

Cartesian Frenchmen and Pragmatic Danes. A Question of Nouns and Verbs?

A Linguistic Contribution to the Comparative Study of National Ways of Thinking and Communicating

Lundquist, Lita

Document Version
Final published version

Publication date:
2010

License
CC BY-NC-ND

Citation for published version (APA):
Lundquist, L. (2010). *Cartesian Frenchmen and Pragmatic Danes. A Question of Nouns and Verbs? A Linguistic Contribution to the Comparative Study of National Ways of Thinking and Communicating*. Working Paper / Department of Business and Politics No. 74

[Link to publication in CBS Research Portal](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us (research.lib@cbs.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 05. Jun. 2023





**Copenhagen
Business School**
HANDELSHØJSKOLEN

International Center
For Business and Politics
Steen Blichers Vej 22
DK-2000 Frederiksberg
Tel. +45 3815 3585
Fax. +45 3815 3555
e-mail cbp@cbs.dk

Cartesian Frenchmen and pragmatic Danes.

A question of nouns and verbs?

**A linguistic contribution to the comparative study
of national ways of thinking and communicating.**

Lita Lundquist

Cartesian Frenchmen and pragmatic Danes.

A question of nouns and verbs?

**A linguistic contribution to the comparative study
of national ways of thinking and communicating.**

© Lita Lundquist

Working paper no 74, 2010

International Center for Business and Politics

Copenhagen Business School

Steen Blichers Vej 22

DK-2000 Frederiksberg

Phone: +45 3815 3585

E-mail: cbp@cbp.cbs

www.cbs.dk/cbp

ISBN

87-91690-77-3

Introduction

Recently, it was observed that the French President Nicolas Sarkozy ‘uses a lot of verbs’ (Calvet & Véronis 2008), what contributes to the impression he makes of being a “turbopresident”. At the same time, the (then) Minister of State in Denmark, Anders Fogh-Rasmussen, was characterised as being arrogant because of his top-down, formal, and impersonal way of communicating.

If these two styles of communication stuck out as being noticeable in their French and Danish political framework respectively, it is because they were seen against the backdrop of social norms spelling out *other* rules for communicating in the two societies; a French norm, for presidents at least, stipulating *not* to use a lot of verbs, and a Danish norm telling *not* to be formal and impersonal.

The present paper will compare how social norms for communicating and presenting thoughts in texts differ between the French and the Danish society and relate these diverging social norms to systematic differences between the two national languages. In fact, French and Danish differ in fundamental ways, starting with the semantic content put in their nouns and verbs. Thus, a typical feature of the French language has been shown to be that nouns are semantically specified and verbs unspecified, with an ensuing prominent role of nouns in the French sentence, the so-called *exo-centric* sentence organisation (the weight *outside* the centre of the sentence). As a contrast, we find that in Danish it is the verb which is specified and the noun unspecified, yielding an *endo-centric* sentence organisation (the weight *inside* the sentence centre). These fundamental typical features justify the distinction between two different *types* of languages, *exo-* and *endocentric* languages (Herslund & Baron 2003), which can be extended to hold as a general rule for the Romance and Germanic language families respectively¹. The paper sets out to show how the two types of language relate to the common way of thinking and communicating in France and Denmark, characterised as Cartesian and pragmatic respectively.

Addressing the question of the existence of a specific national style of communication via the language perspective, I open up for both the question of *linguistic relativity* and the question of *national identity*. The issue of linguistic relativity (or even linguistic *determinism*) has caused and still causes a lot of debate within linguistics and adjoining disciplines, starting with von Humboldt’s radical declaration that “language *is* the nation” (1822), and later followed up by the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Sapir 1929, Whorf

¹ The geopolitical lines of division between the Romance *exo-centric* and the Germanic *endo-centric* languages interestingly seem to coincide more or less with the distinction between Western European and the Eastern European forms of nationalism respectively (Kohn 1944), a distinction later criticised by Smith (1991).

1956). According to this hypothesis, the varying cultural concepts and categories inherent in different languages affect the cognitive classification of the experienced world in such a way that speakers of different languages think and behave differently. More recently it is within cognitive linguistics that we find the claim that there is a relation between the structures of a given language and the perception of the world these linguistic structures impose on its users (Langacker 1987/1999). Noticing a change in the linguistic literature from a causality *national language* -> *national identity* to a causality *language* -> *perception of the world*, linguistic relativity still claims some kind of causality. I shall be more cautious. Instead of claiming a relation of causality going from language to a national way of thinking as expressed in a national character, I shall contend that there is some kind of dialectic form of causality between language and social norms for communicating in a given society, in the sense that a given (type of) national language influences how and in which linguistic forms social norms become institutionalised; and that at the same time social norms regulate how language is used.

In fact, language is not simply there – as a system, or in Saussure’s terms as *la langue*; it is also used in actualised communications as *la parole* (Saussure 1916/1983). I shall show that this distinction is extremely important, in the sense that a given national language as a system of signs offers a reservoir of meaning potentials, some of which impose things that the user *must* say, and others which make more or less available things that the user *can* say (Jakobson 1959). Among the pool of meaning potentials presented by a given language, the speakers can choose to put to use some and not others. The way this is done is governed by the language system itself together with social norms for how to make use of language in given situations and for given purposes.

The aim of the present paper is hence to work out connections between 1) *la langue*, exemplified by the French and the Danish language, 2) *la parole* exemplified below by exemplars of texts representing academic discourse in these two languages, and 3) *social norms* for communicating in the two countries.

In order to get a hold on these three spheres, I shall use as an encompassing concept, the notion of *figuration of interdependencies*. This key concept from Elias’ work on the social as “networks of interdependent human beings” (Elias 1971, 19) is a dynamic and processual term, which for Elias also subsumes interdependencies between symbols such as linguistic signs (Elias 1991). Whereas Elias, however, stays on a very general level, speaking of only the given sound patterns of each “unit of survival”: “Most of (the units of survivals) possess their own network of communicative sound patterns” (Elias 1991, 42), I shall argue that language in the form of *la langue* can be seen as a stable *configuration* of interdependencies at all levels of linguistic signs, words, word order, sentence structure to mention but a few here; the

formulation of thoughts in texts at the level of *la parole*, on the other hand, can be perceived as specific *figurations* of symbolic interdependencies. The French and the Danish language and language use differ fundamentally and systematically in both respects. This is shown via thorough linguistic analyses of French and Danish text excerpts representing academic discourse, the specific figurations of which I qualify as *Cartesian*² and *pragmatic*³ respectively and which I trace back to systematic differences between the two languages on the level of *la langue*. First, however, I shall show how different social norms for interacting and communicating seem to rule in France and Denmark, social norms which have been shaped by different processes of civilisation (Elias 1939) and which converge with a generalised Cartesian as opposed to a pragmatic way of thinking.

Cartesianism

Cartesianism refers to the philosophy of the French philosopher and mathematician René Descartes and especially to his rationally judged confidence in our own natural cognitive faculties. His belief that *method holds a higher place than practice*, and that only *systematic scientific method* can lead to real understanding and the establishment of truth, is laid out in his essay *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting the Reason, and Seeking Truth in the Sciences* (1637)⁴. Especially in chapter 2 of this essay we find explanations which help us identify the crucial elements of the Cartesian method, which, as I claim, characterise the French way of reasoning in general. Stressing again and again the importance of *reason* and scrutinizing his favourite branches of philosophy and mathematics – logic, geometrical analysis and algebra – Descartes praises their advantages, but in order to do away with their defects he suggests the four precepts for “severing the truth from the false” which have come to create the foundation for the *analytical, deductive scientific method*⁵:

The first was never to accept anything for true, which I did not clearly know to be such; (...)

The second, to divide each of the difficulties under examination into as many parts as possible, and

² It should be noted that with ‘Cartesian’ I do not refer here to Cartesian Linguistics (Chomsky 1966), which contends that mental structures are presented in the deep structure of the sentence, common for all languages notwithstanding their different surface structures.

³ ‘Pragmatic’ is here used in its common everyday sense and not in its philosophical sense of *pragmatism* defined, in the vein of Peirce, William James and Dewey, as a philosophical movement which claims that the meaning of a proposition is to be found in the practical consequences of accepting it, and that unpractical ideas are to be rejected. The two senses, however, are clearly related.

⁴ *Le Discours de la méthode. Pour bien conduire sa raison, et chercher la vérité dans les sciences.*

⁵ Descartes opposed these four principles to the syllogistic reasoning pattern of the ancient, which he found were “of avail rather in the communication of what we already know, or even (...) in speaking without judgement of things of which we are ignorant” (Opp.Cit, 4).

as might be necessary for its adequate solution.

The third, to conduct my thoughts in such order that, by commencing with objects the simplest and easiest to know, I might ascend by little and little, and, as it were, step by step, to the knowledge of the more complex; (...)

And the last, in every case to make enumerations so complete, and reviews so general that I might be assured that nothing was omitted. (Project Gutenberg version⁶, 4).

These principles of (1) truth, (2) analysis, (3) synthesis and (4) exhaustiveness are linked to the main belief in the existence of *abstract relations*, i.e., relations of the same kind between different phenomena and in *deduction*, made possible by the rigid order of reasoning, as taught by the geometers:

The long chains of simple and easy reasonings by means of which geometers are accustomed to reach the conclusions of their most difficult demonstrations, had led me to imagine that all things, to the knowledge of which man is competent, are mutually connected in the same way, and that there is nothing so far removed from us as to be beyond our reach, or so hidden that we cannot discover it, provided only we abstain from accepting the false for the true, and always preserve in our thoughts the order necessary for the deduction of one truth from another. (Opp.Cit, 5. My emphasis).

This belief in the necessity to begin with *the general* and only in a later step proceed to *the particular* is further corroborated:

(as the particular sciences commonly denominated mathematics) all agree in considering only the various relations or proportions subsisting among those objects, I thought it best for my purpose to consider *these proportions in the most general form possible, without referring them to any objects in particular (...)* I might thus be better able to apply them to every other class of objects to which they are legitimately applicable. (...) I commenced with the simplest and *most general truths* ... (Opp.Cit, 5. My emphasis).

We shall see later that this insistence on *abstract relations* goes hand in hand with the semantics of the unspecified French verb and that the principle of *starting with the most general* matches figurations in French texts.

⁶ See org/authors/descartes-rene/reason-discourse/chapter-02.html.

Cartesian French and pragmatic Danes

Descartes' principles about using analytical, deductive methods going from the general to the particular and from abstract relations to concrete, not only laid the foundation of modern scientific methods in general, but also came to permeate all realms of the French society. This is noticeable first and foremost in the educational system, spanning from elementary school to university level, and especially to the parallel and superior education in the 'écoles supérieures' (Milner 1984/2009). At all levels of education in France, special attention is paid to the teaching of mathematics and philosophy, of deductive reasoning and scientific method, what is noteworthy as compared to the Danish system with its weight on edifying general and social skills.

The requirement for Cartesian rigorous thinking is of course also a very elitist one. The generalization of elitism in France, as opposed to for instance Denmark, can be related to the French society being hierarchically ordered, a social hierarchy stemming from the specific court society of the 16th - 18th centuries (Elias 1969). This court society engendered a specific court rationality or *court logic* with a social norm for *distinctiveness* also in intellectual matters, i.e. in the demonstration of intelligence and intellectual superiority.

The civilising process of the Danish society is of a radically different kind leading to, or at least supporting, the development of another, more pragmatic type of reasoning. Historians (Jespersen 2004, Østergaard 2006) and sociologists (Kaspersen 2006) have pointed to the defeat in 1864 with the loss of the duchies to Germany as changing Denmark from a big composite nation into a "big small nation" (Østergaard 2006). Together with the characteristic feature of Danes being a *tribe* (Mellon 1992) with a *camp-fire* and an 'us-us' mentality (Jespersen 2004), this has led to an *egalitarian* society and to the creation of the Danish welfare state, founded on a *pragmatic*, that is, on an *action-oriented, consensus seeking* approach. Elitism and distinctiveness do not form part of social norms in Denmark, rather to the contrary⁷, and mathematics and ensuing training in analytical, abstract thinking is neither highly rated nor commonly implemented in Danish schools. We rather find a focus on teaching general practical skills with an emphasis on their functionality, usefulness and effectiveness in the real world. Teaching in this vein cannot help shape a certain way of thinking, which I here qualify as *pragmatic*. My contention is that there is a link between the pragmatism and action-oriented attitude of Danes on the one hand and the Danish language with specified verbs which encode actors in specified relation on the other, just as there is a link between the French language with its unspecified verbs expressing general relations and the French Cartesian insistence on abstract relations.

Cartesianism and pragmatism also seem to infuse more specifically into professional relations where French managers and negotiators interact with Danes and other peoples who happen to speak a Germanic language.

⁷ As expressed in the legendary Danish "Janteloven".

Negotiation styles in France and other countries

Some French sociologists see the hierarchical ordering of the French society in general and of management and organization of work relations in positive terms. This goes for Philippe d'Iribarne (1989) who defends the notion of the "logic of honour" as permeating French mentality in general and French work relations in particular⁸. Defining honour in terms of professional pride, importance of status and a courteous style of interaction and personal respect, this professional logic of honour generates intelligent arrangements together with ingenious technical conceptions and solutions⁹. Others, such as for instance Crozier (1999) and Crozier & Tillier (2000), see French Cartesianism as leading to a "blocked society" creating barriers to change, creativity and innovation. These sociologists impute the general resistance and incapacity to change in France to the French lacking a sense of reality, being concerned less with action and implementation, and more with ideals, abstraction and argumentation, features, which, as we saw, are inherent in the Cartesian way of thinking.

It is, however, when confronted with other national cultures that the specificities of the French way of thinking and (inter)acting become most apparent, especially when it comes to negotiating with people from communities speaking a Germanic language. Thus, several studies comparing France to for instance Dutch-speaking Netherlands, German-speaking Switzerland, Flemish-speaking Belgium, Swedish-speaking Sweden and Danish-speaking Denmark bring out systematic differences, which can be coined in Cartesian – pragmatic terms.

This becomes especially transparent when national differences in styles of negotiations are seen through the eyes of French sociologists. Thus, comparing French and Dutch style of management on the basis of interviews and observations carried out in industrial firms in France and the Netherlands¹⁰, d'Iribarne (1989) emphasizes the Dutchs' search for consensus in management as opposed to hierarchy in France¹¹, just as in politics the Dutch make every effort to obtain conciliation¹². As a whole, the Dutch are seen as very *pragmatic* (d'Iribarne 1989, 217), and their style of negotiation as open and constructive, not evaporating into intellectual abstractions (Opp. Cit., 217)¹³.

Discussing the different conception of 'quality' and how to obtain it, entertained by French and German-speaking Swiss in a Swiss firm to be taken over by a French group, Chevrier (1998) also points to differences which can be subsumed by French Cartesianism as opposed to 'Germanic' pragmatism. The French

⁸ "Un vif amour-propre s'attache à cette réalisation des devoirs de son état" (d'Iribarne 1989, 27)

⁹ "Pour l'ingénieur français, une bonne solution est un problème astucieusement résolu ; son objectif est de réaliser une prouesse technique » (Chevrier 89, 153).

¹⁰ Saint-Benoît-le-Vieux and Sloestad together with the analysis of Patrick City in the US.

¹¹ "le caractère coopératif (des Néerlandais) étonne souvent les Français » (d'Iribarne 1989, 217).

¹² "L'idéal politique néerlandais (...) hérite d'une autre tradition, plus germanique, en matière de la régulation de la vie en société, qui semble privilégier pour sa part une recherche de conciliation" (d'Iribarne 1989, 165).

¹³ For the French negotiators "le pragmatisme des Néerlandais évite que les discussions fréquentes ne deviennent stériles et que l'on s'égaré dans des abstractions intellectuelles. Aussi les discussions restent-elles ouvertes et constructives, bien que critiques..." (d'Iribarne 1989, 217).

negotiators' insisting on ideas, principles, rationality and "formal technical truth" (Chevrier 1998, 154-5¹⁴) in determining quality is opposed to their Swiss counterparts' arriving at agreement by a "social process of harmonization of interests".

Most interesting for our present comparison of France and Denmark and of the French and the Danish language, is the description of a confrontation of French and Swedish styles of negotiation¹⁵ in the fusion (which failed) of a French and a Swedish firm (d'Iribarne 1998). d'Iribarne points to Swedish decentralization easily delegating power in contrast to French hierarchisation (d'Iribarne 1998, 90) with its 'empowerment' of and from the top only. However, the Swedish employee is controlled in more subtle ways, namely by *implicit reference to norms and values*; social pressure puts limits on what a Swedish employee can determine (d'Iribarne 1998, 93). In this view consensus may be only apparent, covering a fear to reveal real disagreement (d'Iribarne 1998, 93¹⁶). This difference is mirrored in the negotiation styles, French being perceived by the Swedes as aggressive¹⁷ as opposed to consensus-seeking Swedes. French people accept open confrontations, provided they are buttressed by a "rigorous argumentative logic" (d'Iribarne 1998, 98) based on a "relatively abstract, technical rationality" and "analytical capacity". d'Iribarne describes the difference in terms of two different "logics" and "styles of relation", the French compromise being guided by *the best technical argument*, the Swedish by "an *accommodation between people* who are ready to give up on their personal views on the altar of the group" (d'Iribarne 1998, 100). In short, French are seen to privilege a "dynamics of ideas" (d'Iribarne 1998, 107), again features which can be attributed to the Cartesian reasoning scheme.

France and Denmark are compared in only few studies. Investigating cultural dimensions of decision-making in France and Denmark, Schramm-Nielsen (2001) refers explicitly to French Cartesianism. Schramm-Nielsen performs interviews with a series of managers with the objective "to examine the respective perceptions of Danish and French managers employed in foreign subsidiaries and working together, in order to evaluate and explain cultural differences, if any, in leadership style, in working methodology, in decision making style and in social interaction". She concludes that Danes seem to prefer a concrete, pragmatic way of reasoning using often "intuition to a swift and effective solution to a complex problem" (Schramm-Nielsen 2001, 410), in fact a very pragmatic way of action; in contrast, the French "analyse problems in a systematic way, looking for as many alternatives as possible and trying to evaluate them before coming to a conclusion and then go back to see whether there might be more possibilities to be

¹⁴ "A la différence des Suisses pour qui l'unanimité tend à primer sur le contenu de la décision, les français se réfèrent en permanence à la rationalité de la solution retenue. Tandis que, pour les Suisses, la qualité résulte d'un processus social d'harmonisation des intérêts, pour les Français, la qualité se mesure à son degré de conformité à la « vérité technique formelle. Dans cette perspective, une bonne solution ne se négocie pas, elle se démontre » (Chevrier 1998, 154).

¹⁵ The Swedish and the Danish language are closely related, both belonging to the Nordic/Scandinavian branch of the Germanic languages, Swedish to the eastern and Danish to the western variety.

¹⁶ "Le consensus entre pairs est autre chose qu'une harmonie paisible. L'absence de désaccord apparent peut être liée à la peur d'exprimer des désaccords plus qu'à une véritable unité de vues." (d'Iribarne 1998, 93).

¹⁷ "Pour les Français le conflit est naturel et il n'y a pas à en avoir peur". Cette défense énergique de ce à quoi on tient est alimentée par une critique vigoureuse du point de vue de l'autrui."

considered...” (Schramm-Nielsen 2001, 412), a procedure, which is truly Cartesian, conforming perfectly as it does with Descartes’ principles for scientific method quoted above.

My own studies (Lundquist 2009, Lundquist to appear a and b) comparing the use of humour by Danes and French in professional interactions point to similar differences in their ways of thinking. Seen as differences in national identity, Danes can be said to have a certain camp-fire mentality (Jespersen 2004), which makes the use of (self)irony acceptable and unthreatening for them, but certainly not for their French interlocutors, who because of their courtly and status-oriented rationality prefer to use humour in the less offensive form of play on words.

The picture, which emerges from these comparisons of France to Denmark and other Germanic-language speaking countries, is rendered in Table 1, which summarizes some dimensions on which France and Denmark seem to differ as to their way of reasoning, coined as Cartesianism as opposed to pragmatism.

FRANCE	DENMARK
<i>Cartesianism</i>	<i>Pragmatism</i>
Ideas	Reality
The general	The particular
Abstraction	Concretization
Deduction	Induction
Rational	Relational

Table 1: General reasoning patterns in French and Danish

Expressing thoughts in texts

In order to illustrate fundamental differences between the Cartesian and the pragmatic way of reasoning, I shall compare how French and Danes express and link thoughts in texts. Applying the method of qualitative text analysis¹⁸, the text analyses are based on linguistic and text linguistic principles and notions, which I have, however, somewhat simplified in order to make them accessible and useful for non-linguists also. The

¹⁸ This qualitative approach, quantitatively limited here, has been corroborated by linguistic comparisons based on larger text corpora, see e.g. Korzen 2003 for a comparison of exocentric Italian and endocentric Danish.

texts chosen belong to *academic discourse*, being excerpts from a Danish¹⁹ and a French²⁰ book treating a comparable political sociologic subject, the Danish and the French contemporary society “in the world” respectively. The first analysis treats the opening lines of both books, which although they are comparable as to subject (and to length), reveal substantial differences in the way they present and order thoughts, i.e., differences in their symbolic figurations on the text level.

Differing textual figurations: inductive vs. deductive

In order to compare the two text fragments²¹ and their progressive linking and building up of thoughts, I propose to follow different ‘tracks’ or ‘paths’ of coherence. By tracks of coherence I refer to systematic and consistent tracks a reader may follow in order to make sense of what s/he reads (Lundquist 2008). In the present comparison of Danish and French textual figurations, I shall focus on three tracks. The first one (underlined) is founded on the *main theme* introduced in the titles, *Denmark* and *France* respectively. This track encompasses all expressions which refer to Denmark and France (or their inhabitants) together with descriptions and qualifications attributed²² to these two main ‘discourse referents’. The second track (in italics) locates all expressions, which take the form of nouns²³, concentrating here on nouns which appear as grammatical subjects or objects. The third track (in bold) follows expressions that contribute to the subjective evaluation of the content and to the structuring of ideas and thoughts in an argumentative arrangement.

Danish text²⁴

Introduction

Everything is well in Denmark, **we know!** Since the middle 1990'es *most socio-economic surveys and tables* have shown, that Denmark does perfectly fine internationally. *The economic key-figures show stable growth, low unemployment, relatively low inequality, sound state finances and good productivity*_(in Denmark). And even with a world-economic recession, Denmark will, in spite of a certain weakness, be a success. In a material respect Denmark is a rich country. In spite of changing conjunctures since the Second World War most people_(in Denmark) have experienced **only** an *increased wealth*. Compared to most other 191 countries in the world Denmark is a success-story. We are doing well economically, and we are still recognized as an autonomous state with autonomy.

¹⁹ Lars Bo Kaspersen: *Danmark i verden*. 2008

²⁰ Crozier et Tilliette *Quand la France s'ouvrira*. 2000.

²¹ See originals and English translation in annex 1. The translations are kept as literal as possible in order to render the two textual logics as faithfully as possible.

²² Technically corresponding to *predicates*.

²³ More precisely, *noun phrases*, i.e., autonomous groups of word with a noun as the kernel.

²⁴ Translation of first paragraphs of Lars Bo Kaspersen: *Danmark i verden*. 2008. Page 11.

Why do we? How can a small country survive so successfully in a heavily globalized world? *This question* is often asked by foreign observers and increasingly by ourselves too. The answer is important, since it can be the condition that we can still develop and become a success. To give a *final answer* is, **however, not** possible and **neither** the ambition of this book.

French text²⁵

To recognize reality

The principle of reality is the first principle for government of every human group, whether it be a company, a city, a family or a whole society. One can have the best ideas and the best didactics in the world, one does not prepare the future ignoring the realities of the present and the heavy tendencies which already announce themselves.

It is true, one has to fight *the errors and injustices which tarnish this present, fear the dangers which the dominant tendencies cover* and try to ward them off. **But** one will only be able to break *the reality* if one knows and understand it.

The first sign of the French problem is the refusal of the reality. The political debates_(in France) lack **neither intelligence nor vigor, but they** are, in a certain way, out of time. It is **not** by chance that the French lose *interest* and that we are simultaneously isolated in a world which understands us less and less.

Comparing main discourse referents (underlined), we see that *Denmark* and related topics appear in the Danish text 19 times, and from the very beginning. In the French text, *France* appears only 6 times, and just in the second paragraph. This indicates that the Danish text is immediately anchored in the reality of the readers, moving only after 10 sentences on to more general questions (and answers). This qualifies the Danish text as a concrete, reality anchored and relational text. The French text, in comparison, refers only lately to the context of its readers. Instead it starts with abstract concepts, which occupy the positions of grammatical subjects as well of objects.

This appears from a comparison of the second track, where expressions in italics in French, such as *the principle of reality* and *first principle for government of every human group*, belong to a more abstract register than underlined expressions in the Danish text. Although being technical, the Danish expressions *socio-economic surveys and tables* and *economic key-figures* are of a less abstract kind. Also, it should be noted that in the Danish text the main referent *Denmark* is put into *focus* via its frequent position as grammatical subject, a sentence position and role which constitute the logical and psychological point of

²⁵ Translation of first paragraphs of Crozier & Tilliette: *Quand la France s'ouvrira*. 2000. Page 7-8.

departure of a sentence and hence its focus. In the French text, we find that it is the abstract notions that are in focus via their role as grammatical subject. This particular track helps us identify characteristics of the French *deductive* textual figuration as compared to the Danish *inductive* one.

And finally, as far as the third track following subjectivity and argumentation (in bold) is concerned, it is noticeable, and completely in accordance with the Danish language system, that the Danish text starts with a pragmatic particle, *jo* rendered into English by *We know* (followed by an exclamation mark), which at once creates an in-group understanding of an ironical echoing (Sperber and Wilson 1995) of somebody else's (here a certain politician's) remark. The Danish language offers a long list of such 'bonding' particles (*jo, da, så, vel, nok, kun, bare, hellere*, etc. See Krylova 2007), which contribute to this language being a *receiver-oriented language* in contrast to 'reality-oriented' French (Durst-Andersen 2010). In French, such subjective particles are not frequent in academic prose; instead we find *argumentative markers*, such as for instance *certes – mais/it is true that – but*, and negations, markers which arrange the content, i.e. the thoughts expressed in an argumentative text structure.

This comparison illustrates, short as it is, that in comparison to the abstract, deductive, impersonal, and rational style of the French text, the Danish is more concrete, inductive, personal and relational in its style, all characteristics which belong to either side of the Cartesian-pragmatic divide, the rational being more acceptable in France, the pragmatic more widespread in Danish society. A comment is called for here concerning the relation between spoken and written language. In general it is so that written Danish is closer to spoken Danish than written French is to spoken French. In other words, written French is of a quite different kind than spoken French, which is in line with the general penchant for elitist and intellectual distinctiveness.

In the second linguistic analysis of two other excerpts from the same books²⁶, we shall focus on how thoughts are linked within and across the sentence boundary in ways which differ between Danish and French texts.

Coordinate and linear vs. subordinate and hierarchical

The first investigation here aims to show the difference in levels of embedding within the sentences. For that purpose, sentences have been attributed an index, coordinated sentences with capitals S1, S2, etc. and subordinated with lower cases s1.1, s.1.2, etc. Also, brackets indicate embeddings:

Danish text

Chapter 1. State and society. A conceptual framework

{S1: Every state exists in a specific context, {s1.1: in which it develops, consolidates and changes}.} {S2: This context is constituted by the placement of the given state in a social and geographical space in a world of other states and communities.} {S3: The Danish state has through several centuries been able to maintain a territory under very different conditions of

²⁶ See originals and English translation in annex 2.

existence.} {S4: This territory has changed and developed, both as far as size and character is concerned, partly in a dynamic interaction with our neighbours, partly as a consequence of changes within the territory itself, among other things in the form of changed economic conjunctures, new ideologies and technical innovations.}

French text

{{s1.1: While the realisation of the monetary Europe means the victory of liberalism in Europe (and not the reinforcement of the resistance against the American and Anglo-Saxon hegemony {s1.1.1 as we wished it to}{S1: then it is {s.1.2: because, in the absence of a strong political European state, unable to be established within long, liberalism offers the best means of regulation for a group/ensemble as ours}.} {S2: In a deeper sense maybe, it is {s2.1: because the more complex world ((which is)) in a fast accelerating situation, ((and)) {s2.1.1: in which we live} requires less strict and more individualistic forms of thinking and of action}}.

The difference in organisation of thoughts is indeed impressive, as shown in table 2:

Danish text	French text
{S1 {s1.1}}	{{s1.1 {s.1.1.1} S1 {s.1.2}}.
{S2}	{S2 {s2.1 {s2.1.1 s.2.1}}
{S3}	
{S4}	

Table 2: Linking thoughts in Danish and French texts

The dominant text figuration found in the Danish text is with one exception based on *coordination*, in which thoughts are presented in a flat, horizontal arrangement. In contrast, thoughts in French text are embedded in a subordinating arrangement, which means that thoughts are hierarchised, some being foregrounded (in superordinate sentences), others backgrounded (in subordinate sentences). These differences, which indicate that the Danish author cognitively follows a horizontal plan, whereas the French authors prefer a vertical plan, are only corroborated with a linguistic analysis of the content expressed in each sentence and of the relations articulated between the sentences.

Thematic vs. argumentative text structure

When we take a closer look at the content of the four sentences of the Danish text, we see that they are neatly linked via the repeating of one or more items (shown by indices) from a preceding sentence:

S1 every state₁ – special context₂
 S2 this context₂ – the given state₁
 S3 the Danish state₁ – territory₃
 S4 this territory₃ ...

This gives a very clear coherence founded on the maintenance of a theme from sentence to sentence (*continuous thematic progression* in text linguistic terms) or the development of a theme (*linear thematic coherence*), as sketched here:

S:	TH1 ---	TH2
S2:		TH2 --- TH1
S3:	TH1 ---	TH3
S4:		TH3 ---

This way of presenting information and linking thoughts in texts corresponds to a textual figuration of an expository and explanatory, i.e. pragmatic, kind.

In comparison, the French text seems very convoluted (for a Dane at least). The embeddings not only create subordination and hierarchisation of information, but also orders this hierarchisation in an *argumentative* structure by expressing rhetorical relations (Mann & Thompson 1988). These rhetorical relations are of different kinds such as condition, comparison, negation, etc, as indicated by the argumentative markers *while, and not, then it is --- because*. Instead of a thematic list structure as expressed in the Danish text, we get an argumentative structure with subordinate satellites:

{s1.1 conditional (negation) {s1.1.1 comparison} {S1 explanation-introduction{S2 explanation}}}
 {S2 specification {s2.1explanation-introduction {2.2specification} {S3 explanation}}

What we have here is a nice example of an argumentative and analytical movement, so typical of a Cartesian reasoning pattern.

3.2.3 Nouns and verbs

Another characteristic is the balance between verbs and nouns in the two texts. The Danish text contains nine verbs (*exist, develop, consolidate, change, consist in, be able to, change and develop*) as compared to five verbs in the French text (*mean, want, offer, live, demand*) in the role of grammatical verb, i.e., in the role of sentence center. When it comes to nouns (short here for noun phrases), the two texts contain a comparable number, the Danish text 24 tokens of nouns (19 types), the French 20 tokens (19 types). What is important, however, is the form the verbs appear in and the type of nouns used. In fact, a considerable number of the nouns contained in the French text are derived from verbs, as for instance (as rendered in the English translation) *realization, reinforcement, resistance, regulation, change, thought ('pensée'), action*, as compared to the following list in the Danish text, *placement, interaction, change, innovation*.

Comparing sentence verbs which are finite and tensed, that is marked for time by present and past tense, with nouns derived from verbs, so-called *deverbalised nouns*, we find noticeable differences as to their contribution to a text being perceived as either abstract or concrete and actual. All verbs come with an inherent pattern of possible semantic roles, a so-called *valency pattern*, in the form of predestined places for possible 'actors', or in linguistic terms: a verb is a predicate which can take a certain number of arguments. Let us illustrate this by an example. Three of the tensed verbs in the Danish text, *develop, consolidate* and *change*, have as an inherent part of their semantic content a valency pattern with the following intrinsic 'arguments':

develop (X,Y): somebody develops something

consolidate (X,Y): somebody consolidates something

change (X,Y): somebody changes something

All three verbs take two arguments (hence they are *divalent*), the first of which plays the semantic role of AGENT, the second the role of PATIENT.

When used in a sentence, a given verb instantiates one, more or all of its intrinsic arguments. In the present context, the three verbs are used in a "reflexive" form: (the state) develops, consolidates and changes (in the Danish text expressed via the form of "s-passive"). Hence the semantic AGENT is left out, only the semantic PATIENT being manifested. In the first Danish text submitted to analysis above, the verb *show* is trivalent, i.e., it has three arguments: *somebody shows something to somebody*. In the sentence '*key-figures show economic growth*', two of these are instantiated, namely

AGENT and PATIENT, the third role of BENEFIAIRY being left out (because of being easily retrievable as 'us'). These examples demonstrate how a verb instantiated as the kernel of a sentence can describe an action, a process or a state more or less close to reality, in the sense of being complete and full in 'embodying' actors and participants in the event described. A tensed verb can be said to actualize a given *action schema*, and the more tensed verbs – and in the active form – a text contains, the more will it tend to reflect reality, via its staging of one or more of the 'actors', be it AGENTS or PATIENTS, as persons, objects or other entities involved in the action. Also, of course, the mere tense of the verb contributes to anchoring the content in the context of the interlocutors because of being actualized in a given time frame.

The situation is completely different for deverbalized nouns. Nouns such as *realization*, *reinforcement*, *resistance*, *regulation* change the action expressed in the underlying verb into a *fact*, to which you can refer and contribute attributes. In technical term, a deverbalised noun is a *hypostatization*. It hypostatizes ('lifts to a higher order') a sentence which is of a third order entity into an entity of a first order, namely a noun. The noun 'realization' hypostasizes the event 'somebody realizes/has realized/will realize something' into a fact, evacuating, in the same movement, some or maybe all traces of the action *per se* together with its participants, people and objects performing or being influenced, just as it de-temporalizes the event, i.e., lifts it out of a temporally actualized context. In this way, deverbalised nouns create a special effect in the textual logic of a given text in that they add to the *de-personalisation*, to the *de-activation* and to the '*abstractification*' of actions, processes and states. Hypostazations contribute to move away content expressed in a text several steps from reality.

As deverbalisation is a linguistic procedure frequently found in French texts, it only adds to the general *logic of abstraction* with a focus on abstract relations, as expressed in French *la parole*. Abstraction via deverbalised nouns is however also a phenomenon, which can be traced back to *la langue* in French, as compared to Danish, a linguistic level to which we now turn. But let us first summarize some of the linguistic characteristics brought out above and which align so neatly with French Cartesianism and Danish pragmatism respectively.

Summing up

The different text linguistic features that characterise the textual figuration of the Danish and the French texts above, and which are corroborated by findings in more comprehensive comparative studies (Baron 2003, Herslund & Baron 2003, Lundquist 2006, 2007), can be said to characterise ways of presenting and linking thoughts in general in the two language communities. This does not mean however that a Dane cannot express his/her thoughts in an embedded, hierarchical, deductive and argumentative arrangement as the one illustrated in the second French text, nor that a Frenchman cannot choose a flat, horizontal, thematic and explanatory way to expose his/her thoughts. It only means that the selection of a typical French textual figuration by a Dane, and vice versa, would be conceived by the Danish and French interlocutors as *unnatural* and *marked*, in the sense that they would search for an additional interpretation. This has been explained within linguistic pragmatics in the Gricean *maxims of conversation* (Grice 1975), especially in the *maxim of manner*: "Be perspicuous. Avoid obscurity. Avoid ambiguity. Be brief. Be orderly." This maxim has been reformulated as a heuristic for preferred interpretations: "What's said in an abnormal way is abnormal. Marked message indicates marked situation." (Levinson 2000).

This pragmatic maxim builds on a generalised principle of cooperation in conversations (and communication in general) which goes for interpretation and making sense of utterances in any language and any community, but what is perceived as being normal and orderly depends on the language in question. Hence, what is orderly, normal and unmarked vs. un-orderly, abnormal and marked differs for Danes and French, due to fundamental differences in their respective language (Lundquist & Gabrielsen 2004, Lundquist 2005), as we shall see below. But let us first sum up how the characteristics brought out as differing textual figurations in Danish and French align with the characteristic features of the Cartesian – pragmatic distinction (repeated here):

FRANCE	DENMARK
Cartesianism	Pragmatism
Ideas	Reality
The general	The particular
Abstraction	Concretization
Deduction	Induction
Rational	Relational
TEXTUAL FIGURATIONS	
Deduction from general principles	Induction from 'real life experience'
Hierarchical sentence structure	Flat sentence structure
Rhetorical relations	Thematic relations
Argumentative figurations	Expository figurations
Hypostazation of actions into facts	Instantiation of action schemata
Abstracting away from actions and actors	Staging action and actors

Table 3: Typical textual logics in French and Danish

Language

Human language is a system of symbolic representation, in which not only signs (words, morphemes, etc., i.e. *semantics*), but also relations between signs (as instantiated in the sentence structure, i.e. *syntax*) create meaning. Every specific language has its own configuration of linguistic signs, which impose constraints on what the language users must necessarily express. In fact, in any given language there are some things you *must* say because it is encoded in language²⁷; and other things that are easy to say because close at hand via the given language system. Probably everything can be expressed in any language, but some ways will be more marked and unnatural than others, being more or less consistent with the structures of the language in question.

What you must say in Danish and French

Danish and French differ in important respects as to what people who speak these languages *must* say. Let us take as an example the *lexicalization* of nouns and verbs²⁸, i.e., the semantic features which are obligatorily encoded in the *lexemes*, i.e. in the roots of nouns and verbs. In Danish, verbs of movement come with the feature MANNER; thus even the most abstract verb of movement in Danish, *at gå* (*to go (on foot); to walk*) encodes the manner of the movement. The French verb, *aller*, does not encapsulate this feature. Thus, having one feature less than the Danish verb, it is more abstract. This is the case for most verbs of movement in French, such as *sortir, entrer, descendre, monter*, which do not specify MANNER, but DIRECTION. It goes for other verbs of action too; the verb *couper* (*to cut*) is unspecified as to MANNER, for which reason it can describe any action of ‘severing something from something’, in cases where Danish would specify the action according to ‘*what is being severed from what and how and with what*’.

	le gâteau	skære kagen		the cake
<i>Couper</i>	l’herbe	slå græsset	<i>cut</i>	the grass
	les cheveux	klippe håret		hair

A speaker of Danish thus cannot help specify MANNER, and hence describe the action (process, event) denoted in a sentence in more details than a speaker of French, a characteristic which contribute, I think, to the general character of these two languages being perceived as action-oriented and abstract respectively.

When it comes to nouns, we have the opposite situation. French nouns, especially those denoting artefacts²⁹, are more specific, in that lexemes denoting artefacts most often include the semantic features CONSTITUTION (FORM and MATERIAL), as compared to Danish nouns for artefacts, which encode

²⁷ "Les langues diffèrent par ce qu’elles *doivent* exprimer, et non pas par ce qu’elles *peuvent* exprimer" (Jakobson 1959, 84). ("Languages differ by what they *have to* express, and not by what they *can* express").

²⁸ This presentation by no means pretends to be exhaustive; it is only meant to be illustrative.

²⁹ And lexemes denoting natural kinds, which I leave out here.

only the semantic feature FUNCTION. For instance, the word *bane* in Danish (English *court, track, rink, etc.*, same level of lexicalization as in French) contains the following configuration of semantic features <PLACE TO PERFORM SOME KIND OF ACTIVITY>. French does not have an equivalent to this word at this level of abstraction. A French language user has to choose between a series of words, all being more specified with respect to FORM or MATERIAL, describing different forms of ‘*baner*’, for different purposes (*un court* for tennis, *une piste* for landing an airplane, *un terrain* for football, etc. For more details see Lundquist 2000, Baron 2003, Herslund & Baron 2003, Lundquist & Korzen in press).

This fundamental difference in the configuration of semantic features in nouns and verbs renders a different configuration of the basic sentence in the two languages, namely the exocentric as compared to the endocentric as shown in the figure below (capitals in boxes and lines in bold figuring ‘more specified’):

Exocentric French sentence structure

NOUN --- verb --- **NOUN**

Endocentric Danish sentence structure

noun ----- **VERB** ----- noun

However, as nouns are often made up by and derived from verbs, abstract verbs in French tend to yield abstract (deverbal) nouns (dn), as compared to Danish where concrete verbs yield concrete (deverbal) nouns (DN). Hence, we get a derived sentence configuration of this kind:

Exocentric French sentence structure

dn-----verb -----dn

Endocentric Danish sentence structure



It is my take that the two types of syntactic configuration lend themselves perfectly well to different ways of reasoning, the abstract exo-centric best to a Cartesian and the concrete endo-centric best to a pragmatic mode of thinking.

What you may easily express in Danish and French

Whereas features encoded in the lexicon (and in morphemes (such as tense, aspect, etc.) which we leave out here for the sake of simplicity) are obligatory and cannot be got around with, other features are ‘facultative’, in the sense that they are there as meaning and communication potentials that one can choose to use or not. One such feature is the existence in Danish of the so-called pragmatic or ‘bonding’ particles (*jo, da, så, vel, nok, kun, bare, hellere*, etc. cf. above), which short as they are, are easily available for a Danish language user. And, in fact, they are abundantly used. As the use of these adverbials implies a sort of connivance and communicative frame of mutual pre-understanding, they fit well into the general Danish camp-fire and ‘us-us’ mentality mentioned above, and to the consensus-seeking approach claimed to be typical of Danes. The frequent use of bonding particles thus contributes to the relational character detected in many Danish texts, and to the “implicit reference to norms and values” in Scandinavian management cultures as noticed by the sociologists above. Also, the generalised use of the familiar form of ‘you’ – *du* as opposed to *De* – is “an expression of intimacy within the Danish nation and its relative connectedness with itself” (Elias 1989/1991, 18).

The French language, on the other hand, shows another type of characteristic, which can easily be exploited in a Cartesian way of thinking and linking thoughts in texts. I refer to the existence and frequent use of the so-called *non-finite verb forms*, (i.e., present and past participles (e.g., **donnant** de l’argent/ de l’argent **donné** (**giving** money/money **given**)), the gérondif (**en donnant** de l’argent ((in) **giving** money)), and infinitive (**donner** de l’argent (**to give** money)). The following example illustrates how such a non-finite verb form can be put to use:

Parlant beaucoup de l’école, *en parlant* de façon répétée, la presse missionnaire joue un rôle essentiel. /Speaking a lot about the school (system), speaking about it repeatedly, the missionary press plays an important role.

Non-finite verbs serve (just as deverbal nouns) to condense a whole sentence in a *reduced sentence structure*, evacuating several features of the full sentence as for instance certain reality anchoring aspects of action such as subject (AGENT), time, etc. But there is an additional effect in that the use of a non-finite verb subordinates the reduced sentence to a super-ordinate sentence, creating some kind of implicit rhetorical link, which in the example above is a logical relation of *causality*: “Because the missionary press talks a lot about the school system, it plays an important role”. Non-finite verb forms are abundantly used in exo-centric languages, changing full-blown sentence content into “rhetorical satellites”, the argumentative and logic links of which to the super-ordinated sentence, the receiver has to make out her- or him-self. Non-finite verb forms also exist in Danish (a part from *the gérondif*), but they are less

frequently used than the corresponding ones in French, a symptom of the fact alleged here that the communicative potentials inherent in a given language are exploited at an interface with social norms for expressing thoughts. Rhetorical satellites, easily expressible via non-finite verbs in exo-centric Romance languages (Lundquist & Korzen in press) fit as hand in glove to a rational Cartesian way of thinking, together with the other characteristics brought out above, as summarized in Table 4.

FRANCE	DENMARK
Cartesianism	Pragmatism
Ideas	Reality
The general	The particular
Abstraction	Concretization
Deduction	Induction
Rational	Relational
FRENCH LANGUAGE	DANISH LANGUAGE
Specified nouns Unspecified verbs Unspecified deverbal nouns	Unspecified nouns Specified verbs Specified deverbal nouns
Exocentric sentence structure	Endocentric sentence structure
Non finite verb forms -> Unspecified rhetorical relations	Bonding particles -> Relational communication

Table 4: Configurations typical of the French and the Danish language

1. Conclusion

The linguistic observations made above as to the semantic specificities of French and Danish nouns and verbs and their contribution to figurational specificities in texts, do not, of course, allow us to answer the question in the affirmative as to whether these linguistic specificities *created* French Cartesianism and Danish pragmatism. Probably they did not. And probably there is not a one-way causality from language to

national characteristics. Specific national ways of thinking are without doubt more the result of a given complex process of civilization. However, every civilizing process takes place via different strata and figurations of symbolic interaction, among which language plays a fundamental role. Civilization comes about by way of transmission of knowledge via language, which permeates every possible sphere of society. It therefore comes as no surprise that the structure a given language imposes on its speakers constrains and moulds their way of thinking and that specific figurations of verbal symbols play a special role in the attachments to a national collectivity; they are the focal points for not only the rational but also the emotional bonding of persons to the collectivity (Elias 1989/1996, 146). One could reasonably allege that a national language contributes to the nationalization of sentiments and thoughts (ibid., 153), and that hence, while the French *langue* did not create a Cartesian and the Danish *langue* not a pragmatic way of thinking, they lie beneath, uphold and sustain by their particular “grammatical pressure” these ways of thinking. That is, until new applications of *la langue* at the level of *la parole* are initiated, as by the political leaders in France and Denmark evoked in the beginning of this paper, forming new linguistic figurations.

References

- Baron, Irene. 2003. Catégories lexicales et catégories de pensée. Une approche typologique du danois et du français. Michael Herslund (red.) Aspects linguistiques de la traduction. Bordeaux: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux. 29-54.
- Calvet, Louis-Jean & Véronis, Jean. 2008. Les mots de Nicolas Sarkozy. Paris: Seuil.
- Descartes, Rene. 1637. Le Discours de la méthode. Pour bien conduire sa raison, et chercher la vérité dans les sciences./ Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting the Reason, and Seeking Truth in the Sciences. Project Gutenberg version 2010. org/authors/descartes-rene/reason-discourse/chapter-02.html.
- Chevrier, Sylvie. 1998. Le solide contre l'ingénieur; malentendus dans la gestion de projets franco-suisses. In d'Iribarne, Philippe. (Ed.) 1998. Cultures et mondialisation. Gérer par-delà les frontières. 137-163.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1966. Cartesian linguistics: a chapter in the history of rationalist thought. New York: Harper & Row.
- d'Iribarne, Philippe. 1989. La logique de l'honneur: gestion des entreprises et traditions nationales. Paris: Seuil.
- d'Iribarne, Philippe. (Ed.) 1998. Cultures et mondialisation. Gérer par-delà les frontières. Paris: Seuil.
- d'Iribarne, Philippe. 2006. L'Étrangeté française. Paris: Seuil.
- d'Iribarne, Philippe. 2008. Penser la diversité du monde. Paris: Seuil;
- Durst-Andersen, Per. 2007. Det danske sprogs mange stemmer. In Sproglig Polyfoni. Tekster om Bachtin og ScaPoLine, eds. Rita Therkelsen, Nina Møller Andersen, Henning Nølle, 163-180. Århus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.
- Elias, Norbert. 1939. Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation. Soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen. Erster Band. Wandlungen des Verhaltens in den weltlichen Oberschichten des Abendlandes and Zweiter Band. Wandlungen der Gesellschaft. Entwurf einer Theorie der Zivilisation. (Published in English as The Civilizing Process, Vol.I. The History of Manners, Oxford: Blackwell, 1969, and The Civilizing Process, Vol.II. State Formation and Civilization, Oxford: Blackwell, 1982). Basel: Verlag Haus zum Falken.
- Elias, Norbert. 1969/2006. The Court Society. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.
- Elias, Norbert. 1970. What is Sociology? London: Hutchinson.
- Elias, Norbert. 1989/1991. The Symbol Theory. London: Sage.
- Elias, Norbert. 1989/1996. The Germans. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Grice, Paul. 1975. *Logic and Conversation*. Peter Cole, & J. Morgan (eds): *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press. 41-58.
- Gumperz, J. & S. Levinson (Eds). 1996. *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. CUP.
- Herslund, Michael & Irène Baron. 2003. *Language as World View. Endocentric and Exocentric Representations of Reality*. Irène Baron (red.) *Language and Culture. Copenhagen Studies in Language 29*. København: Samfundslitteratur. 29-42.
- Jespersen, Knud J.V. 2004. *A History of Denmark*. New York: Palgrave.
- Kaspersen, Lars Bo. 2006. *The Formation and Development of the Welfare State*. In *National Identity and the Varieties of Capitalism. The Danish Experience*, eds. J.L. Campbell, J.A. Hall & O.K. Pedersen, 99-132. Québec: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Kaspersen, Lars Bo. 2008. *Danmark i verden*. København: Hans Reitzels forlag.
- Kohn, Hans. 1944. *The Idea of nationalism*. New York: Collier Books
- Korsgaard, Ove. 2006. *The Danish Way to Establish the Nation in the Hearts of the People*. In *National Identity and the Varieties of Capitalism. The Danish Experience*, eds. J.L. Campbell, J.A. Hall & O.K. Pedersen, 133-158. Québec: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Korzen, Iørn. 2003. *Hierarchy vs. linearity. Some considerations on the relation between context and text with evidence from Italian and Danish*. Irène Baron (ed.) *Language and Culture. Copenhagen Studies in Language 29*. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur. 97-109.
- Krylova, Elvira. (2007). *Epistemisk polyfoni på dansk*. In *Sproglig polyfoni. Tekster om Bachtin og ScaPoLine*, eds. Rita Therkelsen, Nina Møller Andersen, Henning Nølke, 181-203. Århus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.
- Langacker, R. 1987/1999. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. 2 volumes. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen. 2000) *Presumptive Meanings*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Lundquist, Lita. 2000. *Translating Associative Anaphors. A Linguistic and Psycholinguistic Study of Translation from Danish into French*. I. Korzen et C. Marello (Eds) *Argomenti per una linguistica della traduzione*. Alessandria : Edizione dell'Orso. 111-129.
- Lundquist, Lita. 2005. *Be orderly! : Language types and interpretation of texts in the European*. Iørn Korzen & Paolo D'Achille (ed.) *Tipologia Linguistica e Società*. – Firenze: Firenze University Press. 110-133.
- Lundquist, Lita. 2006. *Lexical Anaphors, Information Packing, and Grammaticalisation of Textual Relations*. In *Grammatica : Festschrift in honour of Michael Herslund : Hommage à Michael Herslund*, eds. Henning Nølke et al., 311-323. New York: Lang.
- Lundquist, Lita. 2007. *L'anaphore lexicale demonstrative dans les langues endo- et exocentriques: langue, texte, discours*. In Korzen et al. (Eds) *Langues d'Europe, l'Europe des langues. Croisements linguistiques*. Strasbourg : Université de Marc Bloc. 85-104.
- Lundquist, Lita. 2008. *Navigating in Foreign Language Texts*. København: Samfundslitteratur.
- Lundquist, Lita. 2009. *Humour as a mediator in cross-cultural professional settings. Examples from Danish and French*. CBP Working Papers 66. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School.
- Lundquist, Lita. In press a. *Humor og ironi i tværproglige og tværkulturelle møder. Bona-fide, ikke-bona-fide og bona-fide-cum-humor sproghandlinger i dansk og fransk*. Skandinavisk Skriftserie. To appear 2010.
- Lundquist, Lita. In press b. *Humor in Intercultural professional settings. A shortcut to language, cognition and identity*. Firenze University Press. To appear in 2010.
- Lundquist, Lita & Gorm Gabrielsen. 2004. *EU- fortolkningsfællesskab eller fortolkningsfællesskaber?*. Henning Koch & Anne Lise Kjær (eds.) *Europæisk retskultur – på dansk*. København: Thomsons forlag. 123-167.

- Lundquist, Lita & Iørn Korzen. In press. Dansk og andre indo-europæiske sprog. Strukturelle forskelle mellem tekster på ”endocentrisk” dansk og på ”eksocentriske” romanske sprog. *Nydanske Studier*. To appear 2010.
- Mann, W.C & A. Thompson 1988. Rhetorical structure theory: Toward a functional theory of text organisation. *Text* 8: 243-281.
- Mellon, Sir James. 1992. *Og gamle Danmark ... En beskrivelse af Danmark i det herrens år 1992*. Århus.
- Milner, Jean-Claude. 1984/2009. *De l'école*. Paris: Verdier.
- Sapir, E. 1929. The Status of Linguistics as a Science. *Language* 5. 160-166.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1983. *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris: Payot.
- Schramm-Nielsen, J. 2001. Cultural dimensions of decision making: Denmark and France compared. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16(6), 404-423.
- Smith, Anthony, 1991. *National Identity*. London: Penguin
- Sperber, Dan & Deirdre Wilson. 1995. *Relevance. Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics. Volume II: Typology and process in concept structuring*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT.
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee. 1956. *Language, Thought and Reality*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Østergård, Uffe. 2006. Denmark: A Big Small State. In *National Identity and the Varieties of Capitalism. The Danish Experience*, edited by J.L. Campbell, U.A. Hall and O.K. Pedersen, 51-98. Québec: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Annexe 1

Lars Bo Kaspersen: *Danmark i verden*. 2008

Indledning

Det går jo godt i Danmark! Siden midten af 1990'erne har de flest socioøkonomiske oversigter og tabeller vist, at Danmark klarer sig fornemt internationalt. De økonomiske nøgletal viser stabil vækst, lav arbejdsløshed, relativt lav ulighed, sunde statsfinanser og god produktivitet. Og selv med en verdensøkonomisk recession vil Danmark trods en vis tilbagegang være en succes. I materiel henseende er Danmark et rigt land. Trods skiftende konjunkturer siden 2. Verdenskrig har de fleste mennesker kun mærket en forøget rigdom. Sammenlignet med de fleste andre 191 lande i verden er Danmark en succeshistorie. Vi klarer os godt økonomisk, og vi anerkendes stadig som en autonom stat med selvbestemmelse.

Hvorfor gør vi det? Hvordan kan et lille land overleve så succesfuldt i en stærkt globaliseret verden? Dette spørgsmål stilles ofte af udenlandske iagttager og i stigende grad også af os selv. Svaret er vigtigt, da det kan være forudsætningen for, at vi fortsat kan udvikle os og blive en succes. At give et endegyldigt svar er dog ikke muligt og heller ikke denne bogs ambition. (11)

Introduction

Everything is well in Denmark, we know! Since the middle 1990'es most socio-economic surveys and tables have shown, that Denmark does perfectly fine internationally. The economic key-figures show stable growth, low unemployment, relatively low inequality, sound state finances and good productivity. And even with a world-economic recession, Denmark will, in spite of a certain weakness, be a success. In a material respect Denmark is a rich country. In spite of changing conjunctures since the Second World War most people have experienced only an increased wealth. Compared to most other 191 countries in the world Denmark is a success-story. We are doing well economically, and we are still recognized as an autonomous state with autonomy.

Why do we do that? How can a small country survive so successfully in a heavily globalized world? This question is often asked by foreign observers and increasingly by ourselves too. The answer is important, since it can be the condition that we can still develop and become a success. To give a final answer is, however, not possible and neither the ambition of this book.

Michel Crozier & Bruno Tilliette : *Quand la France s'ouvrira*. 2000

I Reconnaître la réalité

Le principe de réalité est le premier principe de gouvernement de tout ensemble humain, qu'il s'agisse d'une entreprise, d'une ville, d'une famille ou d'une société tout entière. On peut avoir les meilleures idées et la meilleure dialectique du monde, on ne prépare pas l'avenir en ignorant les réalités du présent et les tendances lourdes qui se dessinent déjà.

Certes, on doit combattre les erreurs et les injustices qui ternissent ce présent, craindre les dangers que recèlent les tendances dominantes et essayer d'y parer. Mais on ne saurait infléchir la réalité que si on la connaît et la comprend.

Le premier signe du mal français, c'est le refus de la réalité. Les débats politiques ne manquent ni d'intelligence ni de vigueur, mais ils sont, d'une certaine façon, hors du temps. Ce n'est pas par hasard que les Français s'en désintéressent et que nous sommes en même temps de plus en plus isolés dans un monde qui nous comprend de moins en moins.

To recognize reality

The principle of reality is the first principle for government of every human group, whether it be a company, a city, a family or a whole society. One can have the best ideas and the best didactics in the world, one does not prepare the future ignoring the realities of the present and the heavy tendencies which already announce themselves.

It is true, one has to fight the errors and injustices which tarnish this present, fear the dangers which the dominant tendencies cover and try to ward them off. But one will only be able to break the reality if one knows and understand it.

The first sign of the French problem that is the refusal of the reality. The political debates lack neither intelligence nor vigor, but they are, in a certain way, out of time. It is not by chance that the French lose interest and that we are simultaneously isolated in a world who understands us less and less.

p. 7-8

Annexe 2

Lars Bo Kaspersen: *Danmark i verden. 2008*

Kapitel 1

Stat og samfund

En begrebsramme

Enhver stat eksisterer i en særlig kontekst, hvori den udvikles, konsolideres og forandres. Denne kontekst udgøres af den givne stats placering i et socialt og geografisk rum i en verden af andre stater og samfund. Den danske stat har igennem adskillige århundreder formået at fastholde et territorium under meget forskellige eksistensbetingelser. Dette territorium har udviklet og ændret sig, både hvad størrelse og karakter angår, dels i et dynamisk samspil med vore naboer, dels som følge af forandringer inden for selve territoriet, bl.a. i form af ændrede økonomiske konjunkturer, nye ideologier og teknologiske innovationer.

Chapter 1. State and society. A conceptual framework

Every state exists in a specific context, in which it develops, consolidates and changes. This context is constituted by the placement of the given state in a social and geographical space in a world of other states and communities. The Danish state has through several centuries been able to maintain a territory under very different conditions of existence. This territory has changed and developed, both as far as size and character is concerned, partly in a dynamic interchange with our neighbours, partly as a consequence of changes within the territory itself, among other things in the form of changed economic conjectures, new ideologies and technical innovations. (p. 17)

Michel Crozier & Bruno Tillette : *Quand la France s'ouvrira. 2000*

Si la réalisation de l'Europe monétaire signifie la victoire du libéralisme en Europe (et non pas le renforcement de la résistance à l'hégémonie américaine et anglo-saxonne comme nous l'avions voulu), c'est que, en l'absence d'un Etat politique européen fort, impossible à instituer avant longtemps, le libéralisme offre le meilleur moyen de régulation pour un ensemble comme le nôtre. Plus profondément peut-être, c'est que le monde plus complexe et en situation de changement accéléré dans lequel nous vivons requiert des formes de pensée et d'action moins rigides et plus individualistes.

While the realisation of the monetary Europe means the victory of liberalism in Europe (and not the reinforcement of the resistance against the American and Anglo-Saxon hegemony as we wished it to), then it is because, in the absence of a strong political European state, unable to be established within long, liberalism offers that best means of regulation for a group as ours. In a deeper sense maybe, it is because the more complex world ((which is)) in a fast accelerating situation, ((and)) in which we live requires less strict and more individualistic forms of thinking and of action. (34)