
This is the **published version** of the bachelor thesis:

Sanchez Bartomeu, Raquel; Fernández Montraveta, Ana María, dir. Syntactic mismatches between English and Spanish : a descriptive analysis and classification. 2015. 41 pag. (838 Grau en Estudis d'Anglès i de Clàssiques)

This version is available at <https://ddd.uab.cat/record/141238>

under the terms of the  license

Syntactic Mismatches between English and Spanish:

A Descriptive Analysis and Classification

TFG: Estudis d'Anglès i Clàssiques

Supervisor: Ana Fernández-Montraveta

Raquel Sanchez Bartomeu

June 2015



**Universitat Autònoma
de Barcelona**

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| List of Acronyms | |
| Abstract | 1 |
| 1. Introduction | 2 |
| 2. Literature Review | 4 |
| 3. Methodology | 10 |
| 4. Results and Discussion | 12 |
| 5. Conclusions | 22 |
| 6. Bibliography | 24 |
| Appendix 1 | |
| ○ Table of Mismatches: The Great Gatsby | 27 |
| Appendix 2 | |
| ○ Table of Mismatches: Short stories by Kate Chopin | 34 |

List of acronyms

- CG: Contrastive Grammar
- CL: Contrastive Linguistics
- CP: Complementiser Phrase
- DO: Direct Object
- ECM: Exceptional Case Marking
- EFL: English as a Foreign Language
- FLT: Foreign Language Teaching
- IO: Indirect Object
- MT: Machine Translation
- PP: Prepositional Phrase
- NP: Noun Phrase
- SL: Source Language
- SVO: Subject-Verb-Object Structure
- TL: Target Language
- VP: Verbal Phrase

Abstract

Languages are used to denote concepts shared by a community of speakers. However, the way languages establish relationships among concepts may differ from one language to another. This different realizations cause mismatches or divergences between the languages. This paper focuses on the analysis of syntactic mismatches between English and Spanish. The research question of this study is to show to what extent current classifications of structural divergences cover the real problems between the SL and the TL. Using Dorr's (1993) and Mel'čuk and Wanner's (2006) works as main references we have proposed an original classification of structural mismatches. Taking Corpus Linguistics as our methodological approach, the present study has created a literary corpus. The data collected in this corpus has been thoroughly analysed. The results of this study are useful for the field of translation (both human and MT). This paper also has important pedagogical implications because with this contrastive analysis we can determine some difficulties for the EFL student and adapt the curriculum of FLT.

1. Introduction

Languages denote concepts and world views shared by a community of speakers. Different languages may establish relationships among concepts in the same way but even so, express them differently from a formal point of view. From a language theory or translation perspective, “individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture” (Lado, 1957: 1). Thus, the differences in interpretation and realization of speech constructions between two languages can cause mismatches or divergences.

Mismatches between a source language (SL) and a target language (TL) have received great attention since they constitute a source of information relevant to several areas of Applied Linguistics. In this way, the study of similarities and divergences between languages is the main aim of the field known as Contrastive Linguistics. Also, from the point of view of foreign language teaching (FLT), divergences in the SL and the TL are of interest since “those elements that are similar to this native language will be simple for, and those elements that are different will be difficult” (Lado, 1957: 2).

Another field in which the study of divergences is of interest is translation, especially the field of machine translation (MT) (Mel’čuk and Wanner, 2006). However, most of the studies on translation mismatches in this area approach the topic from a semantic and lexical point of view. As a result less attention has been placed on structural mismatches. This paper aims to fill in this gap by presenting a contrastive analysis of the different syntactic structures in English and Spanish from an empirical approach by analyzing a corpus of real English texts.

This research paper uses English as the SL and Spanish as the TL and presents an original classification of structural mismatches, partially based on Dorr (1993) and Mel'čuk and Wanner (2006) but contributing some categories that have arisen from the data analysis presented in this paper to their proposals. In the classifications reviewed in Section 2, structural divergences are described at either grammatical or lexical level. Grammatical mismatches are mostly based on the fact that the languages under consideration apply different grammatical rules. Lexical mismatches cover phrasal constructions and subcategorisation patterns.

The research question of this study is to show to what extent current classifications of structural mismatches cover the real problems between the SL and the TL. By doing so, we will also contribute data to the research of formal structural mismatches.

The main hypothesis of this piece of research is that by taking corpus linguistics as the methodological approach and, thus, analyzing real examples extracted from a large amount of data we should be able to find examples that do not fit into any of the existing categories helping us to enlarge the classifications reviewed.

The data presented in this paper can also be of used in the field of teaching, both Translation and English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The systematization of syntactic mismatches will also help detect areas that present greater difficulty for the students of English or Spanish and therefore it constitutes a source of valuable information that can contribute to adapt the curriculum in both fields.

2. Literature Review

As seen in Section 1, this piece of research falls within the scope of Contrastive Linguistics (CL) and the results might have implications in the fields of FLT and Translation studies.

CL is an approach to linguistic analysis that aims to describe the similarities and differences between pairs of languages. The interest in comparing and contrasting the different language systems, as a method of analysis, existed before CL inception, but the focus of interest was somehow different. Before, the interest for contrastive analysis was mostly to help linguists study and establish probable families of languages. Modern CL aims to describe the ways in which the systems of languages differ; i.e. languages are described at several levels of language analysis: phonology, lexicon, semantics, pragmatics, grammar and syntax. It is in these last two levels where we have focused our study. *Contrastive Grammar* (CG) refers to “the product of contrastive studies, as a bilingual grammar highlighting the differences across languages” (Krzyszowski 1990: 11). It is commonly believed that the points in which the second and the native language differ will be the most challenging areas for language acquisition. As Lado (1957) states:

“[...] the student who comes in contact with a foreign language will find some features of it quite easy and others extremely difficult. Those elements that are similar to his native language will be simple for him, and those elements that are different will be difficult. The teacher who has made a comparison of a foreign language with the native language of the student will know better what the real learning problems are and can better provide for teaching them” (2)

CG plays an important role in this study since it has many pedagogical implications. CG can “predict and describe patterns that will cause difficulty in learning” (Lado, 1957: ii). Aarts and Wekker (1990) also state that a systematic

comparison of the student's native language with the language to be acquired should reveal the differences as well as the similarities." (165). Therefore, on the basis of such comparison it should be possible to predict difficulties and simplicities as well as making adequate teaching materials for EFL students.

In addition, CG also has theoretical relevance to define the principles underlying the comparison of languages and to provide answers to questions relating language typology and linguistic universals. As Aarts and Wekker (1990) argue, it is important to know what we are comparing because:

"it has usually been taken for granted that comparability presupposes semantic equivalence and that the easiest cases to compare are those where semantic equivalence and formal congruence go hand in hand. In a large number of cases, however, we can speak of semantic equivalence but not of formal identity". (1990: 166).

In Contrastive Analysis the terms *equivalence* and *congruence* refer to semantic and formal identity of constructions in two languages (Marton, 1976 cited in Krzeszowsky, 1990). Thus, in this paper we are interested in analysing constructions which are equivalent but non-congruent, i.e. they share the same meaning but are formally different. .

Moreover, theoretical CG is also useful for the study of second language acquisition in "elucidating the role of interference and the use of compensatory strategies" (Aarts and Wekker, 1990: 166). A contrastive analysis "is indeed very important for the second language learner. Therefore, translation in one form or another can play a certain part in language learning" (Stern, 1991). By using a contrastive study approach, it is not only easier to reveal the structural features of the L2 showing the differences and similarities between the two languages but also to represent these L2 structures so that they can be adapted to the rules of L1.

CG Analysis is also very related to what is known as the Grammar Translation Method: a method of teaching English as a foreign language (derived from the classical method of teaching Greek and Latin) which consists in analysing and studying the grammatical rules of a language and, then practicing the grammatical structures by translating both into and from the mother tongue. This method is believed to have many advantages: “It can provide input for noticing output and accurate forms of English; it can present high-frequency grammatical items explicitly to speed up learning; it can provide information about the communicative use of language structures by contextualizing them in spoken and written form and it can give information implicitly through exposure to examples or explicitly through instruction on the stylistic variation of language form” (Hedge, 2000, cited in Chang, 2010: 14). Nevertheless, this method of language learning has many detractors who think that it is a method that only covers one part of learning a language:

“little attention paid to speaking and listening. Vocabulary was typically taught in lists, and a high priority given to accuracy, and the ability to construct correct sentences. Consideration of what students might do to promote their own learning had little or no place in grammar-translation theory, which tended to assume that, if students simply followed the method, learning would result as a matter of course” (Griffiths and Parr, 2001, 247).

However, the Grammar Translation Method might be convenient for proficient students of English since it particularly focuses on the degree of accuracy of the language and, as Chang proves in her experiment, it was the method that improved learners’ grammar, confidence and motivation the most. The present paper also believes that translation and contrastive analysis are crucial in learning English as a foreign language.

On a different matter and as has already been pointed out, this line of research is also important to both human and machine translation (MT) systems. In this latter area, many authors have tried to improve the quality of the outcome by studying language

mismatches in order to apply language-dependent rules. However, not many studies can be found on mismatches caused by the different syntactic structure of the SL and the TL. As Mel'čuk and Wanner (2006) state, "syntactic mismatches still pose a serious problem to MT because they require idiosyncratic transformations between the source and the target structures for each particular pair of languages involved". The study by Mel'čuk and Wanner presents an exhaustive typology of syntactic mismatches based on Dorr's (1993) classification of "translation divergences".

In Dorr's (1993) *Machine Translation: a View from the Lexicon*, we can find a classification of mismatches belonging to seven different categories but it includes, basically, lexico-semantic divergences. In this same book, Dorr also proposes a classification of eleven divergences which only have to do with syntactic principles and parameters. Mel'čuk and Wanner's (2006) paper proposes a classification with five different categories. Starting from Dorr's work they come up with their proposal joining some mismatches in Dorr's classification. In this literature review we will revise Dorr's classification and compare it to Mel'čuk and Wanner's (2006).

Dorr's (1993) first type of mismatches is called *Thematic*. i.e. a change in the argument structure between the SL and the TL. According to Dorr, this divergence only arises when there is a logical subject i.e. when the subject of the sentence in the SL becomes the object in the TL. Thus, "thematic divergence involves a repositioning of two arguments relative to a head" (Dorr, 1993: 609). Mel'čuk and Wanner's propose another name for this type of mismatch, *Conversion*, and they define it as "mismatch due to syntactic actant permutation" (2006: 82).

The next type of mismatches proposed by Dorr (1993) is labelled *Promotional Divergences*. This mismatch is characterised by the "promotion of a logical modifier into a main verb position". In other words, what in the SL is a modifier of the verb (e.g. adverb) in the TL becomes the main verb itself; according to Dorr, this is placing

“higher up” a verb. Mel’čuk and Wanner’s (2006) name this kind of mismatches *Head Switching* and define them as mismatches caused by the inversion of the head. The next type proposed by Dorr (*Demotional*) is considered of this same kind by Mel’čuk and Wanner’s (2006). However, Dorr makes the difference between *Promotional* and *Demotional Divergences* because she argues that *Demotional* is due to “the demotion (placing “lower down”) of a logical head into an internal argument” (Dorr: 610). That is to say, what in the SL is the main verb becomes a modifier of the main verb in the TL.

Another type of mismatches suggested in Dorr (1993) is the once called *Structural Divergence*. This kind of mismatch does not alter the order of the components of a sentence but change the nature of one of the arguments of the verb. For example, when the DO of the SL is realized by a NP but in the TL the verb requires a PP in order to be grammatical. These mismatches are what Mel’čuk and Wanner’s (2006) define as *function-word introduction/elimination*.

The next type of mismatches that Dorr (1993) defines is the *Conflational Divergence*. According to Dorr, it is “characterized by the suppression of a constituent. The constituent generally occurs in logical argument or logical modifier position” (613). That is to say, the SL incorporates a semantic feature in the main verb and in the TL the verb needs an argument in order to have the same meaning. Mel’čuk and Wanner’s (2006) classify these kind of mismatches under *the Lexical Fission/fusion* category. They define them as mismatches due to a lexeme-phrase substitution. This last study mentioned above also considers, under this classification, another type of Dorr’s divergences, the *Lexical Divergences* which will be eventually explained.

The sixth type of mismatches cited by Dorr (1993) is the one known as *Categorical Divergence*. It is characterized by a change in the category of the word between the SL and the TL. For instance, a specific meaning that in the SL is expressed by an adjective is realized in the TL by a lexical item belonging to a different word class, e.g. a noun.

According to Mel'čuk and Wanner's (2006), they are mismatches due to *part-of-speech changes*. The explanation they give, however, is the same as the one provided above.

The last type of mismatches that Dorr (1993) proposes is the so called *Lexical Divergence* and only occurs in the context of other divergence types. It is viewed as "a side effect of other divergences" (Dorr: 616) since the preceding types already alter some lexical properties. Thus, this type of mismatch is somehow a combination of the previous types. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning since it is very common; for example English phrasal verbs would be considered within this category because what is expressed by a verb in the SL might be expressed by either a single verb (if there is a verb with the same meaning as the phrasal) or, as is usually the case, by a verb together with a prepositional phrase.

Dorr's study concludes that this classification "can be formally defined and systematically resolved through the use of general mapping relations and a small set of cross-linguistic parameters. Because the parameters are used to factor out "transfer" information, the current approach obviates the need for transfer rules" (1993: 253).

Mel'čuk and Wanner conclude that a paraphrasing system can be applied in machine translation to handle syntactic mismatches. In addition they argue that the best way to analyse syntactic mismatches is at the level of deep syntactic structure which they believe to be abstract enough to handle most of the mismatches dealt with in MT although " they are still a challenge"(2006: 133).

To conclude this section we would like to mention that this paper analyses some formal differences: the syntactic mismatches observed between English and Spanish. In this study we are interested in analyzing constructions which are equivalent but non-congruent, i.e. they share the same meaning but are formally different and, therefore, are more likely to pose a problem to an EFL student or to a machine translation (MT)

system. I have tried to put forward a classification of mismatches following the typologies presented above but sometimes it has not been possible. As a result, this paper also includes a classification proposal partially based on both. We have incorporated some changes in the terminology used and some new categories. We have also contributed by providing an extended list of mismatches with more examples.

3. Methodology Section

As stated above, the objective of this paper is to present a systematic classification of syntactic mismatches. The methodological approach is based on Corpus Linguistics because it is grounded on an empirical observation of real data and, therefore, it is not intuitive. We have defined three different phases in our methodology.

Firstly, we created a corpus from different sources. The sources used to extract the data are classic works of American Literature from the Twentieth Century. We are aware of the different varieties of the English language and we chose American English since it is a very well-known variety, shared, accepted and spoken by 225 million of native speakers and it is highly standardized. We created a literary corpus which contains *The Great Gatsby* by F. Scott Fitzgerald (we considered this book appropriate for its many dialogues and narrative texts) and four short stories by Kate Chopin. All in all, a total number of 56,000 words were analysed. We have added our own translation of each mismatch with the help of dictionaries.

Secondly, we created a classification to analyse the data partially based on Dorr's (1993) and Mel'čuk and Wanner's (2006) proposals. The classification we have put forward is made up of eleven structural mismatches which are summarized in Table 1. Some explanations have been added in order to facilitate understanding the mismatches

dealt with. (See Appendix 1 and 2 for a comprehensive list of the mismatches and their translations).

Finally, we proceeded by analysing systematically the corpus in order to identify the syntactic mismatches. Subsequently, we manually created a database with all the examples found. This process was very time-consuming and complicated since it required a mental and immediate translation of each of the sentences in the corpus. Eventually, we classified each of the mismatches applying the labels proposed in our classification (see Table 1).

| My classification | Dorr's (1993) | Mel'čuk's (2006) |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| 1. Argument structure mismatch. | Thematic divergence | Conversion (due to syntactic actant permutation). |
| 2. Function Word mismatch (Phrasal Verbs and Auxiliaries) | Affix divergence | Function word introduction/elimination |
| 3. Preposition standing | Preposition standing | - |
| 4. Long- distance movement | Long- distance movement | - |
| 5. Clitic (not considered in this paper) | Clitic | - |
| 6. Exceptional Case Marking mismatch | Case divergence | - |
| 7. Null Subject (Existential Verbs) | Null subject/ Pleonastic | - |
| 8. V-Proposing | V-Proposing | Function word introduction/elimination |
| 9. Dative mismatch | Dative divergence | - |
| 10. Negations | - | - |
| 11. Grammatical rules | - | - |

| | | |
|----------------|--|--|
| . Prepositions | | |
| . Head-Mod | | |

Table 1: Classification of structural mismatches

4. Results and discussion Section

In Section 3, we have explained the methodological approach to our study, which consisted, basically, of a manual selection and classification of syntactic mismatches. This paper analyses some formal differences, the syntactic mismatches observed between English and Spanish following Lado's proposal of analysis and we have focused on the cases in which there is semantic equivalence but not formal congruence. We will exemplify them with real sentences from the corpus and will follow the classification provided in Table 1.

The mismatch called *Argument Structure Mismatch* is defined by the fact that the arguments present at argument structure in the SL (English) and the TL (Spanish) hold different syntactic functions:

SL : Subject + verb + object

(1) a. English: I (Subject) like (V) your dress (Object). (GG:27)

TL: Object + verb + subject.

b. Spanish: Me (Object) gusta (V) tu vestido (Subject).

(2) a. I (Subject) feel like (V) criticizing (Object). (GG:5)

b. Me (Object) apetece (V) criticar (Subject).

Although the cases are not many, the frequency of use of this type of mismatches is very high since the verbs in this group are extremely common.

As we can observe in example (1) and (2), the object in the SL, becomes the subject in the TL and vice versa. Most of the verbs which present this characteristic in the translation from one language to the other “belong to the semantic class called psychological predicates” (Fernández-Montraveta, 2000:159). An explanation for this mismatch comes from the evolution of the English language since in the early Middle English period these verbs were constructed as the Spanish verbs nowadays:

(3) Me liketh + SUBJ.

Morphological information (inflections) shows that the verb in this construction is on the third person singular. Also, the typical subject position is fulfilled by the accusative case of the personal pronoun *I*. This construction fell in disuse in the late Middle English period when, due to the loss of inflections, the SVO became obligatory. Hence, they started substituting the accusative case of the pronoun for the nominative one in order to correctly use the SVO structure.

In this same category, *Argument Structure*, we can find another mismatch that has to do with a different subcategorisation of the verbs in SL and the TL. The English sentence in (4a) is a transitive construction whose verb selects for a DO whereas the obligatory argument in the TL is a prepositional phrase.

(4) a. She entered the theatre. (DB: 266)

b. Ella entró en el teatro.

This type of mismatches are also considered by Mel'čuk and Wanner's classification under the name of *Function word introduction/elimination* mismatches since it is true that a function word, in this case a preposition, is needed in the SL for the verb phrase to have the same meaning. However, I consider these constructions as a type of *Argument Structure* mismatch because the argument structure of the SL and TL

differs. Nevertheless, in this paper, we also consider the type *Function word introduction/elimination*, proposed by Mel'čuk and Wanner, to refer to a different linguistic phenomenon.

Let us consider one last type of mismatch in this first category. It implies a different expression of possession in the SL and the TL and it can be found in constructions in which the syntactic object belongs to a human being.

(5) a. Daisy went upstairs to wash **her** face. (GG:71)

b. Daisy subió a lavarse **la** cara.

As can be observed in (5), the number of components is the same in both languages, a possessor and a possessed object. The first component, in this case, “appears to determine the possessed object within the same constituent” (Fernández-Montraveta, 2000: 162). In Spanish, possession is expressed by means of a reflexive pronoun whereas in English the possessed object requires the expression of a possessive determiner.

Function Word Mismatch in our classification is related to the need of a function word in one in just one of the languages. This would be the case of phrasal verbs and some modal verbs which express grammatical info. Thus, the syntactic structure in both languages differs since English will require a function word whereas Spanish will express the same meaning by means of a lexical item or a morpheme. Hence, we will consider some examples of each kind:

(6) a. She looked down. (PS: 263)

b. Ella bajó la vista.

In example (6), the lexical verb in the SL (look) expresses the action and the particle (down) the direction of the action. In the TL, the lexical verb conveys the meaning of the particle in the SL; and the DO (la vista) has the meaning of the English verb.

In sentence (7) we exemplify the second type presented above. It is related to the use of auxiliary verbs in the SL that are not needed in the TL.

(7) a. He would never look at a friend's wife. (GG: 58)

b. Él nunca miraría a la mujer de un amigo.

In example (7) an auxiliary verb (*would*) is used to convey a conditional meaning to the main verb “look” and in (8) an auxiliary verb (*will*) is used to express the future tense to the verb “come”. In the TL it is not necessary since Spanish verbs inflect for person, number, tense, mood and aspect. On account of this, the syntactic constructions are different.

SL: S+Aux+(Adverb)+V+(PP)

(8) a. I will rejoin you later. (GG: 40)

TL: S+(Adverb)+V+(PP).

b. Me reuniré contigo luego.

The fourth group of mismatches, *Preposition Stranding Mismatch*, were taken into account by Dorr but not by Mel'čuk and Wanner. “In English PPs, the prepositions commonly precede their complements. There are cases, however, where this general word order preference is overridden in that the preposition is separated from its complement”. (Gries, 2002: 1). The preposition stranding phenomenon is “apparently

rare in natural languages but it is quite free in English. In this language, it is allowed as the result of both Wh-movement and NP-movement” (Maling and Zaenen, 1985: 153).

Let us now consider our examples:

(9) a. I knew what they were referring to. (GG: 19)

b. Yo sabía a lo que se estaban refiriendo.

Example (9) shows a case of wh-movement that allows for preposition stranding to happen. In the TL this is not allowed since this phenomenon is restricted in Spanish and prepositions always precede their complements.

(10) a. Nobody forced you to. (GG: 30)

b. Nadie te forzó (a hacerlo).

As can be seen in (10) the preposition stranding phenomenon appears substituting a VP. According to Takami, “only prepositions whose maximal projections (PP) are immediately dominated by a VP can be stranded” (1992: 8). To convey the exact meaning the preposition stranding phenomenon has in the SL we should add the whole VP (*a hacerlo*) in the TL.

According to our classification, the next structural mismatch we have considered in this paper has been called the *Long-distance movement*. Long-distance wh-movement “is a phenomenon by which an element appears to move directly from an A-position to a higher A-destination, ignoring weak island constraints and bypassing the intermediate landing sites that are characteristic of successive-cyclic wh-movement.” (Kaplan, 2005: 1). In other words, in English when a CP is moved to the first position due to wh-movement in questions, the complementiser (that or whether) is not repeated. However, it is repeated in the TL, Spanish (*que*).

- (11) a. What do you think \emptyset we stopped for? (GG: 97)
b. ¿Para qué piensas que paramos?

Example (11b) shows that the Spanish complementiser (*que*) is possible whereas in the SL it would be ungrammatical. It is due to the Comp-trace effect constraint in the long wh-movement. According to Sobin (1987), long-distance movement of subjects is possible only with a silent complementiser and, therefore the presence of an overt complementiser immediately preceding the trace of wh- movement is ungrammatical.

The category called *Clitic* (Table 1) is not considered in this paper since the direction of analysis of this piece of research is from English into Spanish and these mismatches appear on the opposite direction.

The following group of mismatches is related to the *Exceptional Case Marking* phenomenon:

- (12) a. They expect me to be with them tomorrow. (GG: 134)
b. Ellos esperan que esté con ellos mañana.

In example (12), the main verb in English (*expect*) selects for two arguments: a clause, which expresses the proposition that is expected, and the Agent/Experiencer (the subject). According to Santorini and Kroch (2007), the DP *me* is assigned a θ -role by the infinitival verb *be*. So *me* is an argument of the verb *be* in the same way as it is true when *expect* selects for a finite clause (13):

- (13) They expect that I will be with them tomorrow.

As can be seen in sentence (13), *I* is the subject of the finite subordinate clause. The pronoun *I* in (13) can be considered the equivalent to the pronoun *me* in sentence (12). *Me* in (12) gets its accusative case from the verb in the main clause (*expect*). This

type of case assignment is relatively less common and therefore verbs like *believe*, *consider* and *expect* are often called exceptional case marking (ECM) verbs. In Spanish, the ECM construction is not grammatical and, consequently, the verbs mentioned above always select for a finite that-clause (*que*).

The eighth type of structural mismatches analysed is related to the *Null Subject* phenomenon. In the SL, all verbs require an overt subject, with the exception of subordination; however, in the TL it is never obligatory to overtly mention the subject. Below, we present an example of verbs that are impersonal constructions in Spanish (14):

- (14) a. There was something gorgeous about him. (GG: 6)
b. Había algo precioso sobre él.

The existential verb *haber* in Spanish does not require a subject. Therefore, we can confirm that the Null-Subject phenomenon applies in the TL but not in the SL since the dummy subject *there* (or *it*) always needs to be overt.

The next group of mismatches is the *V-Preposing* mismatches. V-Preposing is commonly known as inversion in English. This phenomenon occurs in direct questions in the SL. It consists in moving (or adding) an auxiliary verb to the first position of the sentence:

- (15) a. Did you see any trouble? (GG:114)
b. ¿Viste algún problema?

English requires an auxiliary verb in interrogative sentences (15). The literal translation from the TL to the SL would be *(You) saw any trouble? This is completely ungrammatical in English. Actually, Spanish only differentiates between declarative and interrogative sentences by means of orthography (question marks) and intonation.

The tenth structural mismatch analysed in this paper is the *Dative Mismatch*. It only happens with ditransitive verbs. The word *dative* refers back to a Greek and Latin case whose basic function was to indicate the IO. This mismatch is relevant since the way of expressing the benefactor of an action (i.e. indirect object) in both languages differs. There are two ways of expressing the IO in English:

- (16) a. I'll give it (DO) to him (IO). (GG:135)
b. Yo se lo daré a él.

Example (16) shows that the way of expressing both objects is the same in the SL and in the TL (in both sentences the IO is introduced by a preposition). However, when the DO is much longer than the IO in English, a dative construction is preferred. Let us now examine an example:

- (17) a. He gave her (IO) a string of pearls (DO). (GG: 60)
b. Él le dio un collar de perlas (a ella)¹.

As can be observed in (17), there is a pronoun (her) preceding the DO which functions as IO. In the TL if we want to express the benefactor after the verb we always need the preposition *a* plus the person who receives the DO. Moreover, in Spanish, the IO can be placed before the verb using the pronoun *le*. It is worth mentioning that the verb *dar* in Spanish “can also be used as a transitive verb whereas in English, *give* is always used a ditransitive verb (with the exception of the expression *to give something away*)” (Fernández-Montraveta, 200: 161).

The last two groups of mismatches are our own contribution to the field of analysis of structural divergences between English and Spanish. The first one, called

¹ In the Spanish sentence (17 b) reduplication of the IO is also possible. *Le* and *a ella* have the same function and both can be overtly mentioned. In the SL, reduplication of the IO is ungrammatical.

Negation Mismatch has to do with the way the SL and the TL express negative sentences. In English, the double negation was ruled out in the Modern period following the logic of mathematics (two negatives equal positive). In Spanish, it is ungrammatical to express a negative meaning without negating the main verb of the sentence; in the SL, however, it is grammatical to express a negative meaning without directly negating the verb:

- (18) a. She wore no gloves. (PS:263)
b. Ella no llevaba guantes.

As can be observed in (18), the negative adverb *no* is negating the DO of the sentence (*gloves*) not the verb. However, for the sentence to be grammatical in Spanish we need to negate the verb. This phenomenon is very common in English and we have found many examples. Let us now consider this example where the double negation rule applies in Spanish but not in English:

- (19) a. He saw nothing. (PS:266)
b. Él no vio nada.

Example (19) shows that the indefinite pronoun *nothing* already conveys a negative meaning and, therefore, it is not necessary to negate the verb. However in Spanish, it is necessary to negate the verb even though there is already an indefinite pronoun (*nada*) which expresses a negative meaning.

The last group analyzed following Table 1 is the *Grammatical Rule Mismatch*. There are two types of divergences in this group. The first one is about the position of the adjective modifying the head in a noun phrase. This mismatch implies a different grammatical rule in the SL and the TL. Hence, in English the modifier adjective

precedes the head whereas in Spanish the adjective is following the head. There are innumerable examples of this kind. In (20) and (21) we present some:

(20) a. Honest people. (GG: 48)

b. Gente honesta.

(21) a. Old copies (GG:25)

b. Copias Viejas.²

Another difference in the grammatical rules of the SL and the TL is the form of the arguments that a preposition requires. As can be observed in (22a), in English prepositions require a present participle whereas in Spanish (22b) we have to use an infinitive after it. Therefore, nominal verbs in English are formed with the gerund form of a verb and in Spanish with the infinitive.

(22) a. Without moving. (GG: 130).

b. Sin moverse.

In this section we have reviewed the mismatches proposed in this work and we would like to highlight our own contribution to the analysis of structural divergences between English and Spanish.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, an exhaustive typology of structural mismatches has been proposed, analysed and described. An original classification of syntactic mismatches has been put forward taking Dorr's (1993) Mel'čuk and Wanner's (2006) works as main references.

² Example (21b), would be the unmarked translation of the English NP. However, a translation in which the modifier is preceding the head is also possible but it would usually be considered a marked construction.

The initial hypothesis of our study was that by taking corpus linguistics as the methodological approach and by analysing real examples extracted from a large amount of data we should be able to find examples that do not fit into any of the existing categories proposed by other scholars. The data collected in this research was taken from real sources. We created a literary corpus which contains *The Great Gatsby* by F. Scott Fitzgerald and four short stories by Kate Chopin and all the translated sentences into Spanish. Approximately, a total number of 56,000 words were analysed.

The results shown in Section 4 have confirmed our hypothesis since we have had to add two more categories to Dorr's proposal. The present study has established eleven different types of structural mismatches (see Table 1).

Using Contrastive Analysis as a basis for our study, we can also conclude that contrasting languages is very useful for second language acquisition in a proficiency level for its high degree of accuracy. We believe the findings in this work can have pedagogical implications since, by pointing out the differences between the L1 and the L2, we can predict areas of difficulty for the learner. Moreover, CL can also help adapt the curriculum of EFL courses, focusing on the greatest areas of difficulty for the students.

Nevertheless, this study has its limitations which need to be taken into account for further research. Firstly, the sentences were only collected from novels and, thus, the corpus was not as balanced as it should have been because only examples belonging to a literary register were analysed. We would have liked to analyse other registers to look for different kinds of structural mismatches. Therefore, other registers such as journalistic writing, academic writing or spoken language are left for further research.

Bibliography:

References:

- Aarts, Flor and Wekker, Herman. (1990). Contrastive Grammar, Theory and Practice. In J. Fisiak (Ed.), *Further Insights into Contrastive Analysis*. (pp. 163-176). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Chang, Shih-Chuan. (2010). A Contrastive Study of Grammar Translation Method and Communicative Approach in Teaching English Grammar. *English Language Teaching (ELT)*. 4, (2): 13-24.
- Dorr, Bonnie J. (1993). *Machine Translation: A View from the Lexicon*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press
- Dorr, Bonnie J. (1993). Machine Translation Divergences: A Formal Description and Proposed Solution. *Computational Linguistics*, 20 (4): 597-633.
- Fernández-Montraveta, Ana. M. (2000). Proposal for a classification of Verbal Mismatches. In *The Analysis of verbal lexical items and translation mismatches in English and Spanish: a theoretical framework* (pp. 123-177). Barcelona: UAB.
- Gries, Thomas. (2002). Preposition stranding in English: predicting speakers' behaviour. In V. Samiiian (Ed.) *Proceedings of the 12th Western Conference on Linguistics* (pp. 230-41) Fresno: California State University.
- Griffiths Carol, Parr Judy M.(2001). Language-learning Theory Strategies: Theory and Perception. *ELT Journal*, 50 (3): 247-254.
- Kaplan, Aaron. F. (2005). Long-Distance Wh-Movement and Minimalism. *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistic*, 12: 1-44.

- Krzeszowski, Thomas. P. (1990). *Contrasting Languages: The Scope of Contrastive Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lado, Robert. (1957). *Linguistics across Cultures*. Michigan: Michigan UP.
- Marton, Ference, Säljö, Roger. (1976b). On qualitative differences in learning: II. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 46: 4-11.
- Maling, Joan, Zaenen, Annie. (1985). Preposition-Stranding and passive. *Syntax and Semantics*, 24: 153-164.
- Mel'čuk, Igor, Wanner, Leo (2006). Syntactic mismatches in machine translations. *Machine Translation*, 20 (2): 81-138.
- Santorini, Beatrice, Anthony Kroch. (2007). *The syntax of natural language: An online introduction using the Trees program*. <http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~beatrice/syntax-textbook>. (Accessed: May 2015)
- Sobin, Nicholas. (1987). The variable status of Comp-trace phenomena. *Natural language and linguistic theory*, 5: 33-60.
- Takami, Ken-Ichi. (1992). *Preposition Stranding: From Syntactic to Functional Analyse*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Talmy, Leonard. (1985). Lexicalization Patterns. In L. Talmy (Ed.), *Toward a Cognitive Semantics* (pp. 57-149). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Corpus:

- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. (1998). *The Great Gatsby*. New York: Oxford University Press.

(Referred to in the text as GG)

- Chopin, Kate. (2003). *Désirée's Baby*. London: Penguin Classics.

(Referred to in the text as DB)

- Chopin, Kate. (2003). *The Story of an Hour*. London: Penguin Classics.

(Referred to in the text as SH)

- Chopin, Kate. (2003). *A Pair of Silk Stockings*. London: Penguin Classics.

(Referred to in the text as PS)

- Chopin, Kate. (2003). *Elizabeth Stock's One Story*. London: Penguin Classics.

(Referred to in the text as ES)

Appendix 1

Table of Mismatches

The Great

Gatsby (GG)

Chapter 1

my father gave me some advice = mi padre me dio un consejo = 9
I feel like criticizing = me apetecia criticar = 1
what it's founded on = en lo
Gatsby turned out all right at the end = Gatsby resultó ser buena persona al final = 2
close out my interest = 2
conferred on me the freedom = me confirió la libertad = 2+9
life is much more successfully looked at from a single window = la vida se ve con mucha más satisfacción desde una sola ventana = 2
Why they came East I don't know = Por qué vinieron al Este, no lo sé = 7
seeking for = buscando = 2
he approved of me = yo le caía bien = 1
and (he) wanted me to like him = y (él) quería que me gustara = 1
She's three years old = Ella tiene tres años = 11
How you ever get anything done = Como consigues que te hagan algo = 8
I know you didn't mean to = Yo sé que no era tu intención = 3
give up his position = abandonar su posición = 2
when she was born = cuando ella nació = 11
I knew what they were referring to = Yo sabía a lo que se estaban refiriendo = 3
after boasting = después de alardear = 11
there was something gorgeous about him = había algo precioso sobre él = 7
Did you give Nick a little heart to heart talk? = Le diste a Nick una sincera charla? = 9+8

Chapter 2

I'd better sell it = será mejor que lo venda = 2
before she selected a new one = Antes de seleccionar uno nuevo = 11x2
We went on = seguimos andando = 2
cutting back again over the Park = atajando otra vez por el Parque = 2
we went haughtily in = entramos con arrogancia = 2+3
I'm going to have the McKees come up = Voy a hacer que vengan los McKees = 2
enlarged photograph = fotografía agrandada = 11
old copies = copias viejas = 11
a stout old lady beamed down into the room = una mujer mayor y robusta se teletransportó a la habitación = 2+11

Syntactic Mismatches

1. Argument Structure
2. Function word
3. Preposition Stranding
4. Long distance movement
5. Clitic (not considered)
6. ECM
7. Null Subject
8. V-proposing
9. Dative
10. Negations
11. Grammar rules

Tom brought out a bottle of whiskey = Tom sacó a relucir una botella de whiskey =2
 All they think of is money = En todo lo que ellos piensan es dinero =3
 She goes around looking at people's feet = ella va por ahí mirando los pies de la gente = 2+11
 I like your dress = Me gusta tu vestido= 1
 I just slip on it sometimes = me lo pongo a veces = 1
 At a man named Gatsby's = en casa de un tal Gatsby =11
 Nobody forced you to = Nadie te forzó =3
 the last ones left on the train = Los últimos que quedan en el tren = 11
 she gave me the bill = ella me do el billete =9
 they should give me that = ellos deberian darme eso =2+ 9

Chapter 3

glide on through the sea = se deslizó (sin dificultad) por el mar = 2
 to call on me long before = hacerme una visita mucho antes = 2
 I found it necessary to attach myself to someone = yo creí necesario unirme a alguien =7
 The last one was the one I met you at = La última fue en la que te conocí =3+7
 Jordan was going to yield him up to her person = Jordan iba a cederle su persona en mayor o menor grado =2
 staring with unsteady concentration = Mirando fijamente con insegura concentración =11
 the library was liable to collapse = la biblioteca tenía la posibilidad de derrumbarse=2
 a little girl who gave way upon the slightest provocation= una niña pequeña que cedía ante la mínima provocación =2
 Any time that suits you best = Cuando te vaya mejor = 1
 I'm afraid I'm not a very good host = Me temo que no soy un buen anfitrión =1
 He smiled understandingly = Sonrió con comprensión =7
 [It] just missed being absurd = se pasaba de absurdo =7
 I like large parties = A mi me gustan las grandes fiestas =1
 I joined the last of Gatsby's guests = Me uní a los ultimos invitados de Gatsby = 7
 There seemed to be a pleasant significance = Parecía ser de una importancia agradable = 7
 (I) stepped back involuntarily = retrocedí involuntariamente = 2+7
 I lost sigh of Jordan Baker = perdí de vista a Jordan Baker =2
 I strolled down Madison Avenue = Paseé por Madison Avenue hacia abajo =2
 I walked up Fifth Avenue = me dirigí a la Quinta Avenida =2
 That's why I like you = Por eso me gustas =1

Syntactic Mismatches

1. Argument Structure
2. Function word
3. Preposition Stranding
4. Long distance movement
5. Clitic (not considered)
6. ECM
7. Null Subject
8. V-proposing
9. Dative
10. Negations
11. Grammar rules

That had to be tactfully broken off = Eso debía terminarse con tacto =2
 honest people = gente honesta =11
 Did you keep it? = Te lo quedaste? =8
 Did you just come? = Acabas de llegar? = 8
 How did it happen? = como pasó? =8+7
 I will rejoin you later = Me reuniré contigo luego =11
 in having been among the last to go =haber sido de los últimos en irse = 11

Chapter 4

Gatsby's house = la casa de Gatsby =11
 who killed himself by jumping = que se suicidó saltando =2
 Gatsby's car lurched up the rocky drive = El coche de Gatsby avanzó a trompicones por la carretera rocosa =2
 That disconcerting ride = Ese paseo en coche desconcertante =11
 his whole statement fell to pieces = toda su declaración se desmoronó = 2
 I came into a good deal of money = Accedí a una gran cantidad de dinero =2+7
 I tried very hard to die = Intenté morir muchas veces = 2+7
 I seemed to bear an enchanted life = Parece ser que tengo una vida encantada =2+7
 discuss Mr Jay Gatsby = hablar sobre Mr Jay Gatsby = 2
 we neared the city = nos acercamos a la ciudad =1
 [he] moved forward into the restaurant = avanzó hacia el restaurante =2
 I like across the street better = Me gusta más el del otro lado de la calle =1
 Friends now gone forever = Amigos que se han ido para siempre =11
 Don't let that waiter take away my coffee! = No dejes que ese camarero se lleve mi café =2
 I made you a little angry = Te hice enfadar un poco =1
 I made the pleasure of his acquaintance = Tuve el placer de conocerle =1
 after I talked with him an hour = después de hablar con él una hora =11
 He would never look at a friend's wife= ÉL nunca miraría a la mujer de un amigo =2
 I have enjoyed my lunch = Me ha encantado la comida = 1
 what do you think I did? = que te piensas que yo hice? = 8
 he gave her a string of pearls = él le dio un collar de perlas =9
 We gave her spirits = Le dimos licores =9
 Did he go? = Él fue? =8

Syntactic Mismatches

1. Argument Structure
2. Function word
3. Preposition Stranding
4. Long distance movement
5. Clitic (not considered)
6. ECM
7. Null Subject
8. V-proposing
9. Dative
10. Negations
11. Grammar rules

Allied government gave me a decoration = El gobierno aliado me dio un condecoración = 9
to give me a better view = para darme una vista mejor = 9

Chapter 5

There's another little thing = hay otra pequeña cosa = 7
this would interest you = Esto te interesaría = 2
It wouldn't take up much of your time = Esto no te sacaría mucho tiempo = 2x2
you might pick up a nice bit of money = Quizás consigues una bonita cantidad de dinero = 2x2
I took him into the pantry = Le llevé a la despensa = 2+9
Will they do? = Lo harán? = 2+8
did I have to come alone? = Tengo que venir sola? = 8
Does the gasoline affect his nose? = Le afecta la gasolina a su nariz? =8
I went in = Entré =2+7
there was a change in Gatsby = Había un cambio en Gatsby = 7
Do you like it? = te gusta? 1+8
I love it = Me encanta = 1
if it wasn't for the mist we could see your home= Si no fuera por la niebla podríamos ver tu casa = 7
He went out of the room = Él salió de la habitación = 2
I couldn't play = No podía tocar = 2
He had thrown himself into it = Él se había abanzado a eso = 2
Gatsby turned on a solitary lamp = Gatsby encendió una lampara solitaria = 2+11
Daisy glanced up = Daisy levantó la vista =2

Chapter 6

will you wait? = Esperarás? = 7+2+8
It was a random shot = Fue un disparo al azar =7+11
Did you have a nice ride? = Tuviste un buen viaje? =8
Do you mind if I eat with some people = Te importa si como con alguna gente? =8+7
I like her = Me gusta (ella) = 1
It occurred to me that he had been very slowly = Se me ocurrió que él había ido muy despacio =7
Gatsby asked me to wait = Gatsby me pidió que me esperara = 6
he came down the steps = Él bajó por las escaleras = 2

Syntactic Mismatches

1. Argument Structure
2. Function word
3. Preposition Stranding
4. Long distance movement
5. Clitic (not considered)
6. ECM
7. Null Subject
8. V-proposing
9. Dative
10. Negations
11. Grammar rules

she should go = Ella debería irse = 2
She will see = Ella lo verá = 2
it was a cool night = Era una noche fresca =7+11

Chapter 7

Did you see that? = Viste eso? =8
Did you invite him to lunch= Le invitaste a comer? =8
What do you think we stopped for? = Por que piensas que paramos? =4
Did you see any trouble? = viste algun problema? =8
He gave me an aluminum putter = Él me dio un putter de aluminio =9
Daisy went upstairs to wash her face = Daisy subió a lavarse la cara =1
without moving = sin moverse =11
It was when curiosity about Gatsby was at its highest that... = Fue cuando la curiosidad por Gatsby estaba en lo más alto =7
would I come to lunch? = Vendría a comer? =2
I picked it up = Lo recogí = 2
I'll see = Ya veré =2
Madame expects you to come in = Madame espera que entres = 6
a cold drink = Una bebida fría = 11
Did mother get powder on your old yellowy hair? Te puso tu madre talco en tu pelo viejo y amarillento? =8+11
I went with them out to the veranda = Yo salí con ellos al porche = 2
do you like mother's friends? Te gustan los amigos de tu madre? = 8+11
Gatsby took up his drink = Gatsby se tomó su bebida de un trago = 2
Shall we take anything to drink? = Tomamos algo de beber? =2
Do you mean you've been to a medium? = Quieres decir que has ido a una medium? =2
shall I help myself? = Me sirvo yo mismo? = 8
What do you want money for? Para qué quieres dinero? = 3+8
What do I owe you? = Qué te debo? =8
I will let you have that car = Te dejaré tener ese coche =2
a simple mind = Una mente simple =11
I got up = Me levanté = 2
do you hear? = Oyes? = 8+7
I found out what your 'drug stores' were = Descubrí lo que eran tus farmacias =2

Syntactic Mismatches

1. Argument Structure
2. Function word
3. Preposition Stranding
4. Long distance movement
5. Clitic (not considered)
6. ECM
7. Null Subject
8. V-proposing
9. Dative
10. Negations
11. Grammar rules

he went on = Él continuó = 2
I walked back along the border of the lawn = Volví andando por el borde del césped = 2
anybody would have said that... = Cualquiera hubiera dicho que...
I walked away = Me marché = 2

Chapter 8

do you see? = Lo ves? 9
Did you ever have any children?
I heard a taxi go up = Oí un taxi subir = 2
I jumped out of bed = Me levanté de la cama de un salto = 2
There was a slow pleasant movement = Había un movimiento lento y agradable = 7
He came back from France = Él volvió de Francia = 2
He went out to the open vestibule = ÉL salió al vestibulo abierto = 11+2
He stretched out his hand = Estiró su mano = 2
it was all going by too fast = Todo iba demasiado rápido = 7
I enjoyed breakfast = Disfruté del desayuno = 1
I want to go back a little = Quiero retroceder un poco = 2
There was an inexplicable amount of dust everywhere = Había una cantidad de polvo inexplicable = 7
it was Gatsby who was breathless = Fue Gatsby quien estaba sin respiración = 7
the yellow car = el coche amarillo = 11
I have a way of finding out = Sé una manera de descubrirlo = 2+11
the chauffeur helped him pump it up = el chofer le ayudó a incharlo = 2

Chapter 9

they expect me to be with them tomorrow = ellos esperan que esté con ellos mañana = 7
There was nothing I could say = No había nada que pudiera decir
Did you start him in business? = Le iniciaste en los negocios? = 9
the butler gave me his office address = El mayordomo me dio la dirección de su oficina = 10
I thought this would be Daisy at last = Yo pensé que sería Daisy por fin =
what did you say to Wilson that afternoon = qué le dijiste a Wilson esa tarde? = 8
Will you ring again? = llamarás de nuevo? = 2+8
I will do it = Lo haré = 2

Syntactic Mismatches

1. Argument Structure
2. Function word
3. Preposition Stranding
4. Long distance movement
5. Clitic (not considered)
6. ECM
7. Null Subject
8. V-proposing
9. Dative
10. Negations
11. Grammar rules

Will you just go? = Simplemente te irás? = 2+8
we will run faster = correremos más rapido =2
I called up Daisy = llamé a Daisy = 2
They picked him up = Le recogieron = 2
What do you know about that? = Qué quieres saber sobre eso? = 8
it was on the third day that a telegram arrived = Fue en el tercer día cuando un telegrama llegó =7
I raised him up out of nothing = Lo crié sin nada = 2
we beat on = seguimos adelante con fuerza = 2
the white steps = los escalones blancos = 11
I got off the train = bajé del tren = 2
Who are you going with? = 3

Syntactic Mismatches

1. Argument Structure
2. Function word
3. Preposition Stranding
4. Long distance movement
5. Clitic (not considered)
6. ECM
7. Null Subject
8. V-proposing
9. Dative
10. Negations
11. Grammar rules

Appendix 2
TABLE OF
MISMATCHES
Desirée's
Baby (DB)

It made her laugh to think of Desirée with a baby = Pensar en Desiré con un bebé le hizo reír. = 1
 It seemed yesterday that Desirée was like a baby herself = Parecía ayer cuando Desirée era como un bebé = 7
 (he) had fallen in love with her = él se había enamorado de ella. = 2
 That was the way all Aubignys fell in love= Esta era la manera en la que todos los Aubignys se enamoraban. = 2x2
 The girl's obscure origin = El origen oscuro de la niña. = 11
 He was reminded that she was nameless = Él recordó que no tenía nombre =10
 The roof came down steep and black like a cowl = El techo descendía empinado y negro como una capucha = 2+11
 The yellow nurse woman sat beside a window = La enfermera vestida de amarillo se sentó al lado de una ventana = 11
 Since the baby is born = desde que nació el bebé =2
 She asked no greater blessing of God = Ella no le pedía una mayor bendición a Dios = 10
 The day he fell in love with her = El día en el que él se enamoró de ella = 2x2
 The baby was about three months old = El bebé tenía unos tres meses = 2
 She dared not to ask him to explain = Ella no se atrevió a pedirle una explicación = 1+2
 It was with averted eye when... = Fue apartando la mirada cuando... =7
 Desirée was miserable enough to die = Desiré era tan miserable que podía morir = 6
 He laid aside the great, soft fan = Él estaba tumbado al lado del suave y gran abanico =2
 On his bare tiptoes = en sus pies descalzos =11
 Presently her husband entered the room = Inmediatamente su marido entró en la habitación = 1
 Without noticing her = sin fijarse en ella = 11+1
 Do you want me to go? = Quieres que me vaya = 6
 I want you to go = Quiero que te vayas = 6
 She turned away= Ella se dio la vuelta = 2
 She did not come back again = Ella no volvió más = 2
 There was a curious scene enacted at L'Abri = Hubo una escena curiosa en L'Abri =7+11

The Story
of an Hour (SH)

her husband's death = La muerte de su marido = 11
 It was her sister Josephine who told her = Fue su hermana Josephine quien se lo dijo = 7
 Her husband's friend = El amigo de su marido =11
 It was he who had been in the office = Fue él quien estuvo en la oficina =7
 a distant song = una canción distante=11
 She was waiting for it, fearfully = Ella lo estaba esperando, con miedo = 1

Syntactic Mismatches

1. Argument Structure
2. Function word
3. Preposition Stranding
4. Long distance movement
5. Clitic (not considered)
6. ECM
7. Null Subject
8. V-proposing
9. Dative
10. Negations
11. Grammar rules

A clear and exalted perception = Una precepción clara y glorificada = 11

But Richards was too late = Pero Richards llegó demasiado tarde = 2

***A Pair of Silk
Stockings (PS)***

(this) made her restless and wakeful = Esto la hizo estar preocupada y desvelada =1

getting the children fed = dar de comer a los niños =1+11

she wore no gloves = Ella no llevaba guantes = 10

She looked down = Ella bajó la vista = 2

She held back her skirts = Ella se bajó las faldas =2

There were books and magazines piled up = Había libros y revistas acumuladas = 7

A sense of belonging = Un sentimiento de pertenecer = 11

Another time she would have returned it = En otro tiempo ella lo hubiera devuelto... = 2

her appearance created no surprise = Su apariencia no generó ninguna sorpresa = 10

As she had half feared it might = como ella había temido que pasaría =2

There were quiet ladies and gentlemen = Había mujeres y hombres callados =11+7

There was still money = Todavía quedava dinero = 7

She entered the theatre = Ella entró en el teatro = 1

The play was over = La obra había acabado = 1

The crowd filed out = La multitud salía en fila = 2

It puzzled him to decipher what he saw there = Le daba vueltas para encontrar el significado de lo que veía allí = 7

He saw nothing = Él no vio nada = 10

***Elizabeth Stock's
One story (ES)***

There were no unusually pathetic features = No había características inusuales ni raras=7+11

The village where Elizabeth Stock was born and raised = El pueblo dónde Elizabeth nació y se crió = 2

Where I happen to be sojourning = dónde yo casualmente estaba pasando unos días =2

never came back = Nunca volvió = 2

It always turned out to be something = siempre resultaba ser algo =2

I heard of great inducements = Yo oí grandes alicientes =11+2

No more could I make out a tale out of a murder = Yo ya no podía hacer un cuento basado en un asesinato =10+2

mistaken identity = identidad equivocada = 11

I gave it up = Lo abandoné (lo dejé estar) =2

Syntactic Mismatches

1. Argument Structure
2. Function word
3. Preposition Stranding
4. Long distance movement
5. Clitic (not considered)
6. ECM
7. Null Subject
8. V-proposing
9. Dative
10. Negations
11. Grammar rules