Contrastive linguistics

Narrowly defined. incompatible linguistics can be regarded as a subdivision of comparative linguistics that is concerned with braces of linguistic communications which are ' socio-culturally linked' . Two linguistic communications can be said to be socio-culturally linked when (I) they are used by a considerable figure of bi- or multilingual talkers. and/or (two) a significant sum of ' linguistic output' (text. discourse) is translated from one linguistic communication into the other.

Harmonizing to this definition. incompatible linguistics trades with braces of linguistic communications such as Spanish and Basque. but non with Latin and (the Australian linguistic communication) Dyirbal. as there is no socio-cultural nexus between these linguistic communications. More loosely defined. the term ' contrastive linguistics' is besides sometimes used for comparative surveies of (little) groups (instead than merely braces) of linguistic communications. and does non necessitate a socio-cultural nexus between the linguistic communications investigated.

On this position. incompatible linguistics is a particular instance of lingual typology and is distinguished from other types of typological attacks by a little sample size and a high grade of coarseness. Consequently. any brace or group of linguistic communications (even Latin and Dyirbal) can be capable to a incompatible analysis. This article is based on the (intermediate) position that incompatible linguistics constantly requires a socio-cultural nexus between the linguistic communications investigated. but that it is non restricted to pairwise linguistic communication comparing.

Even though it is non a subdivision of applied linguistics. incompatible linguistics therefore aims to get at consequences that carry the potency of being used for practical intents. e. g. in foreign linguistic communication instruction and interlingual rendition. As it provides the descriptive footing for such applications. its research programme can besides be summarized as ' comparison with a purpose' (E. Konig) . The ' objective of applicability' is besides reflected in the fact that incompatible surveies focus on the differences. instead than the similarities. between the linguistic communications compared.

As a first estimate. the method of incompatible linguistics can be represented as in Diagram 1 (for easiness of representation. the undermentioned treatment will concentrate on pairwise comparing) . ' A (Ln) ' bases for the analysis of a linguistic communication Ln and ' Ac (L1 – L2) ' for the incompatible analysis of two linguistic communications L1 and L2. analysis of individual linguistic communications & gt ; incompatible analysis & gt ; A (L1) sociocultural nexus application foreign linguistic communication learning interlingual rendition … Ac L1 L2 A (L2) Diagram 1: Contrastive linguistics between language-particular analysis and application

The scheme given in Diagram 1 will be refined below. In peculiar. the function of ' bilingual lingual output' will be integrated into the image. This end product non merely provides the empirical footing for incompatible surveies but besides maps as a conceptual nexus between the lingual systems investigated. as it can be used to set up comparison between classs from different linguistic communications. After supplying a brief historical overview of incompatible linguistics in Section 2. Section 3 will turn to some

cardinal methodological issues. in peculiar the inquiry of crosslinguistic comparison.

In Sections 4 and 5. two major types of comparing will be illustrated. i. e. comparing of strictly formal classs (consonants) and comparing of lingual classs that carry intending or map (tense) . Section 6 will cover with generalisations across functional spheres (Wh-question formation and relativization) . Section 7 will reason with some comments on the empirical footing of incompatible linguistics (specialised principal) . 2 Historical comments The programme of incompatible linguistics was instigated by Charles Carpenter Fries from the University of Michigan in the 1940s.

French friess (1945: 9) contended that " [T] he most effectual stuffs [in foreign linguistic communication learning] are those that are based upon a scientific description of the linguistic communication to be learned. carefully compared with a parallel description of the native linguistic communication of the learner" . Some old ages subsequently. this undertaking was put into pattern by Fries' co-worker Robert Lado (1957) . who provided a comparative description of English and Spanish. The premise that foreign linguistic communication instruction can be improved by comparing the learner's native linguistic communication with the linguistic communication to be learned came to be known as the " Contrastive Hypothesis" .

Its chief premises can be summarized as follows (californium. Konig & A ; Gast 2008: 1) : • • First linguistic communication acquisition and foreign linguistic communication larning differ basically. particularly in those instances where the foreign linguistic communication is learnt subsequently

than a female parent lingua and on the footing of the full command of that female parent lingua. Every linguistic communication has its ain specific construction. Similarities between the two linguistic communications will do no troubles (' positive transfer') . but differences will. due to ' negative transfer' (or ' interference') . The student's larning undertaking can therefore approximately be defined as the amount of the differences between the two linguistic communications.

A systematic comparing between female parent lingua and foreign linguistic communication to be learnt will uncover both similarities and contrasts. On the footing of such a comparing it will be possible to foretell or even rank larning troubles and to develop schemes (learning stuffs. learning techniques. etc.) for doing foreign linguistic communication learning more efficient. • • The incompatible hypothesis in the signifier summarized above shortly turned out to be excessively optimistic. It was excessively uniform in many respects and neglected of import parametric quantities of 2nd linguistic communication acquisition (e. g. natural vs. mediated. consecutive V.

coincident. 2nd vs. 3rd linguistic communication. etc.) . Furthermore. the incompatible programme lacked a solid foundation in larning psychological science and was ne'er even set on a sensible empirical footing. in so far as the purpose of bring forthing comprehensive comparings of linguistic communication brace was ne'er convincingly realized. The endeavor of bettering foreign linguistic communication learning on the footing of pairwise linguistic communication comparing was hence abandoned before long. even

though a certain plausibleness of at least some of the basic premises made by early incompatible linguistics can barely be denied (californium.

Kortmann 1998) . New drift was given to pairwise linguistic communication comparing in a figure of publications from the 1970s and 1980s that did non chiefly prosecute didactic intents (e. g. Konig 1971. Rohdenburg 1974. Plank 1984) . These writers regarded incompatible linguistics as a " limiting instance of typological comparison" (Konig 1996: 51) which was characterized by a little sample size and a high grade of coarseness. This typologically oriented attack culminated in John Hawkins' (1986) monograph A comparative typology of English and German – Unifying the contrasts.

It was one of Hawkins' primary aims to uncover correlativities between belongingss of specific grammatical subsystems (esp. sentence structure and morphology) . with the ultimate end of ' unifying the contrasts' . Furthermore. Hawkins aimed at supplying accounts for the correlativities he observed and related his incompatible analyses to theories of linguistic communication processing (e. g. Hawkins 1992) .

Even though Hawkins' hypotheses and generalisations met with unfavorable judgment (e. g. Kortmann & A ; Meyer 1992. Rohdenburg 1992) . they provided of import penetrations and helped set up incompatible linguistics as a type of linguistic communication comparing that was interesting and worthwhile in itself. without prosecuting any specific aims related to 2nd linguistic communication acquisition or other lingual applications.

The 1980s and 1990s witnessed a certain variegation in the field of incompatible linguistics in so far as new subjects came into the focal point of attending (e. g. pragmatics and discourse surveies. californium. House & A ; Blum-Kulka 1986. Oleksy 1989) . and new empirical methods were introduced. clairvoyance. corpus-based 1s (californium. Section 7) .

The handiness of specialised principal (parallel principal and scholar principals) besides led to a reclamation of the nexus between incompatible linguistics and lingual applications. e. g. in so far as penetrations gained from (quantitative) contrastive analyses turned out to be utile for interlingual rendition surveies (see e. g. Johansson 1998a) . Most modern-day surveies published under the label of ' contrastive linguistics' follow the spirit of the word picture given in Section 1. i. e. they pursue a fundamentally lingual involvement but trade with braces of linguistic communications that are ' socio-culturally linked' .

In fact. the bulk of articles published in the diary Languages in Contrast. which was launched by the John Benjamins Publishing Company in 1998. trades with European linguistic communications. clairvoyance. Germanic and Romance 1s. Equally far as the subjects investigated are concerned. there is a preponderance of discourse-related surveies. which may be due to the corpus-based methodological analysis applied in most instances. 3 Establishing comparison Just like lingual typology. incompatible linguistics has to confront the job of " comparability of incommensurable systems" (Haspelmath 2008) .

In non-universalist models (such as early structuralist linguistics and its modern replacements) . lingual classs are merely defined relation to the system that they form portion of. Accordingly. the inquiry arises whether classs from different lingual systems can be compared at all. and if so. how such a comparing can be carried out. In really general footings. comparing can be defined as the designation of similarities and differences between two or more classs along a particular (set of) dimension (s) . The classs compared must be of the same type. i. vitamin E.

at that place has to be a set of belongingss that they have in common. or a superordinate class incorporating them. One major challenge for comparative linguistics therefore is to find the nature of that superordinate class (' CS') for any brace of classs under comparing: (1) C1 CS C2 In lingual typology. the job of " comparability of incommensurable systems" has been tackled in assorted ways.

Haspelmath (2008) has argued that cross-linguistic comparing demands to be based on " comparative concepts" . i. e. analytic impressions that are used to depict specific facets of lingual systems. e. g. ' subject' . ' case' . ' (past/present/future) tense' . etc. For case. a ' subject' in German does non hold exactly the (system-internal) belongingss of a ' subject' in English.

Still. ' subject' can be used as a comparative construct. in the sense of ' grammaticalized neutralisation over specific types of semantic roles' . Determining the extent of similarity every bit good as the differences between the instantiations of the comparative construct ' subject' in the linguistic communications under comparing is exactly the undertaking that a

relevant contrastive survey has to transport out (californium. Rohdenburg 1974. Konig & A ; Gast 2008: Ch. 6) .

In incompatible linguistics. the ' assumption of comparability' for specific braces of classs is reflected in. and supported by. lingual end product. Remember that incompatible linguistics has been defined as covering with braces (or groups) of linguistic communications that are socio-culturally linked. i. e. linguistic communications for which a significant sum of bilingual end product is available. for case in the signifier of interlingual renditions and parallel principal. As Johansson (2000: 5) puts it. " [T] he usage of multilingual principal. with a assortment of texts and a scope of transcribers represented. increases the cogency and dependability of the comparing.

It can so be regarded as the systematic development of the bilingual intuition of transcribers … . " The ' hypothesis of inter-lingual commensurability' is therefore non a heuristic move but a fact of life reflected in the linguistic communication of (balanced and to the full adept) bilingual talkers. Bilingual end product is besides relevant to the inquiry of (non-) equality between classs from different linguistic communications in another regard: Second linguistic communication scholars frequently identify classs from their L2 with classs from their L1 (' inter-lingual identification' . ' interference' . californium. Weinreich 1953) .

In other words. 2nd linguistic communication scholars make an premise of ' interlingual equivalence' that gives rise to non-target-like constructions in their L2. In these instances. the (non-) equality of classs from different linguistic communications is non a inquiry of heuristics but portion of the

object of survey. 4 Comparison based on signifier: Consonant stock lists A phonological and morphophonological comparing of two linguistic communications is strictly form-based insofar as it does non do mention to significance or map.

Specific facets of phonological organisation have figured conspicuously in (particularly early) incompatible surveies (e. g. Lado 1957) . Given that phonemes are relational entities that can merely be defined with mention to the system that they form portion of and in fact constitute. they can non easy be compared across linguistic communications. Let us see the consonant stock lists of English and German for illustration.

A model of comparing is provided by a classical structuralist analysis which is based on articulative characteristics of typical allophones instantiating the relevant phonemes (' place of articulation' . ' manner of articulation' and ' voicing') .

Both the English phoneme /t/ and the German one /t/ can therefore be regarded as instantiating the comparative construct ' voiceless alveolar plosive' . There are two basic types of relationships between such braces of consonants: near equality and non-equivalence. The latter relationship is uninteresting in most instances – as the bulk of braces of consonants are evidently non-equivalent. state Engl. /p/ and Germ. /k/ – but there is a particular instance of non-equivalence that is extremely relevant to incompatible surveies. i. e. partial equality.

In the instance of close equality two phonemes have a similar distribution and (in most contexts) similar phonic realisations. For case. the concluding

consonant in the English word bin is both phonetically and phonologically similar to the concluding consonant in (the first individual remarkable signifier of the German linking verb) bin. and the relevant phonemes have a similar distribution. The relationship between these phonemes is one of close equality (instead than ' full equivalence') because phonemes (every bit good as lingual classs in general) are defined merely comparative to lingual systems.

This means that phonemes from different lingual systems can ne'er be to the full tantamount. A relationship of partial equality obtains when two phonemes are phonetically and distributionally similar but non (near) equivalent. For case. the alveolar lateral of English and its German opposite number have a similar distribution but (partly) different phonic realisations. as Engl. /l/ . unlike German /l/ . is velarized in a syllable-final place. If phonemes are regarded as sets of allophones. Engl. /l/ and Germ. /l/ can be said to overlap but non to be co-extensive: (3) comparative construct ' voiced alveolar lateral' Engl.

/l/ = { l. ? . cubic decimeter? } Germ. /l/ = { l. cubic decimeter? } As this illustration illustrates. the difference between close equality and partial equality is a gradual 1. Partial equality can be assumed when the inter-lingual designation of two classs leads to considerable divergences from the mark system in one of the linguistic communications involved. If German talkers identify the German /n/-phoneme with the English 1. this will non take to any noticeable divergence from native English phonemics ; the two classs are therefore near equivalent.

If. nevertheless. the /l/-phoneme of English is identified with the one of German. the pronunciation will be non-target-like in specific contexts (e. g. * [degree Fahrenheit? fifty] alternatively of [degree Fahrenheit? ?]) . Such ' erroneous' inter-lingual designation of classs from different linguistic communications leads to interference. The relationship between the classs involved can be called pseudoequivalence ; it holds between a brace of classs as conceived by an (imbalanced) bilingual talker.

The incompatible method outlined above is illustrated in Diagram 2. where the function of bilingual information is taken into history. Each linguistic communication is first analyzed in its ain footings (e. g. by placing alveolar laterals in English and German) . and the ' raw data' is capable to a ' preliminary comparison' (e. g. by comparing Engl. bin to Germ. bin and Engl. tall to Germ. toll) .

Comparison is established on the footing of comparative constructs (' voiced alveolar lateral') . and the braces of classs therefore identified are capable to a incompatible analysis against the background of bilingual end product (e. g. the pronunciation of German L2-speakers of English) . bilingual end product L1 data language-internal lingual classs analysis preliminary comparing comparing based on ' comparative concepts' L1 Ac L2 L2 data language-internal lingual classs analysis Diagram 2: The process of form-based comparing in incompatible linguistics 5 Comparison based on signifier and map:

Temporal classs Most parametric quantities of comparing investigated in incompatible surveies are non strictly formal but concern the function

between signifier and map. As is good known from typological surveies. this function is typically (and possibly universally) many-to-many. i. e. each ontological class can be expressed utilizing assorted lingual classs. and each lingual class covers a certain scope of maps.

This many-to-many relationship between signifier and map is illustrated in Table 1. ontological classs OC1 OC2 OC3 OC4 … Table 1: Function from map to organize and frailty versa Still. the function from map to organize is non wholly arbitrary. Roughly speech production. the spheres of significance covered by a given lingual class must be semantically similar. In the ' semantic map' attack developed in lingual typology (e. g. Haspelmath 1993. new wave der Auwera & A ; Plungian 1998) . semantic similarity is represented as propinquity in an ndimensional infinite.

Such cross-linguistic theoretical accounts of form-function function can function as a comparative construct in incompatible analyses. This will be illustrated with the illustration of tense classs in English and German. As is by and large the instance in comparative surveies. a certain sum of simplification is needed in the constitution of inter-lingual comparison. (4) represents a simplified theoretical account of temporal linguistics classs LC1 LC2 LC3 LC4 … mention that high spots those differentiations which are cardinal to a comparing of English and German (californium. Declerck 2006) : (4) PAST … PRE-PRESENT t0 POST-PRESENT

Tense classs will normally cover contingent spheres on a clip axis as shown in (4) . The ' time spheres' (approximately) covered by English and German tense classs are indicated in (5) : (5) English PAST … PRE-

PRESENT t0 POST-PRESENT

——

————————————————————————- Past Tense Present Perfect

Present Tense Future (will) Prateritum Perfekt Prasens Futur (werden) The

same types of (non-) equality dealingss that were pointed out in Section 4

can be observed in (5) .

The relationship of close equality holds between the English will-future and

the German werden-future. Again. the two classs can non be said to be ' fully

equivalent' . Even though both future tenses are used for the future clip

sphere merely (ignoring non-temporal utilizations like the epistemological 1s

) . their distribution in English and German differs well. The ground is that

there are different contrasting and viing tense classs in each linguistic

communication: The English will-future competes with the traveling to-future

whereas the German werden-Futur competes with the Prasens.

One effect of this difference is that the English will-future is well more

frequent than the German werden-Futur (in the spoken linguistic

communication) . as the former. but non the latter class represents the '

unmarked' (semantically more general) pick vis-a-vis its primary rival. The

English and German tense systems provide several illustrations of partial

equality. For case. the English Simple Present and the German Prasens are

tantamount in some contexts but non in others. Approximately talking. the

contexts where the English Simple Present is used constitutes a subset of the

contexts where the German Prasens is used.

This. once more. frequently gives rise to interference in bilingual address (' pseudo-equivalence') . e. g. when talkers of German use the English Simple Present for future clip mention as a consequence of ' inter-lingual identification' of the two classs. 6 Comparison across functional spheres As was shown in the old subdivision. the comparing of classs associated with specific maps (' tense') typically departs from an ontological class (' temporal reference') . In specific instances several types of ontological classs (every bit good as their manifestations in different linguistic communications) can be described in footings of the same comparative construct.

A relevant illustration is provided by the two phenomena of comparative clause formation and Wh-question formation in English and German (californium. Hawkins 1986) . From an ontological (functional) point of position. these operations must be kept apart: Relative clauses are typically used to impute a German belongings to some referent with the aim of enabling the listener to place that referent (the adult male who lives following door) . By contrast. Wh-questions (Who will you get married?) elicit the value of a specific variable in an unfastened proposition (' You will get married x ; who is x? ') .

However. in English and German both operations can be described in footings of the same comparative construct. i. e. ' movement' or ' extraction' . Assuming that discernible syntactic constructions are (either in specific instances or ever) the consequence of motion operations (one of the basic creed of pre-Minimalist Generative Grammar) . both Wh-question formation and comparative clause formation can be regarded as cases of extraction.

differing merely in footings of the (external) distribution of the relevant clauses.

For case. in (6) who is assumed to hold been moved from its ' base position' (T) to its ' surface position' : (6) a. The adult male [whoi you talked to ti] is my brother. b. Whoi did you speak to ti? The comparative construct of ' extraction' allows us to explicate generalisations across functional spheres (comparative clauses and Wh-formation) . As Hawkins (1986) has shown. the operation of extraction is capable to different limitations in English and German: English allows extractions out of finite complement clauses and nonfinite adverbial clauses. though non out of finite adverbial clauses.

By contrast. German does non let extractions out of finite or adverbial clauses at all (i. e. extractions are merely possible out of infinite complement clauses) . This is shown in (7) and (8) and illustrated in Table 2 (from Konig & A ; Gast 2008: 195) . (7) (8) a. Whoi did Charles believe [that he saw Ti in our garden] ? B. The adult male [whoi Charles thought [that he saw Ti in our garden]] was my brother. a. *Weni glaubte Karl. [hyrax Er in unserem Garten Ti sah] ? B. *Der Mann. [deni Karl glaubte. [hyrax Er in unserem Garten Ti sah]] . war mein Bruder.

Table 2: Extractions in English and German The illustration discussed in this subdivision illustrates the function of lingual theories in incompatible linguistics. They provide constructs and footings that can function as a model of comparing. Note that the ' usefulness' of any given theoretical account (for a given inquiry) should be evaluated against the background of the (incompatible) generalisations that it allows one to do. Contrastive

linguistics is therefore frequently intentionally ecclectic with regard to the theories and methods that it uses. and the pick of lingual theoretical account may differ from one functional sphere to another.

7 The usage of principal in incompatible linguistics As the predating treatment has shown. bilingual end product plays an of import function in incompatible linguistics in at least two respects: First. it provides a footing of comparing. or at least justifies the premise of comparison ; 2nd. it constitutes the stuff on which incompatible generalisations are based. The being of bilingual end product has hence been pointed out as a cardinal characteristic of incompatible linguistics. non least because it distinguishes this subject from other types of comparative surveies. particularly typological 1s.

Two major types of bilingual end product can be distinguished: (I) information sets which instantiate each of the lingual systems in ways that do non differ well from end product produced by native talkers of the relevant linguistic communications (' balanced bilingual output') ; and (two) informations sets which are characterized by aberrance from relevant end product produced by native talkers in one of the linguistic communications involved (' unbalanced bilingual output') . Balanced bilingual end product is represented by (high quality) interlingual renditions and parallel principals based on such interlingual renditions.

Unbalanced bilingual end product is represented by the non-target-like linguistic communication of 2nd linguistic communication scholars. Such information has besides been collected in big samples of texts in the signifier

of ' learner corpora' . Each type of resource can be used for different intents. As a general inclination. parallel principals are associated with quantitatively oriented (frequently distributional) surveies of specific lingual characteristics in discourse.

The consequences obtained in such surveies are frequently relevant to interlingual rendition surveies. In recent old ages. parallel principals have played a peculiarly outstanding function in incompatible linguistics based in Norse states (e. g. Aijmer et Al. 1996. Johansson 1998b) .

It is besides in this research context that extended analogue principals have been compiled. e. g. the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus. which was assembled between 1994 and 1997 at the University of Oslo. This principal contains (braces of) texts that have been translated in both waies. i. e. there are English masters with Norse interlingual renditions and frailty versa. Such ' bidirectional' principals allow for the probe of instead elusive inquiries refering the theory and pattern of interlingual rendition. e. g. ' hidden' intervention phenomena and interlingual rendition norms.

While parallel principals provide (balanced) bilingual end product. scholar principals are ' bilingual' in a different manner: they contain merely informations from one linguistic communication. which is. nevertheless. produced by 2nd linguistic communication scholars and accordingly exhibits characteristics of the leaner's L1. One of the most comprehensive scholar principals available – the International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE) – has been compiled at the University of Leuven under the coordination of S. Granger (californium. Granger 1998) . It contains more than 3 million words

produced by native talkers of more than twenty different linguistic communications.

Even though the computerized analysis of lingua franca need non prosecute a didactic intent. it evidently lends itself to several pedagogical applications and has in fact go a cardinal constituent of technology-enhanced acquisition in recent old ages. References Aijmer. Karin. Bengt Altenberg and Mats Johansson (eds.) (1996) . Languages in contrast. Documents from a symposium on text-based cross-linguistic surveies. Lund 4-5 March 1994. Lund Studies in English 88. Lund: Lund University Press. Declerck. Renaat (2006) . The grammar of the English verb phrase. Vol. 1. German capital: Mouton de Gruyter. French friess. Charles Carpenter (1945) .

Teaching and larning English as a foreign linguistic communication. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Granger. Sylviane (1998) . Learner English on Computer. London: Longman. Haspelmath. Martin (1993) . Indefinites. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Haspelmath. Martin (2008) . Comparative constructs and descriptive classs in crosslinguistic surveies. Ms. Hawkins. John (1986) . A comparative typology of English and German. Unifying the contrasts. London: Croom Helm. Hawkins. John (1992) . A public presentation attack to English/German contrasts. In In Mair. Christian and Manfred Markus (explosive detection systems.) . New goings in incompatible linguistics.

Proceedings of the conference held at the Leopold-Franzens-University of Innsbruck. Austria. 10–12 May 1991. 115-136. Innsbruck. House. Juliane and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds.) (1986) . Interlingual and intercultural

communicating: Discourse and knowledge in interlingual rendition and 2nd linguistic communication acquisition surveies. Tubingen: Narr. Johansson. Sig (1998a) . Loving and detesting in English and Norse: A corpus-based contrastive survey. In Albrechtsen. D. . B. Henriksen. I. M. Mees and E. Poulsen (explosive detection systems.) . Positions on foreign and 2nd linguistic communication teaching method. Essaies presented to Kirsten Haarstrup on the juncture of her 60th birthday. 93-103.

Odense: Odense University Press. Johansson. Stig (1998b) . On the function of principals in cross-linguistic research. In S. Johansson and S. Oksefjell (explosive detection systems.) . Corpora and cross-linguistic research: Theory. method. and instance surveies. 3-24. Amsterdam and Atlanta. GA: Rodopi. Johansson. Stig (2000) . Contrastive linguistics and principals. Reports from the undertaking ' Languages in Contrast' . University of Oslo. Konig. Ekkehard (1971) . Adjectival buildings in English and German. Heidelberg: Groos. Konig. Ekkehard (1996) . Kontrastive Grammatik und Typologie.

In Lang. E. and G. Zifonun (explosive detection systems.) . Deutsch – typologisch. 31-54. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Konig. Ekkehard and Volker Gast (2008) . Understanding English-German Contrasts. 2nd edition (revised) . Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag. Kortmann. Bernd and Paul-Georg Meyer (1992) . Is English grammar more expressed than German grammar. after all? In In Mair. Christian and Manfred Markus (explosive detection systems.) . New goings in incompatible linguistics. Proceedings of the conference held at the Leopold-Franzens-University of Innsbruck. Austria. 10–

12 May 1991. 155-166. Innsbruck. Kortmann. Bernd (1998) . Kontrastive Linguistik und Fremdsprachenunterricht.

In Borner. Wolfgang and Klaus Vogel (explosive detection systems.) . Kontrast und Aquivalenz. Beitrage zu Sprachvergleich und Ubersetzung. 136-167. Tubingen: Narr. Lado. Robert (1957) . Linguistics across civilizations: Applied linguistics for linguistic communication instructors. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Oleksy. Wieslaw (ed.) (1989) . Contrastive pragmatics. Amsterdam: Benzoins. Plank. Frans (1984) . Verbs and objects in semantic understanding: Minor differences between English and German that might propose a major one. Journal of Semantics 3: 30560. Rohdenburg. Gunter (1974) . Sekundare Subjektivierungen im Englischen und Deutschen.

Vergleichende Untersuchungen zur Verb- und Adjektivsyntax. Bielefeld: Cornelsen-Velhaben & A ; Klasing. Rohdenburg. Gunter (1992) . Bemerkungen zu infiniten Konstruktionen im Englischen und Deutschen. In In Mair. Christian and Manfred Markus (explosive detection systems.) . New goings in incompatible linguistics. Proceedings of the conference held at the Leopold-FranzensUniversity of Innsbruck. Austria. 10–12 May 1991. 187-207. Innsbruck. new wave der Auwera. Johan and Vladimir Plungian (1998) . Modality's semantic map. Linguistic Typology 2. 1: 79-124. Weinreich. Uriel (1953) . Languages in contact: findings and jobs. The Hague: Mouton.