

A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF LINKING VERBS IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN¹

WOLF-DIETRICH BALD

Mainz University

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS. The contrastive analysis of two or more languages, or of particular areas of these languages, may obviously be aimed at various linguistic levels. By way of example one might mention three basic levels, namely, the semantic, the syntactic, and the phonological, but it should be clear that numerous others like the paralinguistic or the emotive, etc., could be equally good levels for comparison.

From previous contrastive analyses it is apparent that these levels are interrelated at least in some fields so that in such cases the question automatically arises whether the methods of analysis applied in one area may profitably be transferred to another and whether, in the end, one may formulate a "unified theory" of contrastive analysis².

In this paper we shall assume that it is possible to formulate such a "unified theory" and we shall concentrate on the analysis of our data, which in its turn may serve to support and exemplify the hypothesis of a theory of language comparison.

2.1 THE PROBLEM. As our object of study we have chosen the field of linking verbs in English and German³. As is well-known, and has already been observed by Biese (1932), English exhibits an extraordinarily complex field of linking verbs compared to all other Germanic or Romance languages, and presumably other branches of language as

¹ This article is a revised version of a paper read at the Second Polish Conference on Contrastive Linguistics, Dec. 16-18, 1971, in Karpacz, Poland. I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Dr. B. Carstensen, director of the Contrastive Linguistics Project at Mainz University, and my other colleagues for their help during the revision of the paper. In particular I have the pleasure of acknowledging the improvements concerning the text and the examples suggested by Mr. R. L. Atkinson.

² My colleague, Ch. Todenhagen, from Mainz University, is working on problems of such a unified theory, and I profited greatly from discussions on this subject with him and other colleagues at Mainz.

³ Cf. König-Nickel (1970) on some general aspects of English-German verb syntax.

well⁴. This is particularly obvious for those verbs having the meaning 'change, become'; English offers *become, come, fall, get, go, grow, run, turn, wax, wear*, as compared to German *werden*, French *devenir*, Danish *bliver*, etc. Another example of such diversity is supplied by English *remain, keep, continue, stay*, etc., where German seems to offer just *bleiben*.

The question which these phenomena pose and which we shall try to answer is threefold, and may be formulated as follows:

- (a) which semantic and syntactic features characterize the English set of verbs
- (b) which semantic and syntactic features characterize the German set of verbs
- (c) how do the two sets compare

One might further ask what consequences the comparison may have for the teaching of English to German students or vice versa, but this question will only be of marginal importance for the present paper.

We shall not deal with any problem of phonology either since there do not seem to be any difficulties specifically connected with our set of verbs.

Another point concerning the subsequent procedure must be explained. Instead of analysing and describing the two languages in isolation and then comparing them to each other, we shall describe the system of English and demonstrate similarities and dissimilarities with German⁵. We hereby imply that the categories, elements, etc., on the semantic as well as on the syntactic level are valid for both languages, i.e. are adopted from a possibly universal inventory⁶. We cannot deal extensively with this hypothesis here, but it had to be mentioned, since it is only the assumption of such an inventory that explains the absence of a metatheory within which the comparison is carried out.

2.2 THE ANALYSIS. The analysis of the linking verbs in English as presented here is taken from my thesis which deals with the semantic and syntactic phenomena in this area on a wider scale. A detailed justification of the system as given below is to be found in that thesis (Bald 1972).

The major subclasses of linking verbs are listed below, with a suggestion as to their defining semantic component or feature:

⁴ Cp. also Liston 1970: 40 ff.), who mentions this kind of convergence and divergence for English — Serbo-Croatian lexical fields.

⁵ Cf. the recommendations by Nemser-Ivir (1969: 6 ff.).

⁶ Cf. Berndt (1971: 28 ff.) on "language-invariant" categories, etc. Berndt himself advocates "deep semantic structures" as the starting point for language comparison. Cp. also Ivir (1970: 24) Wagner (1970).

- | | | |
|------------|---|---|
| (1) (a) BE | : | empty surface-structural element indicating the basic form of attribution: 'X be Y' |
| (d) SMELL | } | relating the basic form of attribution to one of the senses: 'X be Y to a certain sense' |
| (c) LOOK | | |
| (b) FEEL | | |
| (e) SOUND | | |
| (f) TASTE | | |
| (g) SEEM | } | speaker's judgement on the facticity of the basic form of attribution: 'may or may not be true that X be Y' |
| (h) APPEAR | | |
| (i) PROVE | : | speaker's judgement on the facticity of the basic form of attribution: 'is definitely true that X be Y' |
| (j) REMAIN | : | 'X be Y before and after a point t on the time scale' |
| (k) BECOME | : | 'X be Y after a point t on the time scale' |

Assuming that these semantic characterizations, which have here the form of paraphrases but might also be represented by way of features, are correct, and that at least the central field of linking verbs is covered by them, the question is first whether German realizes the same set of distinctions. Secondly, one has to examine whether there are differences within the various subclasses.

Be is equivalent⁷ to *sein* as is illustrated by the following sentences:

- (2) (a) The man is my father
- (a') Der Mann ist mein Vater
- (b) He was ill
- (b') Er war krank

It will be obvious that there are various restrictions in English sentences containing *be* that are absent in their German equivalents; compare for instance the use of the article in the following pairs:

- (3) (a) He was a teacher
- (a') Er war Lehrer
- (b) Er war ein guter Lehrer
- (b) He was a good teacher

⁷ By *equivalence* we mean an at least partial functional equivalence on the semantic and syntactic levels, which is in part indicated by the possible translations offered in the examples. Only a more detailed description of the two languages could illustrate the exact extent of this equivalence. On the question of translation and equivalence cf. Ivir (1969, 1970); Marton (1968: 54) gives a very useful definition of *equivalence*.

Such phenomena, which are important for the teacher, can only be dealt with in a more detailed analysis; here it has to suffice to demonstrate the basic syntactic and semantic equivalence of *be* and *sein*.

Feel in its various constructions may be contrasted with several German phrases containing *fühlen*:

- (4) (a) She feels happy
 (a') Sie fühlt sich glücklich
 (b) He feels at home in London
 (b') Er fühlt sich in London heimisch (zu Hause)
 (c) She feels a different person after that experience
 (c') Sie fühlt sich wie ein (als) anderer Mensch nach diesem Erlebnis
 (d) The water feels hot
 (d') Das Wasser fühlt sich heiß an

These examples illustrate that *feel* and *fühlen* are semantically equivalent in the constructions listed, exhibiting three differences, however: German always requires the reflexive *sich* (*fühlen*, *anfühlen*)⁸. Secondly, whenever the complement has the form of an NP, it is preceded by *als* or *wie* in German. As regards the latter construction, it would appear that it comes close to the English construction *feel like*+NP, whereas *als* is equivalent to *feel*+NP, but this semantic-syntactic differentiation will need further investigation. The third point is that in the sentence type (4d) German uses the verb *sich anfühlen*, thus exhibiting an overt structural difference that correlates with the semantic-syntactic one between, e.g. (4a) and (4d). Compare the following sentences, that illustrate this difference:

- (5) (a) *She feels happy to me
 (b) The water feels hot to me
 (c) She is feeling happy
 (d) *The water is feeling hot

Look shows the following parallels:

- (6) (a) He looks old
 (a') Er sieht alt aus
 (b) He looked a fool with his new hair-cut
 (b') Er sah aus wie ein Narr mit seiner neuen Frisur

⁸ Poutsma (1914-29: II, 1 B, 854 ff.) makes the interesting point that the use of *feel* in linking constructions goes back to a reflexive construction. One would have to check, however, whether this is to be taken as a synchronic or diachronic statement on surface or underlying structure, since the OED lists quite early examples with *feel* in a linking construction without reflexive.

Look and *aussehen* may be opposed in this function in linking constructions. The same phenomenon as with *feel* is to be observed here: for *look*+NP German requires *wie*, whereas English has two possibilities, depending on the semantic relation between subject and complement:

- (7) (a) He looks a tough man
 (b) He looks like a cactus in the morning

Compare:

- (c) He is a tough man
 (d) *He is a cactus in the morning

Sentence (7d) is only acceptable if interpreted in a metaphorical sense, which is signalled by *like* in (7b). The class of noun that may occur in sentences like (6b, 7a) seems to be characterized by its evaluative function with regard to the subject.

Smell and *riechen* fulfil the same functions in the two languages:

- (8) (a) Vodka smells nice
 (a') Wodka riecht angenehm

For *smell*, as well as for *taste* (see below), there is a restriction on the type of construction in which both may occur. *Smell*+NP or *taste*+NP do not seem to be possible, or they are extremely rare at least. The NP — complement has to be construed with *of* or *like* and *nach* or *wie*, respectively, in each language:

- (8) (b) It smells of Whisky
 (b') Es riecht nach Whisky
 (c) It smells like Whisky
 (c') Es riecht wie Whisky

As regards *sound*, the following sentences may be compared:

- (9) (a) That sounds marvellous
 (a') Das klingt (hört sich) sehr gut (an)
 (b) She sounds a very nice person (W. 7. 1 - 46)
 (b') Sie Kling (hört sich an) wie eine sehr nette Person
 (c) That sounds like a Jaguar
 (c') Das klingt (hört sich an) wie ein Jaguar
 (d) That sounds like a bad experience
 (d') (i) Das klingt nach schlechter Erfahrung
 (ii) Das klingt (hört sich an) wie eine schlechte Erfahrung

For *sound* there are again three different types of construction, i.e. *sound*+adjective (+NP)+*like*+NP. German has two verbs that may be

used interchangeably. It is apparent that *klingen* or *sich anhören*, if construed with an NP — complement, require *wie* or *nach*, while English has a set of sentences with *sound*+NP that do not have the particle *like* (cf. 9b).

Taste can be found in the following types of sentence:

- (10) (a) The wine tastes good
 (a') Der Wein schmeckt gut
 (b) It tastes like vinegar
 (b') Es schmeckt wie Essig
 (c) The drink really tastes of lemon
 (c') Das Getränk schmeckt tatsächlich nach Zitrone

Here the English and the German verb need a particle whenever the complement is an NP; both of (*like* and *nach*) *wie* are possible.

In both English and German the verbs whose semantic paraphrase was given above as 'X be Y to a certain sense' are characterized by a particular construction they allow. Compare the following:

- (11) (a) The water feels hot to me
 (b) The house looks old to me
 (c) The milk smells sour to me
 (d) That sounds unfamiliar to me
 (e) The beer tastes good to me

The phrase *to me* in these sentences indicates the evaluator or experiencer of the sensation concerned⁹. In German this experiencer appears in the form of the dative in the case of *klingen* and *schmecken*:

- (11) (d') Das klingt mir fremd¹⁰
 (e') Das Bier schmeckt mir gut

With the verbs *aussehen* and *riechen*, however, the equivalent construction results in sentences with a rather doubtful degree of acceptability:

- (11) (b') ?Das Haus sieht mir alt aus
 (c') ?Die Milch riecht mir sauer

Yet these sentences become perfectly normal when they contain a certain type of adverbial:

- (11) (b'') Das Haus sieht mir sehr alt aus
 (c'') Die Milch riecht mir zu sauer

⁹ Cf. Poltauf (1964) on questions of evaluation in language.

¹⁰ Wahrig (1968), s.v. *klingen* 4.

In such instances the presence of the evaluator, i.e. the dative *mir*, seems to be justified by the adverb of degree. The German counterpart of *feel* as it is employed in (11a), the verb *sich anfühlen*, cannot be used with this particular type of dative, but requires a prepositional phrase instead:

- (11) (a') Das Wasser fühlt sich für mich heiß an

Another possibility of translation is offered by *jemandem vorkommen*, a form that, being semantically emptier than *fühlen*, *schmecken*, etc., may be used as a substitute:

- (11) (a'') Das Wasser kommt mir heiß vor

This form is obligatorily construed with the dative. Another verb that seems to prohibit the dative is *sich anhören*, which was illustrated above in (9). Its partial synonym *klingen* is different in this respect (cf. 11d').

This restriction on the occurrence of the dative appears to correlate with the presence of the morpheme *an-* in *sich anfühlen* and *sich anhören*, but more examples will have to be examined before this may be treated as a fact.

The possible constructions with *of* or *like* as compared to *nach* or *wie* in German and English deserve some comment, since they reveal various restrictions in the two languages. In English only *smell* and *taste* may co-occur with *of* (cf. exx. 8b, 10c). In German one has *riechen nach*, *klingen nach*, *schmecken nach*, *aussehen nach*; compare examples (8b', 9d', 10c') and the following:

- (12) (a) It looks like rain
 (a') Es sieht nach Regen aus

It is only *sich anfühlen* that does not accept *nach*.

Like may co-occur with all verbs of this group, and so can *wie* in the case of the German equivalents. The combination *sich fühlen* (4c'), however, permits also *als*, which is impossible with any of the other verbs.

It is not easy to define the difference between the constructions with *like* (*wie* and *of*) *nach*, because in certain contexts they appear to be exchangeable without incurring any clear shift of meaning. Perhaps it is true to say that the constructions with *smell* (*riechen*, *taste*) *schmecken*, etc., plus *like* (*wie*) have the implication of 'making an impression on the olfactory sense or the sense of taste, etc., as the substance itself denoted by the complement'. Compare the following examples and their paraphrases:

- (13) (a) It smells like wine
According to its smell it could be wine
(a') Es riecht wie Wein
Aufgrund seines Geruchs könnte es Wein sein
(b) It tastes like vinegar
According to its taste it could be vinegar
(b') Es schmeckt wie Essig
Aufgrund seines Geschmacks könnte es Essig sein

If the verbs in question are construed with *of/nach*, however, the implication is of 'making an impression on the respective sense which is reminiscent of that made by the real substance denoted by the complement'. This could be illustrated by the following sentences and their paraphrases:

- (14) (a) It smells of sherry
Its smell is reminiscent of sherry
(a') Es riecht nach Sherry
Sein Geruch erinnert an Sherry
(b) It tastes of caviar
Its taste is reminiscent of caviar
(b') Es schmeckt nach Kaviar
Sein Geschmack erinnert an Kaviar

That there is some linguistic support for the semantic difference between the constructions with *like (wie and of) nach* that we have postulated above is illustrated by the following sentences:

- (15) (a) Proposals smelling of confiscation (OED, s.v. *smell*, v., 9b [1887])
*Proposals smelling like confiscation
(a') Vorschläge, die nach Beschlagnahme riechen
*Vorschläge, die wie Beschlagnahme riechen
(16) (a) The wine tasted of the cask (cp. OED, s.v. *taste*, v., 9 [1655])
*The wine tasted like the cask
(a') Der Wein schmeckte nach dem Faß
*Der Wein schmeckte wie das Faß
(b) The place, the air tastes of the nearer north (OED, s.v. *taste*, v., 9b [1840])
*The place tastes like the nearer north
(b') Die Gegend, die Luft schmeckt nach dem nahen Norden
*Die Gegend, schmeckt wie der nahe Norden

In (15), *like* and *wie* are impossible since the implication, as was suggested above, is that the denotatum of the complement actually has

a smell; *confiscation* or *Beschlagnahme*, however, belong to a class of noun that does not qualify for this feature. In (16a) the sentences with *like* and *wie* have to be asterisked because *taste like* and *schmecken wie* imply a complement having the feature [eatable] if it is to be tasted, which *cask* and *Faß* do not have; the same holds true for *north* and *Norden* in (16b). *Of* and *nach* on the other hand are possible since they do not imply the presence or reality of the relevant features for smelling, tasting, etc., but indicate a reminiscence of them¹¹.

Another argument¹² for the distinction we have drawn between constructions with *like (wie and of) nach* is furnished by the following examples:

- (17) (a) It smells like sherry
It smells just like sherry does
(a') Es riecht wie Sherry
Es riecht so, wie Sherry riecht

The compound-sentence construction illustrated here is an impossible paraphrase for sentences containing *of* or *nach*.

In the case of *seem* and *appear* the following examples may be constructed:

- (18) (a) She seems happy
(a') Sie scheint glücklich
(b) She seems to be happy
(b') Sie scheint glücklich zu sein
(c) She seems (to be) happy to me
(c') Sie scheint mir glücklich (zu sein)
(d) At first the cat seemed a nuisance
(d') ?Zuerst schien die Katze eine Plage

The only difference between *seem* and *scheinen* according to these sentences appears to be the constructional restriction that in German an NP — complement requires the form *zu sein scheinen*, whereas in English *seem* is possible without *to be*, although usually *seem to be* will be employed in such cases.

Although it is possible in certain contexts to translate *appear* alternatively with *scheinen* or *erscheinen*, the nearest approximation to *appear* would be *erscheinen*. Both may be used in linking constructions, as in demonstrated by the following sentences:

¹¹ This difference of meaning explains why *He smells of horses* may be taken as a complement, but *He smells like horses* much less so.

¹² This was pointed out to us by Dr. M. Hellinger.

(19) (a) It appears (to be) profitable (to me)

(a') Es erscheint (mir) nützlich

In contrast to *appear*, however, *erscheinen* cannot be construed with *zu sein*:

(19) (a'') *Es erscheint (mir) nützlich zu sein

The second reason why we treat *appear* and *erscheinen* together is their use in the sense of 'turn up', i.e. as verbs of motion:

(20) (a) The dog appeared in the garden

(a') Der Hund erschien im Garten

Erscheinen, however, seems to behave still more like a verb of motion than *appear*, since the only context in which the motion-features are suppressed, thus permitting the linking construction, is that of *erscheinen*+adjective; *appear* in connection with *to be* occurs in a wider range of constructions, for instance with NPs:

(21) (a) He appears to be a teacher

(b) *He appears a teacher

There is only one other possibility with *erscheinen*:

(22) (a) Dieser Vorschlag erscheint uns als nützlich

(b) Dieser Vorschlag erscheint uns als Fortschritt

It is open to further research to determine the exact syntactic and semantic relationship these sentences have to those given under (19).

The German verb equivalent to *prove* in linking constructions is *sich erweisen*:

(23) (a) The new invention proved (to be) useless

(a') Die neue Erfindung erwies sich als nutzlos

(b) He proved (to be) a coward

(b') Er erwies sich als Feigling

In contrast to *prove*, *sich erweisen* is never used with *zu sein*. It always requires *als* when the complement is an NP; in the case of an adjective *als* seems to be usual, although there are examples without it¹³:

(24) Er hat sich mir gegenüber stets dankbar erwiesen

The factors determining the distribution of *als* with adjectival complements are not quite clear yet.

The semantic paraphrase 'X be Y before and after a point *t* on the time scale' holds for several verbs in English, for instance *remain*, *stay*, *keep*, *go*, *continue*. The central verb in German would be *bleiben*. Compare the following examples:

¹³ Wahrig (1968), s.v. *erweisen* 2.

(25) (a) She remained happy

(a') Sie blieb glücklich

(b) He remained a teacher

(b') Er blieb Lehrer

(c) The coffee kept warm

(c') Der Kaffee blieb warm

(d) The weather continued calm

(d') Das Wetter blieb freundlich

(e) The crime went unpunished

(e') Das Verbrechen blieb unbestraft

Both the English verbs of this group and their German equivalent need further research before a more detailed subclassification may be attempted.

Finally we have to mention the group of verbs with the meaning of 'X be Y after a point *t* on the time scale', which in English consists of about ten members, such as *become*, *fall*, *get*, *grow*, etc., whereas German has only *werden*. Examples are easy to find:

(26) (a) He becomes a teacher

(a') Er wird Lehrer

(b) He became old

(b') Er wurde alt

(c) The child fell ill

(c') Das Kind wurde krank

(d) The student got nervous

(d') Der Student wurde nervös

The particular problems that arise from such a situation, where a whole set of partially synonymous verbs in one language is confronted with just one verb in the other language will be dealt with below (cf. § 2.3).

The survey of linking verbs in English and their German equivalents that we have given above was only to serve three major purposes:

(a) it demonstrated that all the semantic components, or paraphrases, given above (cf. 1) are lexicalized in English and German;

(b) it showed that the two languages differ in the number of lexicalizations of one basic semantic paraphrase, so that one has to inquire about further relevant semantic features that may determine subclasses;

(c) it made obvious that the syntactic characteristics of the verbs in question vary considerably between the languages and within one language, while the basic semantic relation of attribution and the essential features of the respective subclasses remain constant.

2.3 SEMANTIC CONSIDERATIONS. As was pointed out above, all the semantic components we had stated for the English set of linking verbs are also to be found in the various German verbs. In other words, the two languages make use of the same set of semantic distinctions.

Preliminarily, these semantic distinctions might be regarded as belonging to a universal set, which, in our case, appears *in toto* in both languages. Whether all of the distinctions introduced above (cf. 1) can be called universal, will depend on further analyses of various languages with respect to these distinctions. At least the basic form of attribution appears to qualify for a universal semantic relation if one considers the analyses published by Verhaar (1967 ff.).

The semantic components we have discussed so far would have to be classified as criterial for the respective subclass. Within the subclasses the various members may be differentiated by another type of feature that one may call *latent feature* after Kempson-Quirk (1971), i.e. a feature that may be activated or suppressed by the context.

Two examples shall be briefly discussed in order to illustrate this phenomenon.

The verbs *go* and *turn* are members of the subclass containing *become*, etc., i.e. they are characterized by the same criterial feature (cf. paraphrase 1k). The following contexts, in which they were tested according to the methods described in Quirk-Svartvik (1966) and Greenbaum-Quirk (1970), demonstrate, however, that the two verbs are distinguished through a particular latent feature. The contexts were:

- (27) (a) The man — — — — violent
 (b) The man — — — — insane
 (went, turned)
- (28) (a) The animal — — — — ferocious
 (b) The animal — — — — quiet
 (went, turned)

The distribution of the verb forms by the informants was significant in each case: *turn* collocates with *violent* and *ferocious*, *went* with *insane* and *quiet*:

- (27') (a) went : 1 (1,4%)
 turned : 68 (98,6%)
 (b) went : 68
 turned : 1
- (28') (a) went : 3 (9,7%)
 turned : 28 (90,3%)
 (b) went : 28
 turned : 3

The feature distinguishing the two verbs might be called [visual agitation].

The second example to be mentioned furnishes a demonstration of the semantic differentiation of two constructions. The verb phrases *grow* and *grow to be* were tested in the following contexts:

- (29) (a) He — — — — tall and stately
 (b) He — — — — angry
 (grew, grew to be)
- (30) (a) She — — — — older and older
 (b) She — — — — very old
 (grew, grew to be)

In each case, *grew to be* collocated with the complement having the feature [permanent] or [static], i.e. with *tall and stately* and *very old*:

- (29') (a) grew : —
 grew to be : 67 (100%)
 (b) grew : 67
 grew to be : —
- (30') (a) grew : 64 (97%)
 grew to be : 2 (3%)
 (b) grew : 2
 grew to be : 64

It will be obvious that such semantic differences between members of one subclass, based on latent features, do not find a counterpart in German, since in each case German would use *werden*. In other words, the two languages are identical with regard to the criterial semantic features within the area of linking verbs, but differ, quite naturally, in contextually determined latent features.

2.4 SYNTACTIC CONSIDERATIONS. In order to summarize the various characteristics that appeared in the comparison of the two sets of verbs, the following points may be mentioned. Within each of the two languages there are differences that a description somehow has to account for. To give an example for English, one might consider the possible constructions with *of* and *like* in which *smell* and *taste* may occur, but not *feel*, *look*, and *sound*, which permit only *like*. For German it could be pointed out that some verbs have to be used with the reflexive pronoun, whereas others are construed without (*sich anhören*, *sich fühlen*, *sich anfühlen* vs. *schmecken*, *aussehen*, *klingen*, etc.). It is still an open question whether these variations are merely accidental surface-structure phenomena or whether there are semantic correlates as yet undiscovered.

A comparison of the two languages has to describe the phenomena

that in German all NP- complements require one of the particles *wie*, *als*, or *nach* except in the case of *sein* and *scheinen*, whereas English permits the construction V + NP for several other verbs. Further, *appear* may be construed with *to be* while *erscheinen* never co-occurs with *zu sein*. Another area is that of the different semantic-syntactic realizations of certain semantic features (*feel vs. sich fühlen* and *sich anfühlen*; cf. exx. 4,5).

It will be apparent that many more questions apart from those enumerated here await a detailed contrastive analysis within the field of linking verbs, and that these questions are closely connected with general problems of semantics and syntax. It would appear that the findings of a contrastive analysis can throw some light on the controversial problem of their interrelationship.

2.5 PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS. Obviously, the semantic and syntactic problems pointed out in the last two sections are of considerable importance for the teaching of English to German students or of German to English students. Since the fundamental categories and constructions can be found in the inventory of both languages, the teaching material may be restricted to introducing the equivalent constructions of the other language without having to explain in detail their basic semantics and syntax. Emphasis will have to be laid on the differences, which, in our case of the syntactic variations mentioned above, may be classified as surface-structural and have to be learnt via the lexicon and certain language-specific syntactic rules.

The latent features exemplified in section 2.3 will present a more problematical area, since they are not at all clearly defined for all the various verbs in English or German, and since their introduction into the teaching process would presuppose quite a detailed knowledge of, and familiarity with, the respective foreign language. Presumably, only cases of wider application can be integrated into the teaching material. Thus, the negativity of the complements following *go* (*go mad*, *go wrong*) is often mentioned¹⁴, and similar cases might be added.

Generally, the differences between the languages as regards lexicalizations, which in many cases are linked to these latent features, as well as other fields might be isolated by setting up tables for convergent and divergent phenomena¹⁵. The subsequent examples demonstrate conver-

¹⁴ Cf. OED, s.v. *go* 44, Jespersen (1909-49: III, 386) and Jones (1936). The same problem is posed by the results of Greenbaum (1970): the teacher can only select the most characteristic collocations and present them at some stage in the process of learning as a regular feature of English.

¹⁵ This was pointed out to us by Doc. dr. Reszkiewicz, from Warsaw University.

gence 31) and divergence (32) from the point of view of English, and the opposite for German, if read from right to left:

(31) (a)	become		
	come		
	fall		
	get		
	go		
	grow		→ werden
	run		
	turn		
	wax		
	wear		
(b) continue			
	go		
	keep		→ bleiben
	remain		
	stay		
(32) (a) feel →			
			sich fühlen
			sich anfühlen
(b) sound →			
			sich anhören
			klingen
(c) smell →			
			riechen
			duften ¹⁶

Such tables may be used as a first indication of problem areas for teaching purposes. But it is obvious that more detailed analyses of the two verb groups in English and German are required before, on the basis of statistical considerations of frequency of occurrence, one can profitably make a selection of the various linguistic facts for inclusion in teaching material.

REFERENCES

- Bald W. D. (1972) *Studien zu den kopulativen Verben des Englischen*, Commentationes Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae V (München: Hueber), to appear
 Berndt, R. (1971) 'Recent approaches to grammar and their significance for con-

¹⁶ Whereas in the case of *feel* the two reflexive verbs of German represent the lexicalizations of the two uses of *feel* as a linking verb (cf. exx. 4,5), *riechen* is equivalent to *smell* in all its senses ('detect', 'seek', and 'emit'; cf. Quirk [1970: 119 ff.]), but *duften* has only the meaning of 'emit' plus the inherent feature [pleasant].

- trastive structure studies", *The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian — English Contrastive Project, B. Studies 3*, ed. by R. Filipović (Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics, Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics), 1 - 36
- Biese, Y.M. (1932) "Die neuenglischen Ausdrücke des Werdens in sprachgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung", *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 33, 214 - 244
- Czochralski, J. A. (1971) "Zur sprachlichen Interferenz", *Linguistics* 67, 5 - 25
- Duden (1961) *Rechtschreibung der deutschen Sprache und der Fremdwörter*, bearb. v. P. Grebe, 15. Aufl. (Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut)
- Duden (1966) *Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, Der Große Duden, Bd. 4, bearb. v. P. Grebe et al., 2. Aufl. (Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut)
- Greenbaum, S. (1970) *Verb-intensifier collocations in English: An experimental approach*, *Janua Linguarum, Series Minor 86* (The Hague, Paris: Mouton)
- Ivir, V. (1969) "Contrasting via translation: formal correspondence vs. translation equivalence", *The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian — English Contrastive Project, B. Studies 1*, ed. by R. Filipović (Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics, Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics), 13 - 25
- Ivir, V. (1970) "Remarks on contrastive analysis and translation" *The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian — English Contrastive Project, B. Studies 2*, ed. by R. Filipović (Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics, Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics), 14 - 26
- Jespersen, O. (1909 - 49) *A modern English grammar on historical principles*, 7 vols. (first Heidelberg: Winter, then Copenhagen: Munksgaard & London: Allen & Unwin)
- Jones, J. (1936) "Some semantic observations on certain uses of *go*", *studies in English* 16 (The University of Texas Bulletin 3626, Austin, Texas, 1936), 42 - 52
- Kempson, R. M. — Quirk, R. (1971) "Controlled activation of latent contrast", *Language* 47, 548 - 572
- König, E. — Nickel, G. (1970) "Transformationelle Restriktionen in der Verbal-syntax des Englischen und Deutschen", Moser, H. et al., (eds.) *Probleme der kontrastiven Grammatik: Jahrbuch 1969*, Sprache der Gegenwart, Schriften des Instituts für deutsche Sprache in Mannheim, Bd. 8 (Düsseldorf: Schwann), 70 - 81
- Liston, J. L. (1970) "Formal and semantic considerations in contrastive analysis", *The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian — English Contrastive Project, B. Studies 2*, ed. by R. Filipović (Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics, Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics), 27 - 49
- Marton, W. (1968) "Equivalence and congruence in transformational contrastive studies", *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 1, 53 - 62
- Nemser, W. — Ivir, V. (1969) "Research guide for project workers: I. morphology and syntax", *The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian — English Contrastive Project, A. Reports 1*, ed. by R. Filipović (Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics, Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics), 3 - 8
- The Oxford English Dictionary (1933) ed. by J.A.H. Murray et al., re-issued, with supplement, 13 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, repr. 1961)
- Poldauf, I. (1964) "The third syntactical plan", *Travaux linguistique de Prague* 1, 241 - 235
- Poutsma, H. (1914 - 29) *A grammar of late modern English*, pts. 1 and 2 (Groningen: Noordhoff)
- Quirk, R. (1970) "Taking a Deep Smell", *Journal of linguistics* 6, 119 - 124
- Quirk, R. — Svartvik, J. (1966) *Investigating linguistic acceptability*, *Janua Linguarum, Series Minor 54* (The Hague et al.: Mouton)

- Verhaar, J.W.M. (1967 ff.) *The verb 'do' and its synonyms*, 4 pts., *Foundations of Language, Supplementary Series* (Dordrecht-Holland: D. Reidel)
- Wagner, K. H. (1970) "The relevance of the notion 'deep structure' to contrastive analysis", *PAKS — Arbeitsbericht 6* (Stuttgart: Institut für Linguistik — Lehrstuhl Anglistik, Universität Stuttgart), 1 - 42
- Wahrig, G. (1968) *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Lexikon-Verlag)