( )   –
( )   –

6 au

2   E

(Butler et al, 2005; Gómez-González et al., 2008b, 2008c; González Álvarez and Rollings, 2004; Iglesias Rábade and Doval-Suárez, 2002) have summa-

r 0 Td5zed5(l-7 0.01 0.5(rade a (- 0.5(i)]TJc 0 T5(l-S)33r)13( )]Tyside a, wáhic)232

genres across languages and cultures (Mitchell, 1957; Koike and Biron, 1996; Luzón Marco, 2002; Taboada, 2004).

Within the studies on contrastive discourse it is worth mentioning the work of the Multilingualism group based at the University of Hamburg, some of which has an emphasis on translation. Many of their publications deal with contrastive issues in discourse, in particular two of the volumes in the Hamburg Studies in Multilingualism published by John Benjamins, one on connectivity (Rehbein et al, 2007) and one on multilingual discourse production (Kranich et al, 2011).

3. Corpus-based contrastive studies

Johansson (2007) makes a compelling case for the use of corpora in contrastive studies, attributing, in part, the resurgence of contrastive work to the availability of corpora. It is certainly the case that corpora, whether small-, medium- or large-scale, have given us new insights into the comparison of languages. Multilingual corpora are useful because they provide information about all aspects of the language, from morphological to discourse-level comparisons. e composition of the corpora may also shed light on di erences

1999; Altenberg, 2002), connectors (Milton and Tsang, 1993; Granger and Petch-Tyson, 1996; Altenberg and Tapper, 1998) collocations and prefabs (Howarth, 1996; Granger, 1998b; De Cock, 2000; Nesselhauf, 2003)-to infor mation structure (Boström Aronsson, 2001; Callies, 2009). is approach has been criticized for presenting interlanguage as an incomplete version of the target language. Granger (2004: 133) justi es the approach arguing that 'most CLC research so far has involved advanced EFL learners (…). For this cate- gory of learners more than any other, it makes sense to try and identify the areas in which learners still di er from native speakers and which therefore necessitate further teaching.'

4. The papers in this collection

 e papers included here have been organized around four themes: stud ies of discourse markers; information structure; registers and genres; and phraseology.

 e rst theme, discourse markers, includes four papers that examine the di erences in the use of discourse markers across languages. Recent research has shown the fruitful perspective that contrastive studies can bring to the study of discourse markers and their use in signalling coherence relations (Knott and Sanders, 1998; Altenberg, 2002; Degand and Pander Maat, 2003;

shows that, given its multifunctionality in Spanish, it has more than one equiv-
alent in the English corpus.

e third paper, by Adam and Dalmas, compares discourse markers in
French and German, rst from a general point of view, thus abstracting from
existing studies in either language, and then in the two languages-in con
trast, with focus on three particular markers. Adam and Dalmas propose that
the di erences in the use of discourse markers rest with two characteristics
of French that make it di erent from German. First, in French, the signs of
discourse organization on the part of the speaker tend to be more explicit.
Second, the verbal element in French has a more central global role than it
does in German.

e nal paper in this section, by Romero-Trillo, examines the use of
Pragmatic Markers as a tool to support interpretation and verify the current
interpretation of the communicative act, in a process labelled 'communica-
tive triangulation'. Romero-Trillo studies the English of native and non-native
speakers, showing that there are subtle intonation di erences in the produc-

Herriman's paper has as a starting point the similarities in presentation order in English and Swedish. Both languages make use of the principle of end-weight, and both languages rearrange elements following that principle, with rearrangements resulting in fronting, extraposition, existential constructions and cle sentences. However, upon close inspection, she discovers that Swedish makes much more frequent use of fronting and it-cle s, which she attributes to language-speci c constraints (V2 in Swedish, and SV in English). As with many of the other papers, her careful study of ne-grained aspects of discourse has applications for second language teaching.

Doval Suárez and González Álvarez also concern themselves with structure of information, in their case the use of it-cle s in learner corpora. ey contrast use, frequency and structural complexity of it-cle s in the Spanish por tion of the International Corpus of Learner English with the native equivalent in the Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays. ey conclude that, contrary to the ndings of previous studies carried out with learners with di erent L1s, Spanish learners underuse it-cle s. It is suggested that this underuse may point to the fact that the learners are overusing other focus constructions such as pseudocle s. e paper is an excellent example of a type of contrastive analysis that examines learner's language, or interlanguage, but unlike older approaches to interlanguage, does so from a quantitative point of view.

e structure of eme and Rheme, both in English and Spanish, has been well researched (Gómez-González, 2001; Lavid, et al. 2010; Taboada, 2004). e di erences across the two languages are well known, as are the challenges

e third set of papers deal with discourse and contrastive issues from the point of view of genre or register. Although most of the other papers also consider genre as an important variable in contrastive analyses, the papers in this section take the notion of genre as the point of departure for the analysis. e uncovering of recurrent lexico-grammatical patterns in di erent text types and genres, and across di erent languages and socio-cultural settings, raises speakers' awareness of how di erent discourse roles, discourse strategies and power statuses are enacted in their linguistic choices. is has been a continuous preoccupation among discourse analysts and grammarians (e.g., Swales, 1990; Biber et al., 1999; Bhatia, 2002), but it clearly is still a hot issue that deserves further investigation. e papers in this section make an important contribution to the study of genres from a contrastive point of view.

Kunz and Steiner open the section with a study of cohesion in English and German. ey consider cohesion from the point of view of language contact, and study texts in either language and their translations in the other, analysing the in uence that translation has on language change. Cohesion analyses have a long tradition in English, starting with the seminal work of Halliday and Hasan (1976), but there exists little work comparing studies of cohesion in English based in that framework to analyses in other languages. Kunz and Steiner propose a framework, methodology and corpus annotation process that will facilitate the systematic comparison of cohesive resources across languages and genres.

In Pounds' paper we nd a contrastive analysis of an everyday genre, real estate advertisements, in English and Italian. Given the culture-speci c context of the genre, Pounds uncovers interesting di erences in the way the persuasive nature of the texts is conveyed in the two languages. She uses the Appraisal framework (Martin and White, 2005) to study how evaluative language is expressed in the two sets of corpora. Appraisal and evaluative language are particularly interesting cross-linguistically because, as pointed out by Hunston and Sinclair (2000: 74), 'evaluation appears parasitic on other resources and to be somewhat randomly dispersed across a range of structural options shared with non-evaluative functions'. Evaluation tends to be highly implicit and discourse-dependent (Hunston, 2000: 199–201), which makes a contrastive analysis particularly well-suited to uncovering general properties of evaluation across languages. Pounds nds interesting di erences between English and Italian, in particular in the degree of explicitness of the evaluation.

Taboada and Carretero also study evaluative language from the perspective of Appraisal. In their work, a corpus of informally-written reviews of books and movies is analysed, contrasting English and Spanish texts. e genre is particularly interesting because it is also persuasive and argumentative, but informal in this case (the reviews were posted online, on consumer-oriented

sites). eirs is part of a large-scale annotation e ort, and their paper discusses, in particular, how the categories of Appraisal need to be very well de ned, so that the corpus can be reliably annotated by di erent coders.

Zamorano-Mansilla and Carretero close this section with a paper within the same research project, aimed at creating a large annotated corpus of English and Spanish. eir paper focuses on the annotation of modality in the two languages, and in particular the issues of annotator reliability when specifying types of modality conveyed by modal verbs and particles. is paper focuses on dynamic modality, showing that, although it is comparable in English and Spanish from a de nition point of view, in practice its annotation leads to the most disagreements.

e nal section of the special issue contains two papers that focus on phraseology, as a bridge between lexico-grammar and discourse. Rica Per omingo analyses lexical bundles in two corpora, one of non-native writers of English, and another one of professional native writers (containing English and Spanish subcorpora). e study uncovers interesting results, showing that non-native writers resort to multi-word units more frequently than native speakers of English, but that they show both over- and under-use of certain multi-word units, in particular those present in the native language. Rica Per omingo emphasizes the importance of multi-word units as topics in the teaching of English as a second language.

Mansilla also studies phraseology, but this time with a Spanish-German contrast, and focusing on an interesting semantic eld, that of lying, falsehood and deceit. She approaches the concept of falsehood as a metaphor (Lako and Johnson, 1980), and explores the di erent expressions of falsehood in the two languages, and the di erent cognitive models that they reveal.

About the authors

Maite Taboada is Associate Professor of Linguistics at Simon Fraser University

References

Aijmer, K. (2002) Modality in advanced Swedish learners' written interlanguage. In S. Granger, J. Hung and S. Petch-Tyson (eds), Computer Learner Corpora, Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching, 55–76. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Altenberg, B. (2002) Concessive connectors in English and Swedish. In H. Hasselgård, S. Johansson, B. Behrens and C. Fabricius-Hansen (eds), Information Structure in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective, 21–43. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Altenberg, B. and Tapper, M. (1998) e use of adverbial connectors in advanced Swedish learners' written English. In S. Granger (ed.) Learner English on Computer, 80–93. London: Longman.

Beekman, J. and Callow, J. (1974) Translating the Word of God. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

Bhatia, V. K. (2002) Professional discourse: Towards a multi-dimensional approach and shared practices. In C. N. Candlin (ed.) Research and Practice in Professional Discourse, 39–59. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. and Finegan, E. (1999) Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. and Kasper, G. (eds) (1989) Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Boström Aronsson, M. (2001) Cle s and pseudo-cle s in Swedish advanced learner English. Moderna Språk 95 (1): 16–23.

Brinton, L. J. (1996) Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Butler, C., Gómez-González, M. de los Ángeles and Doval-Suárez, S. (eds) (2005) e Dynamics of Language Use: Functional and Contrastive Perspectives. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ca arel, A. (2000) Interpreting French eme as a bi-layered structure: Discourse implications. In E. Ventola (ed.) Discourse and Community, 247–272. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Callies, M. (2009) Information Highlighting in Advanced Learner English. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Connor, U. (2002) New directions in contrastive rhetoric. Tesol Quarterly 36 (4): 493–510. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588238

Corder, S. P. (1981) Error Analysis and Interlanguage. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Well. Studies in Linguistics O ered to Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen, 173–184. Gent: Academia Press.

Degand, L. and Maat, H. P. (2003) A contrastive study of Dutch and French causal connectives on the Speaker Involvement Scale. In A. Verhagen and J. van de Weijer (eds) Usage Based Approaches to Dutch, 175–199. Utretcht: LOT.

Delin, J, Hartley, A., Paris, C., Scott, D. and Vander Linden, K. (1994) Expressing procedural relationships in multilingual instructions. Proceedings of 7th International Workshop on Natural Language Generation (IWNLG 7), 61–70. Kennebunkport, Maine.

di Pietro, R.J. (1971) Language Structures in Contrast. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Du Bois, J. W. (1985) Competing motivations. In J. Haiman (ed.) Iconicity in Syntax, 343–365. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eckman, F. R. (1977) Markedness and the contrastive analysis hypothesis. Language Learning 27 (2): 315–330. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1977.tb00124.x

Ellis, R. (1994) e Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Enkvist, N. E. (1978) Contrastive text linguistics and translation. In L. Grähs, G. Korlén and B. Malmberg (eds) eory and Practice of Translation, 169–188. Berne: Peter Lang.

Fabricius-Hansen, C. (2005) Elusive connectives: A case study on the explicitness dimension of discourse coherence. Linguistics 43 (1): 17–48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/ling.2005.43.1.17

Gast, V. (forthcoming) Contrastive analysis: eories and methods. In B. Kortmann and J. Kabatek (eds) Dictionaries of Linguistics and Communication Science: Linguistic eory and Methodology. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Available from http://www.personal.uni-jena.de/~mu65qev

Goldberg, A. E. and Del Giudice, A. (2005) Subject auxiliary inversion: A natural category. Linguistics Review 22 (2–4): 411–428. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/tlir.2005.22.2-4.411

Gómez-González, M. d. l. Á. (2001) e eme-Topic Interface: Evidence from English.

Langacker, R. W. (1985) Observations and speculations on subjectivity. In J. Haiman (ed.) Iconicity in Syntax, 109–150. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Langacker, R. W. (1989) Subjecti cation (No. A 262). Duisburg: Linguistic Agency University of Duisburg.

Langacker, R. W. (1990) Subjecti cation. Cognitive Linguistics (1): 5–38. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1990.1.1.5

Lavid, J. (2000) Text types, chaining strategies and eme in a multilingual corpus: A cross-linguistic comparison for text generation. In J. Bregazzi, A. Downing, D. López and J. Ne (eds) Homenaje a Jack C. White: Estudios de lología inglesa, 107–122. Madrid: Universidad Complutense.

Lavid, J., Arús, J. and Zamorano, J. R. (2010) Systemic Functional Grammar of Spanish: A Contrastive Study with English. London: Continuum.

Rösner, D. (1993) Intentions, rhetoric, or discourse relations? A case from multilingual document generation. In O. Rambow (ed.) Proceedings of Workshop on Intentionality and Structure in Discourse Relations, ACL, 106–109. Ohio State University: ACL.

Sajavaara, K. (1996) New challenges for contrastive linguistics. In K. Aijmer, B. Altenberg and M. Johansson (eds) Languages in Contrast. Papers from a Symposium on Text-based Cross-linguistic Studies 17–36. Lund: Lund University Press.

Salkie, R. and Oates, S. L. (1999) Contrast and concession in French and English. Languages in Contrast 2 (1): 27–56. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/lic.2.1.04sal

Scheibman, J. (2002) Point of View and Grammar: Structural Patterns of Subjectivity in American English Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Selinker, L. (1992) Rediscovering Interlanguage London: Longman.

Stein, D. and Wright, S. (eds) (1995) Subjectivity and Subjectivisation: Linguistic Perspectives Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steiner, E. H. and Ramm, W. (1995) On eme as a grammatical notion for German. Functions of Language 2 (1): 57–93.

Swales, J. M. (1990) Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taboada, M. (2004) Building Coherence and Cohesion: Task-Oriented Dialogue in English and Spanish Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Verhagen, A. (2005) Constructions of Intersubjectivity: Discourse, Syntax, and Cognition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wardaugh, R. (1970) e contrastive analysis hypothesis. TESOL Quarterly 4 (2): 123–130. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3586182