, presents a synchronic and diachronic analysis, based on a wide array of sources. 52 phraseological units are analysed, of which 10 are defined as biblical phraseological units and 42 as Bible-derived phraseological units. The synchronic analysis of the 16<sup>th</sup>-century Slovenian literary language is based on the common-name and proper-name paper corpora created for the SSKJ16, with the addition of one dictionary source (Megiser: *Paroemiologia Polyglottos*). In the paper corpora, I examined all occurrences of lexemes that I assumed could be components of the chosen phraseological units. When possible, I compared my findings with the first volume of the SSKJ16, published in 2021, which contains entries A-D. I found that some biblical phraseological units appear only in translations of the Bible and in contexts closely related to the source passages (e.g. in explanations of the source passage, quotations, names of the parable, summaries, etc.), while others show further phraseologisation in different contexts. This developmentally important distinction should also be reflected in the dictionary. Of the 42 Bible-derived phraseological units, ten phraseological units have been partially confirmed (attested by one or two examples of the same type) and only eight have been attested more convincingly in 16<sup>th</sup>-century Slovenian literary language. For each phraseological unit a dictionary form and meaning is given, as well as information on all the source passages. Of all of the 52 phraseological units analysed, only about half are attested in this period.

Diachronic analysis is based on 18 dictionary sources and two corpora. Both printed and manuscript dictionaries can confirm the existence of a phraseological unit in a certain period, but it was quite common, especially until the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, for lexicographers to produce loan translations of foreign lexemes and phraseological units that were not really in use. Moreover, phraseological units were not systematically included in older dictionaries and it is likely that much of the phraseological material remained unrecorded. Thus, the presence of a phraseological unit in older dictionaries does not necessarily mean that it was actually in use at the time (this is especially true for dictionaries up to the 18<sup>th</sup> century), but at the same time, the absence of a phraseological unit in a dictionary does not necessarily mean that it was not in use. Therefore, it is of great importance to also include text sources to analyse actual language use. I used the *Corpus of historical texts IMP* to confirm the use of phraseological units in earlier periods, and the *Slovene reference corpus Gigafida 2.0* for conformation in the modern language. The IMP corpus has a limited selection of texts before 19<sup>th</sup> century, so the data from both the dictionaries and the corpus for this period are the least reliable. In the diachronic analysis, I paid attention to: 1) changes in the meaning, form and usage of phraseological units (shortening and establishment of new shorter phraseological units from originally longer ones, changes in meaning (especially the transition from religious meaning to general meaning)), 2)

continuity in the Slovenian literary language, 3) differences and similarities in the development of biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units, and 4) similarities and discrepancies between lexicographical sources and corpora dealing with the language of the same period. I also analysed the lexicographical treatment of biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units, as the aim of my doctoral dissertation was to establish guidelines for their lexicographical treatment in the forthcoming SSKJ16.

The subchapter “Characteristics of biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units from the beginnings of the Slovenian literary language to modern times” combines the findings of synchronic and diachronic analysis. The result of both analyses is a timeline, which provides information on the presumed time of the beginning of phraseologisation, the first appearance in the text sources and the first appearance in the lexicographical sources for each analysed phraseological unit. For biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units, there is often a visible departure from the primary text and a loss of obvious connection with it in more modern times. This is connected with the adaptation of phraseological units to modern reality and language. A minor difference between biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units is reflected in the corpora, as all the phraseological units that are not attested in the corpora are Bible-derived phraseological units. It is possible that biblical phraseological units, as set language units in the Bible itself, had become established in the Slovenian literary language earlier and then persisted in use. Of the 14 phraseological units not attested in the dictionaries, only one is a biblical phraseological unit, all the others are Bible-derived phraseological units. It has also been shown that biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units have an unpredictable development: it is impossible to predict their further development based on what is attested in the 16<sup>th</sup> century sources. Many phraseological units show changes in form, meaning or usage. There is a large gap between the lexicographical and text sources, since a large number of phraseological units are attested much earlier in the texts than in the dictionaries: some phraseological units attested in the 16<sup>th</sup> century have only been recorded in modern dictionaries. For a small number of phraseological units, the opposite is true: they appear in older Slovenian dictionaries, but I found textual confirmation of them only in the most recent material.

I was further interested in how the authors of foreign historical dictionaries approached the problem of lexicographical treatment of biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units, which is presented in the chapter “The treatment of (biblical) phraseology in foreign historical dictionaries”. Ten foreign historical dictionaries were analysed. The main focuses of the analysis were: 1) what information on the lexicographical treatment of fixed expressions and phraseological units is the user given in the introduction, 2) the consistency of actual lexicographical treatment with principles explained in the introduction, and 3) the consistency of the lexicographical treatment of the same phraseological unit in different dictionary entries. Only one dictionary explains all the essential information in the introduction. I found good examples of the lexicographical treatment of phraseological units in individual dictionary entries, but there are many inconsistencies in all the dictionaries (except in one with a significantly different concept), when more dictionary entries were compared.

In the chapter “Biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units in the historical SSKJ16” suggestions for additional guidelines for the lexicographical treatment of these phraseological units in SSKJ16 are presented. The additional guidelines are based on the material I have reviewed for the 16<sup>th</sup>-century Slovenian literary language, scientific literature, foreign historical dictionaries and various Slovenian dictionaries. In the case of biblical phraseological units, it was relatively easy to formulate guidelines for distinguishing between phraseological units that are only attested in the source passages and closely related secondary

texts, and those phraseological units that are also used in other, new contexts. Nor was it very difficult to formulate guidelines for dealing with those Bible-derived phraseological units which are based on an expression with a literal meaning in the Bible, and those which are based on a story, motif, person, etc. in the Bible, but the expression itself does not appear in the Bible. It has been somewhat more difficult to formulate guidelines for dealing with Bible-derived phraseological units that are based on an expression that has both a literal and a figurative meaning in the Bible. It was the most difficult to make guidelines for the treatment of those Bible-derived phraseological units which are based on an expression with a figurative meaning in the Bible, where I presented two suggestions.

Although the doctoral dissertation is thematically limited to biblical phraseological units and Bible-derived phraseological units, it is relevant for diachronic phraseological research or synchronic phraseological research of remote time periods in general, as it is the first diachronic phraseological analysis of this scope. It is an important achievement in historical lexicology and lexicography, as it brings the first monographic treatment of historical phraseological units in the development of the Slovenian literary language, which is interesting not only for the Slovenian linguists, but also for the non-expert public and dictionary users.

**Key words:** biblical phraseological units, Bible-derived phraseological units, 16<sup>th</sup>-century Slovenian literary language, historical lexicography, historical phraseography, historical phraseology