



Meaning Through Language Contrast

Edited by K.M. Jaszczolt and
Ken Turner

OFFPRINT

Cross-language commutation tests and their application to an error-prone contrastive problem

Ger. einige, Fr. quelques, Sp. algunos

Eva Lavric

Institut für Romanische Sprachen, Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien

As a linguist, and particularly as a contrastive linguist, I would like to start this contribution with three cheers to our students: Thank God we have students; thank God the students ask questions and thank God the students make errors! Because the errors and the questions about what would have been right and why, not only provide the contrastive linguistics branch of research with a first-class right to exist but also with a continuous stream of ideas of what to examine more minutely from what point of view.

The investigation at hand thus starts with errors, errors of German-speaking students producing texts in business French, errors in particular areas of nominal determination and especially in the field of indefinite plural determiners. Those errors serve as the starting point of an investigation into the three languages German, French and Spanish, with a short look at the English language.¹

The question how to carry out such a contrastive semantic investigation, i.e. what methods to apply to accomplish a satisfactory description of a particular area allowing for the deduction of rules suitable for teaching – that is a question which exceeds mere error analysis and which calls for the whole range of linguistic-semantic methodology. Personally, I see myself as part of a structuralist tradition as e.g. represented by Coseriu,² Vater,³ Schifko.⁴

In addition to standard linguistic methods, there are of course special contrastive methods, in particular the translation comparison, which yields valuable results but which, however, did not seem sufficient for my question concerning determiner semantics. I would like to exemplify why this is the case. And my first example just happens to be an error example, and a three-fold one at that:⁵

- (1) Le premier impact [d'un accident] est celui du point de vue de *ces institutions *qui doivent financer* *ces frais *qui sont directement liés aux accidents*. *Ces frais *qui se trouvent à gauche* sont les frais directement liés à l'accident

This is of course about determiners in noun phrases with restrictive relative clauses. Both the explanation and the respective rule are simple: what I would like to point out in this example (which is located halfway between syntax and semantics) is the way how to get there.

This way is via another example, and it is that example by means of which I want to exemplify my semantic method:

- (2) J'étais entré dans le bonheur,
qui est de faire le métier qu'on aime
Ich genoß nun das Glück, das darin besteht,
daß man jene Arbeit macht, die man gerne tut
Comencé a disfrutar de la felicidad que supone
dedicarse a la profesión que a uno le gusta

(HPP 180–183)

The example is taken from the corpus of my postdoctoral thesis,⁶ and one can see that this corpus is trilingual. It consists of texts with translations (half of them literary and the other half everyday texts). In this case, the original text is in French – and therefore comes first – the translations are into German and Spanish. (The other two directions of translation are of course also represented in the corpus.) The applied method is first and foremost a translation comparison.⁷ Example (2) is relevant for our first error example in so far as it includes a noun phrase with a restrictive relative clause and in its present form also provides the explanation of the error: In German, a restrictive relative clause can be signaled by a demonstrative determiner, namely by *jener*; the student has by analogy tried to do the same in French. One can already provide the learner with a rule of thumb here: In French, restrictive relative clauses cannot be signaled by a demonstrative determiner, one has to use the definite article.

Linguistically, however, this rule is still unsatisfactory because it does not completely and explicitly represent the situation in both languages; moreover, Spanish is still missing to render the comparison a triple one. How is a restrictive relative clause signaled in Spanish? Example (2) shows: by the definite article, as in French. There is a parallel between the two Romance languages, which are in opposition to German, at least in example (2).

Unfortunately however, this result is totally incorrect: mere translation comparison has led us astray in this case. With a mere translation comparison, one is far too much subject to the coincidences of translation, and that is why I system-

atically supplement the translation comparisons by commutation tests in all three languages. This means that in the same slot, I test all other determiners of the relevant language and note those which lead to the same meaning as the original text. I adapted this method from Väter (1963/1979), adding the contrastive dimension myself.⁸ The commutation tests restore the whole range of paradigmatic possibilities in all languages involved; under this method, one not only compares what is there in the text, but also what could have been there in this slot of the text while maintaining its meaning. The result for our example (2):

- (2') J'étais entré dans le bonheur,
qui est de faire le métier qu'on aime
Ich genoß nun das Glück, das darin besteht,
daß man jene Arbeit macht, die man gerne tut
daß man diejenige Arbeit macht, die man gerne tut
daß man die Arbeit macht, die man gerne tut
Comencé a disfrutar de la felicidad que supone
dedicarse a la profesión que a uno le gusta
a aquella profesión que a uno le gusta

There are three forms yielding the same meaning in the same slot in German, two in Spanish and only one in French. And thus we can with the help of this characteristic example lay down all possibilities to signal a restrictive relative clause in the systems of the three languages:

1. In all three languages, there is the option of the definite article.
2. In addition, there are possibilities with demonstrative determiners in German and Spanish: Sp. *aquel*, Ger. *jener* and *derjenige*.⁹
3. In French, there is no possibility to signal a restrictive relative clause by a demonstrative determiner.¹⁰ This constraint is probably related to the fact that French does not really have a distal demonstrative,¹¹ while both Ger. *jener* and Sp. *aquel* are distal demonstratives.¹²

So this would be the precise result of an empirically-based interlingual systems comparison, which the combination of translation comparison and commutation tests allows for. Although the rule of thumb for the student remains the same, we can now predict that e.g. German-speaking learners of Spanish will not make any interference errors with such examples, but that their transfer attempts will be successful.¹³

This brings us to the main part of this paper: the plural indefinites used for small numbers, i.e. Fr. *quelques*, Sp. *algunos* and Ger. *einige*. Again, we start with a few typical error examples:

- (3) Dans *quelques classe(s) d'école 70% des élèves ont besoin de leçons particulières
- (4) Son électorat est très hétérogène, mais *quelques groupes sont particulièrement attirés
- (5) *Quelques villes ont un certain pouvoir d'attraction, c'est la raison pour laquelle beaucoup d'entreprises s'y installent volontairement

What these examples have in common is that the learners use the Fr. *quelques* in contexts in which it is not 'appropriate'. By way of correcting, one could insert Fr. *certains* in all the examples; however, what the students actually 'meant' was not its German equivalent *manche*, but the German form *einige*, which was rashly equated with *quelques*. It is furthermore noteworthy that similar errors do not occur with Sp. *algunos*. We will therefore have to look at the French and Spanish equivalents of Ger. *einige*. Our 'pre-investigation' by means of error analysis suggests that Sp. *algunos* and Ger. *einige* could be synonyms, whereas Fr. *quelques* shows a narrower range of possible applications. The relation to *certain*s furthermore suggests that the opposition [+/-SPECIFICITY] plays a certain role regarding these differences. (What I mean by [+/-SPECIFICITY] is the opposition between e.g. Engl. *certain* and *any*, i.e. the opposition constituted by random selection versus a selection of the referent which is governed by (knowledge of) its identity).¹⁴

In the linguistic literature, Fr. *quelques* is often compared with *plussieurs* (e.g. Gondret 1976; Kesić 1978; Gaatone 1991). This, however, is of no help with our error examples, since it is not the interlingual problem concerning German. Here, errors occur because of the learners' hypothesis that Fr. *quelques* is the equivalent of Ger. *einige*. This hypothesis is not totally unfounded, however. It is definitely valid in a number of cases (and the Spanish versions show that *algunos* is indeed the Spanish equivalent):

- (6) Nach hinten wird das Gelände von einigen Eichen begrenzt
Vers le fond, quelques chênes bornent l'espace visible
Hacia detrás, el terreno está delimitado por algunos robles
(Wal 22/25/20)
- (7) Quelques femmes célèbres sont censées symboliser au Parlement et au gouvernement l'égalité des droits entre les sexes
Einige berühmte Frauen gelten in Parlament und Regierung als symbolhafte Verkörperung der Gleichberechtigung von Mann und Frau
Algunas mujeres célebres simbolizan en el Parlamento y en el gobierno la igualdad de derechos entre los sexos
(Hen 9-16)

The forms *quelques*, *algunos* and *einige* have in common the semantic feature [SMALL NUMBER],¹⁵ which means that the number of referents is lower than expected, lower than an objective or at least intersubjective standard.

Since we are moreover interested in the aspect of [+/-SPECIFICITY], I have chosen examples 6 and 7 to illustrate both poles of the opposition: (6) is non-specific and (7) is specific. Surprisingly, however, Fr. *quelques* can be found in both examples, which means it is not marked for the opposition [+/-SPECIFIC]. The semantic restrictions of Fr. *quelques* compared with Ger. *einige* can thus not be located in this dimension.

Therefore, we still have to look for authentic examples in which Ger. *einige* can occur, while Fr. *quelques* cannot. In my corpus, few but very characteristic examples can be found, the most meaningful of which is the following:

- (8) Ce truculent article ravira bien des présidents d'organisations agricoles!
*quelques présidents
- Dieser gesalzene Artikel wird einige Präsidenten landwirtschaftlicher Organisationen erfreuen...!
- !Este artículo encantará a algunos presidentes de organizaciones agrícolas...!
- (Pre)

A particular semantic feature can be tested against this example, namely the feature [CONSIDERABLE NUMBER]. While the opposition [SMALL NUMBER] versus [LARGE NUMBER] represents the objective aspect of the 'number' dimension, the opposition [CONSIDERABLE NUMBER] versus [INCONSIDERABLE NUMBER] denotes a subjective evaluation of the number on part of the speaker.¹⁶ The two aspects can be well differentiated in the semantics of the forms Fr. *plus d'un* / *Sp. más de un*, since both aspects are in a state of conflict here: *Plus d'un* / *más de un* denote an objectively small but subjectively considerable number. Fr. *bien des* signifies a large and at the same time considerable number.¹⁷

Example (8) shows that Fr. *quelques* cannot be used to refer to a considerable number and will therefore be substituted with *bien des*; *quelques* thus shows the feature [INCONSIDERABLE NUMBER], and that is exactly the difference to Ger. *einige* and Sp. *algunos*. Because *einige* and *algunos* are neutral concerning the opposition [+/-CONSIDERABLE], they can, as in the majority of examples (6)-(7), denote an inconsiderable number, but are also used to refer to a considerable number, as in example (8).

[SMALL NUMBER]	
[CONSIDERABLE NUMBER]	[INCONSIDERABLE NUMBER]
einige algunos	quelques

From a didactic viewpoint, it may make sense to ask whether there is a determiner in German which, just like Fr. *quelques*, represents a combination of the features [SMALL NUMBER] and [INCONSIDERABLE NUMBER]. There is indeed such a determiner: It is the form *ein paar*. This enables us to include Spanish again, because Sp. *un par de* is a synonym of Ger. *ein paar*, i.e. they can be applied in exactly the same contexts: e.g. in the following, which also confirms the equivalence with Fr. *quelques*:

- (9) Combien de prétendus savants sont aujourd'hui capables de faire une règle de trois ? Quelques mathématiciens !
 Wie viele, die sich Wissenschaftler nennen, sind heutzutage noch fähig, einen Schluß zu rechnen? Ein paar Mathematiker!
 ¿Cuántos pseudo-científicos son capaces hoy en día de hacer una regla de tres? ¡Un par de matemáticos!
 (Wil 92)

One can see that *ein paar* / *un par de* are German and Spanish determiners which represent the same features as *quelques*. Is it therefore possible to tell the learners to use Fr. *quelques* only when they could also use Ger. *ein paar*?

It is possible, albeit not one hundred percent true. Because there is a certain group of examples by which *quelques* exceeds *ein paar* / *un par de*. The commutations for examples (6) and (7) are particularly meaningful here:

- (6') Nach hinten wird das Gelände von einigen Eichen begrenzt
 ein paar Eichen
 Vers le fond, quelques chênes bornent l'espace visible
 Hacia detrás, el terreno está delimitado por algunos robles
 un par de robles
 (7') Quelques femmes célèbres sont censées symboliser au Parlement et au gouvernement l'égalité des droits entre les sexes

Einige berühmte Frauen gelten in Parlament und Regierung als symbolhafte Verkörperung der Gleichberechtigung von Mann und Frau
 ?? Ein paar berühmte Frauen
 Algunas mujeres célebres simbolizan en el Parlamento y en el gobierno la igualdad de derechos entre los sexos
 ?? Un par de mujeres célebres

Example (6) is [-SPECIFIC], and *ein paar* / *un par de* fit well, example (7) is [+SPECIFIC], and it excludes *ein paar* / *un par de*. *Ein paar* / *un par de* are thus marked as [-SPECIFIC]. We therefore have to enlarge our table by the 'specificity' dimension:

'number' dim. →	[SMALL NUMBER]	
'specificity' dim. ↓	[CONSIDERABLE NUMBER]	[INCONSIDERABLE NUMBER]
[+ SPEC.]	einige algunos	quelques ein paar un par de
[- SPEC.]		

If we now want to briefly include the English language, we can try to translate our example sentences into this language and test certain commutations. The obvious form for a comparison with *einige/quelques/algunos* and *ein paar* / *un par de* resp. is of course Engl. *a few*, which signifies [SMALL NUMBER] just like all the other examined forms. But in which variant? Is *a few* perhaps an equivalent of *ein paar* / *un par de*? Example (9) at least would suggest just that:

- (9') How many of those who call themselves scientists are nowadays able to do a rule-of-three? A few mathematicians!

We see that *a few* can occur in [-CONSIDERABLE] examples. To be equivalent to *ein paar* / *un par de*, it would also have to signify [-SPECIFIC]. So let's check examples (6) and (7):

- (6'') The back of the area is bordered by a few oaks
 (7'') A few famous women in Parliament and in Government are deemed as token embodiments of equal rights of men and women
 Engl. *a few* is possible in both examples and is thus not marked for the opposition [+/-SPECIFIC]. It could therefore be an equivalent of Fr. *quelques* or Ger. *einige*.

Let's check its behaviour with regard to example (8), which tests compatibility with [+CONSIDERABLE]:

- (8') This malicious article will be to the liking of *a few presidents of agricultural organisations

A few completely changes the meaning and can thus not be inserted here. From this it can be deduced that it behaves more or less like Fr. *quelques*, which represents the features [SMALL NUMBER] and [-CONSIDERABLE]. However, a few can also express [+CONSIDERABLE] if a relevant modifier is added:¹⁸

- (8'') This malicious article will be to the liking of quite a few presidents of agricultural organisations

Views may differ as to how to interpret this possibility: A few can either be regarded as [-CONSIDERABLE] and quite a few as [+CONSIDERABLE], so that the two terms are in privative opposition; or a few is (like Ger. *einige* and Sp. *algunos*) not marked for the opposition [+/-CONSIDERABLE], so that quite a few only topicalises a possible facet of meaning – which would mean that this is a case of an inclusive opposition. In this case, however, one would have to explain why a few alone 'fits' well in example (9) and not at all in example (8), i.e. why without a modifier it tends towards [-CONSIDERABLE], whereas Ger. *einige* and Sp. *algunos* actualize [+CONSIDERABLE] in the respective examples. It can be seen that even with such seemingly simple (pseudo-)equivalences each language triggers completely new questions.

After this short excursus into English we now return to German, French and Spanish and will, in the last part of this paper, enlarge our semantic table by several additional categories, which enable us to include further forms of determiners:

If we e.g. want to locate the specific determiners Fr. *certains* / Sp. *ciertos* / Ger. *manche* we have to exceed the realms of [SMALL NUMBER], because *certain/ciertos/manche* are not specified according to number.

'number' dim. →	[LARGE NUMBER]	[SMALL NUMBER]	
'specificity' dim. ↓		[CONSIDERABLE NUMBER]	[INCONSIDERABLE NUMBER]
[+ SPEC.]	<i>certains / ciertos</i> <i>manche</i>	<i>einige</i> <i>algunos</i>	<i>quelques</i> <i>ein paar</i> <i>un par de</i>
[- SPEC.]			

In this context, I provide my students with the following rule of thumb: *Einige* in the sense of *manche* = *certain*; *einige* in the sense of *ein paar* = *quelques*. This rule of thumb is valid for certain areas and would e.g. have been sufficient to avoid the errors in examples (3) to (5). To be precise, however, one would have to say that Fr. *quelques* as opposed to Ger. *einige* conveys, as an additional feature, a subjectively negative evaluation of the number, i.e. the feature [INCONSIDERABLE NUMBER].

For the sake of completeness, we should now closer examine Sp. *algunos*. It showed solidarity with Ger. *einige* in all previous examples and could thus be considered a synonym of *einige*. This is not exactly true, however, because the range of *algunos* is actually broader than that of *einige*. *Algunos* can also occur in examples in which the referents exist merely hypothetically, i.e. in a possible world, whereas *einige* is restricted to the existence of referents in the real world, i.e. to actual existence:¹⁹

- (10) Bringt er irgendwelche Ideen vor, ist man automatisch dagegen

**einige* Ideen

Si présente des idées, on est automatiquement contre

**quelques* idées

(Pre)

One can see that in the relevant examples, the German equivalent of *algunos* is the form *irgendwelche*, which refers to [-SPECIFIC] referents, no matter whether they exist in possible worlds or simply in the real world.²⁰

For a final table, the 'specificity' dimension therefore has to be broadened by a worlds aspect ([RW] = existence in the real world; [PW] = existence only in a possible world):

'number' dim. →	[LARGE NUMBER]	[SMALL NUMBER]	
'specificity' / 'worlds' dim. ↓		[CONSIDERABLE NUMBER]	[INCONSIDERABLE NUMBER]
[+ SPEC.]	<i>certain / ciertos</i> <i>manche</i>	<i>einige</i>	<i>quelques</i> <i>ein paar</i> <i>un par de</i>
[RW]	<i>irgendwelche</i>		
[- SPEC.]		<i>algunos</i>	
[PW]			

In all its complexity, this table shows how real equivalences – e.g. *certain/ciertos/manche* or *ein paar / un par de* – are actually an interlingual exception. The plural indefinites of the three examined languages overlap in specific functional areas, but their borders are divergent in the different languages. In particular, there is actually a relation of inclusion between the pseudo-equivalents *algunos*, *einige* and *quelques*: *quelques* \subset *einige* \subset *algunos*. The investigation clearly shows how the three languages structure reality in a comparable, but not in the same way.

The table developed here shows the limits of certain contrastive rules of thumb, because in the subtlety of analysis, it far exceeds the necessities of error explanation. It shows the problematic forms to be parts of a complex system, parts which can be compared in minute detail by means of a table divided according to semantic features and oppositions. By applying the combined contrastive method, it is possible to generate a comprehensive map of determiner meanings in three different languages.

French			
'number' dim. →	[LARGE NUMBER]	[SMALL NUMBER]	
		[CONSIDERABLE NUMBER]	[INCONSIDERABLE NUMBER]
'specificity' / 'worlds' dim. ↓			
	[+ SPEC.]	<i>certain</i>	<i>quelques</i>
[RW]			
[– SPEC.]			
[PW]			

Spanish

Spanish			
'number' dim. →	[LARGE NUMBER]	[SMALL NUMBER]	
		[CONSIDERABLE NUMBER]	[INCONSIDERABLE NUMBER]
'specificity' / 'worlds' dim. ↓			
	[+ SPEC.]	<i>ciertos</i>	<i>algunos</i>
[RW]			
[– SPEC.]			<i>un par de</i>
[PW]			

German			
'number' dim. →	[LARGE NUMBER]	[SMALL NUMBER]	
		[CONSIDERABLE NUMBER]	[INCONSIDERABLE NUMBER]
'specificity' / 'worlds' dim. ↓			
	[+ SPEC.]	<i>manche</i>	<i>einige</i>
[RW]			
[– SPEC.]	<i>irgendwelche</i>		<i>ein paar</i>
[PW]			

French, Spanish and German

French, Spanish and German			
'number' dim. →	[LARGE NUMBER]	[SMALL NUMBER]	
		[CONSIDERABLE NUMBER]	[INCONSIDERABLE NUMBER]
'specificity' / 'worlds' dim. ↓			
	[+ SPEC.]	<i>certain / ciertos</i>	<i>einige</i>
[RW]			
[– SPEC.]	<i>irgendwelche</i>		<i>quelques</i> <i>ein paar</i> <i>un par de</i>
[PW]		<i>algunos</i>	

Sources of the examples:²¹

- Hen Käthe Henschelmann: Technik des Übersetzens Französisch-Deutsch, Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer 1980 (+ Spanish translation by Ángel Borda)
- HPP Herbert Huber, Henri Perrin, Alain Pachod: Deutsch-französische Übersetzungen mit Stützbungen. Thèmes et versions, Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag 1973 (+ Spanish translation by Ángel Borda)
- Pre "Pas facile d'être président" / "Von der Kunst, Präsident zu sein" (translated by Susanne Auer) / ["No es fácil ser presidente"], journal article of unknown origin, which has been taken from the internal bulletin of the SFG, "Tausanne Bourgeoise", November 1983 (+ Spanish translation by Ángel Borda)

- Wal Martin Walsler: Eiche und Angora. Eine deutsche Chronik, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp 1963
- Fr.: *Chêne et lapins angora. Chronique allemande* (traduit de l'allemand par Gilbert Badia), Paris: Gallimard 1968
- Sp.: *Roble y conejos de Angora* (traducción Heleno Saña Alcón), Madrid: Edicusa 1970 (*Cuadernos para el diálogo. Libros de teatro* 19)
- Will Marc Wilmet: *La détermination nominale. Quantification et caractérisation* (Linguistique nouvelle), Paris: Presses universitaires de France 1986 (German and Spanish translation by me, E. L.)

Notes

1. For error analysis and the notion of interference, see e.g. Rattunde 1977; Flament-Boistrancourt 1985; James 1990; Vogel 1990; Henrici & Zöfgen 1993.
2. See e.g. Coseriu 1973.
3. See the famous dissertation, Vater 1963/1979.
4. See e.g. Schifko 1975 and 1992.
5. The fact that the same mistake occurs three times in this student's text shows that it is a competence mistake, i.e. that there is a wrong rule stored in the interlanguage.
6. Lavric 2001a.
7. The founder of this method is of course Mario Wandruszka (1969 and 1971). See also the recent symposium held in the course of the Romanistentag Osnabrück 1999 (Albrecht & Gauger 2001).
8. For a justification and explanation of the combined method (translation comparison + commutation tests), see among others Lavric 2001b.
9. *Derjenige* is actually confined to this function and cannot be used otherwise. (Although sometimes it also marks restrictive attributes in a form other than that of the relative clause.)
10. There are exceptions to this rule which correlate with clearly describable stylistic effects; see Lavric 1996, 1997 and 1998.
11. *Ce...là* can only be used with explicit or implicit contrast.
12. Strictly speaking, the proximate demonstratives Ger. *dieser* and Sp. *este* are marked for non-restrictivity (= appositionality) of the following relative clause. The distal demonstratives are actually unmarked and thus theoretically comprise both possibilities (restrictivity or appositionality); in fact, however, they are used to mark restrictivity in the overwhelming majority of cases. (Strictly speaking, the definite article also embodies both possibilities). See Lavric (2001a: 900–914).
13. In addition, one could predict that Spanish-speaking learners of French will face problems similar to those of German-speaking ones when confronted with this matter while native speakers of French learning German or Spanish will probably tend to exclusively

use the definite article with restrictive relative clauses and thus convey the so-called "over-indulgence" phenomenon (Levenston 1972) – out of several varieties the one similar to the mother tongue is preferred – which, however, is obviously not too troublesome.

14. See e.g. Vater 1963/1979; Stroka 1983; Zhou 1985. This opposition should not be confused with the one between actually versus hypothetically existing referents, which is often referred to by the same term. For a more extensive discussion of the ambiguities of indefinite reference see Galmiche 1983; Martin 1983; and Lavric 1990.

15. Moreover, they of course show the features [INDEFINITE], [MORE THAN ONE REFERENT] and [EXACT NUMBER], meaning that they are plural indefinites. (For the semantics of plural indefinites in French and Spanish, see Lavric 2000 and forthcoming).

16. A number of authors (e.g. Oomen 1977; Flückiger-Studer 1983; Zhou 1985) mix the two oppositions, which in fact can be distinguished in case of a few determiners only: Moxey & Sanford (1993), however, do distinguish between the two approaches to quantity, the objective and the subjective one.

17. Ger. *so mancher* and Fr. *maint(s)* refer to a number as being considerable without specifying whether it is large or small.

18. Of particular interest is the existence of a singular form *many a (many a president ...)*, which is the exact equivalent of Fr. *maint(s)* and Ger. *so mancher(r)*. All three forms signify [+CONSIDERABLE] without specifying a large or small number. They are furthermore stylistically marked as slightly pompous.

19. For the concept of possible worlds see e.g. Martin 1983 and 1987, and subsequently Lavric 1990 and 1995.

20. Engl. *a few* is here subject to the same restrictions as Ger. *einige*; it has to be substituted with *any* (here equivalent of Ger. *irgendwelche*):

(10) When he proposes any new idea(s), people are automatically against them
*a few new ideas

21. All emphases in the examples are mine, E. L.

References

- Albrecht, J., & Gauger, H.-M. (Eds.). (forthcoming). *Sprachvergleich und Übersetzungsvergleich. Leistung und Grenzen, Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten*. Frankfurt a.M. c.a.: Peter Lang.
- Coseriu, E. (1973). Probleme der strukturellen Semantik. Lecture given in the winter semester 1965/1966 at the University of Tübingen. Authorised and edited notes by Dieter Kastovsky (Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 40). Tübingen: Narr.
- Flament-Boistrancourt, D. (1985). L'interférence : Un masque, une ambiguïté ? *Acta universitatis wratislaviensis*, 818, *Romantica wratislaviensis*, 23 (= Le français langue étrangère. Actes du colloque franco-polonais, Lille, avril 1983), 21–35.

- Flückiger-Studer, T. (1983). *Quantifikation in natürlichen Sprachen*. Zur Semantik und Syntax französischer und deutscher Beschreibungen (Linguistische Arbeiten 132). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Gaatone, D. (1991). Les déterminants de la quantité peu élevée en français. Remarques sur les emplois de *quelques* et *plusieurs*. *Revue romane*, 26 (1), 3–13.
- Galmiche, M. (1983). Les ambiguïtés référentielles ou les pièges de la référence. In G. Kleiber & M. Riegel (Eds.), *Grammaire et référence* (= *Langue française* 57) (pp. 60–86).
- Gondet, P. (1976). 'Quelques', 'plusieurs', 'certains', 'divers': Étude sémantique. *Le français moderne* 44, 143–152.
- Henrici, G., & Zöfgen, E. (Eds.). (1993). *Fehleranalyse und Fehlerkorrektur* (= *Fremdsprachen Lehren und Lernen*, 22).
- James, C. (1990). Learner language. *Language teaching*, 23 (4), 205–213.
- Kęsik, M. (1978). *Quelques* vs. *plusieurs*. In *Actes de la IIe Conférence des linguistes romans polonais* (pp. 59–64). Warsaw: Editions de l'Université de Varsovie.
- Lavric, E. (1990). *Missverstehen verstehen: Opake Kontexte und Ambiguitäten bei indefiniten und definierten Nominalphrasen* (Grazer Linguistische Monographien 7). Graz: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Graz.
- Lavric, E. (1995). Referential ambiguities, possible worlds, and universes – The problem of substitution in contexts of propositional attitude. In R. A. Geiger (Ed.), *Reference in multidisciplinary perspective*. Philosophical object, cognitive subject, intersubjective process (pp. 45–62). Hildesheim/Zürich/New York: Georg Olms.
- Lavric, E. (1996). 'Cet air doublement immobile qu'ont les choses mobiles quand elles ne bougent pas...': Haloefekt und Relativsatz-Ankündigung. *Moderne Sprachen*, 40 (2), 157–170.
- Lavric, E. (1997). 'Ese reino movable' – Spanische, französische und deutsche Demonstrativa. In G. Wójcik (Ed.), *Studien zum romanisch-deutschen und innerromanischen Sprachvergleich*. Akten der III. Internationalen Arbeitstagung zum romanisch-deutschen Sprachvergleich (Leipzig, 9.10.–11.10.1995) (pp. 515–543). Frankfurt a.M./Berlin/Bern/New York: Peter Lang.
- Lavric, E. (1998). *Este, ese y aquel* en función determinativa. In G. Ruffino (Ed.), *Acti del XXI Congreso Internacional de Lingüística e Filología Romanza* (Palermo, 18–24 settembre 1995), Vol. III: Lessicologia e semantica della lingue romanze (pp. 405–418). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Lavric, E. (2000). Indéfinis pluriels français et espagnols. In A. Englebert, M. Pierrard, L. Rosier, & D. Van Raemdonck (Eds.), *Actes du XXIIe Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes*, Bruxelles, 23–29 juillet 1998, Vol. VII: Sens et fonction (pp. 377–386). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Lavric, E. (2001a). *Filler und Klarheit. Eine Determinantensemantik Deutsch-Französisch-Spanisch* (Stauffenburg Linguistik 9), Vol. I: Referenzmodell; Vol. II: Kontrastiv-semantische Analysen. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Lavric, E. (2001b). Übersetzungsvergleich mit Kommutationsprobe – eine paradigmatische Tiefendimension. In J. Albrecht & H.-M. Gauger (Eds.), *Sprachvergleich und Übersetzungsvergleich. Leistung und Grenzen, Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten* (pp. 97–129). Frankfurt a.M. c.a.: Peter Lang.
- Lavric, E. (forthcoming). Indéfinidos plurales españoles. In F. Sevilla & C. Avar (Eds.), *Actas del XIII Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas*, Madrid 1998, Vol. III: Hispanoamericana. *Linguística*. Teoría literaria. Madrid: Castalia.
- Levenson, E. A. (1972). Über- und Unterrepräsentation – Aspekte der muttersprachlichen Interferenz. In G. Nickel (Ed.), *Reader zur kontrastiven Linguistik* (pp. 167–174). Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer.
- Martin, R. (1983). *Pour une logique du sens* (Linguistique nouvelle). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Martin, R. (1987). *Langage et croyance*. Les 'univers de croyance' dans la théorie sémiotique (Philosophie et langage). Brussels: Pierre Mardaga.
- Moxey, L. M., & Sanford, A. J. (1993). Prior expectation and the interpretation of natural language quantifiers. *European journal of cognitive psychology*, 5 (1), 73–91.
- Oomen, I. (1977). *Determination bei generischen, definierten und indefiniten Beschreibungen im Deutschen* (Linguistische Arbeiten 53). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Rattunde, E. (1977). Transfer – Interferenz? Probleme der Begriffsdefinition bei der Fehleranalyse. In E. Rattunde (Ed.), *Fehleranalyse/Fehlerbewertung* (= *Die Neueren Sprachen*, 7 (1)) (pp. 4–14).
- Schifko, P. (1975). *Bedeutungstheorie*. Eine Einführung in die linguistische Semantik (Problemmata 45). Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Fromman-Holzboog.
- Schifko, P. (1992). Spanisch: Lexikologie und Semantik. In G. Holtus, M. Metzeltin, & C. Schmitt (Eds.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* (URL). Vol. VI, 1: Aragonesisch/Navarresisch, Spanisch, Asturianisch/Leonesisch (pp. 132–148). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Sroka, K. A. (1983). Definiteness and truth relation. In R. Jongen, S. De Knop, P. H. Nelde, & M.-P. Quix (Eds.), *Sprache, Diskurs und Text*. Akten des 17. Linguistischen Kolloquiums, Brüssel 1982, Vol. I (Linguistische Arbeiten 133) (pp. 110–120). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Vater, H. (1963/1979). *Das System der Artikelformen im gegenwärtigen Deutsch*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1963, 2nd, revised edition (Linguistische Arbeiten 78). Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1979.
- Vogel, K. (1990). *Lernersprache*. Linguistische und psycholinguistische Grundfragen ihrer Erforschung (Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 341). Tübingen: Narr.
- Wandruszka, M. (1969). *Sprachen, vergleichbar und unvergleichlich*. Munich: Piper.
- Wandruszka, M. (1971). *Interlinguistik*. Umriss einer neuen Sprachwissenschaft. Munich: Piper.
- Zhou, H. (1985). *Determination und Determinanten*. Eine Untersuchung am Beispiel neuhochdeutscher Nominalsyntaxen (Bochumer Beiträge zur Semiotik 2). Bochum: Brockmeyer.