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This pilot study looks at an apparently simple case of translation equivalents in two closely related languages, the English preposition *with* and the German preposition *mit*. It uses a subcorpus of the Chemnitz German-English/English-German translation corpus to analyse over 700 English *with*-constructions and finds surprisingly few correspondences. This raises the question why translators obviously do not “fall” for the direct, prototypical translation equivalent *mit* when they come across the English *with* but choose other options instead. This corpus-based study compares the semantic and syntactic categories of source and target texts in order to establish the reasons underlying translators’ choices in a contrastive perspective on three levels. Finally it draws conclusions for translation studies and the related areas of lexicography and language teaching.

1. Background: Prepositions in an English-German translation corpus

The corpus I chose for this pilot project in prepositions is a subcorpus of the Chemnitz English-German translation corpus and it consists of over 112,000 words with over 20,000-word samples from five text-types, including Tourist Brochures (abbreviated in the following tables and sample sentences as TOU), Political Speeches (spoken-to-be-written; SPE), Publications by the European Community/Union (EU), Scientific Textbooks (SCI) and Literary Texts (LIT).

The actual texts selected for the subcorpus from the complete translation corpus displayed over 700 occurrences of *with*, an average of 5.9 in 1,000 words; but the unequal spread across text types makes their composition an issue; thus our tourist and document text samples are agglomerations consisting of four and six individual texts, respectively, whereas the others are coherent...
text samples of between 20,000 and 26,000 words. *With* in general is among the most frequent words (together with articles and most general conjunctions, such as *and* and *that*) and prepositions.

2. Prepositions and prototypes: The case of *with*

*With* is a good example where apparently simple surface phenomena may be based on rather complex syntactic and semantic features underneath. We have chosen a preposition, because prepositions are apparently simple language structures, and we have chosen *with* because it seems to have a clear German equivalent, *mit*. Complex *with*, either as *with* or *along with*, has been excluded from the analysis. But even these delimitations do not make things easy, as far as syntax and semantics are concerned. The first cursory look into standard dictionaries shows that the semantic structures of *with* must be relatively complex. Apart from *of* it is the English preposition that is most polysemous (despite the obvious problem of counting overlapping sememes) in the learners' dictionaries we consulted. There are 18 entries in LDOCE3, 21 in the Cobuild2, 16 in ALD and also 16 in CIDE, the last of which tries to achieve the clearest semantic distinction by its use of semantic guidewords (e.g. *company* and *method*, as prototypical for concomitant and instrumental *with*). The same goes for bilingual dictionaries such as *Langenscheids Handwörterbuch Englisch-Deutsch* (1991: s.v.).

This semantic diversity in bilingual dictionaries is mirrored in scholarly or didactic treatises. Radden (1989), for instance, analyses the uses of *with* and other prepositions and lists twelve figurative meanings2 for *with*, more than for the others, again with the exception of *of*. With so many sememes, not only a list but a hierarchical order of uses seems necessary. For, in a cognitive perspective, some of these meanings are perceived as more central (e.g. the 207 "[human] company" meaning in S1 and the "instrument/method" meaning in S2) than others (e.g. "time" in S3), whether they occur more frequently or not. These central elements of the meaning class *with* are called 'prototypical'; less central, peripheral ones are called 'non-prototypical'.

(S1) During the last four years it had been rare for him to visit his aunt without driving with her to Salle, (...) (LITE: 175)

(S2) Sitting on a ridge of shingle, he tackled the familiar problem of the paddler: how, *with* an inadequate handkerchief, to rid the spaces between his toes of the gritty dusting of tenacious sand. (LITE: 180)

(S3) And *with* the happiness came optimism. (LITE: 173)

The width of semantic definitions is also shown in monolingual learners' dictionaries. I listed the meanings in the CIDE according to guidewords plus some examples and tested whether these were translated by *mit* in German or not and I did the same using my own descriptors extracted from the Cobuild entries to show the overlap and contrast in meaning description in those two corpus-based modern monolingual dictionaries (Table 1; all tables in the appendix).

I would like to point out four interesting results:

- After the prototypical entries, there are many differences in descriptors (e.g. CIDE 8 *time* vs. Cobuild 18 *change*).
- The difference in the number of meanings does not only mean that fewer meanings are included in the dictionary but also that the categorization is more detailed, which may not always be necessary (does CIDE 1 *COMPANY* include Cobuild 3 *INVOLVE* and CIDE 7 *DIRECTION* Cobuild 19 *DIRECTION* and 10?).
- Cobuild has some "syntactic meanings" (in the form of adverbials) 12 manner, 13 circumstance, 15 appearance and 16 situation that will occur again in our syntactic discussion below.
- Finally, altogether the *with/mit*-overlap seems to be around 60 to 70 % only.

As with other prepositions, *with* is hardly treated in grammars of English, because as noun phrase relators their functions fall squarely in between lexicon and grammar. The only grammars that deal with *with* intensively are Leech and Svartvik (1994), especially under the grammar-in-use headings "relations between ideas expressed by nouns", "manner, means, instrument" and "describing emotions" and, particularly, Quirk et al. (=CGEL 1985), which distinguishes most clearly between *with* as a preposition and *with* as a conjunction introducing non-finite clauses (esp. in informal style; see below).

In contrast to this semantic diversity of *with*, the syntactic categories seem clear. "A preposition expresses the relation between two entities, one being that represented by the prepositional complement, the other by another part of the sentence" (CGEL 1985: 657). This complement is always nominal or nominalized, a noun phrase, characteristically a noun, in contrast to participles and conjunctions that introduce a clause (ibid: 660). Other grammars describe the functions of prepositions as linking nominal entities to other nominal, verbal, adjectival, adverbial or clausal entities. Downing and Locke (1992: 588f) even develop an elaborate 14-type categorization that distinguishes prepositional phrases according to word classes on the group or phrase level and according to their (syntactic) function on the clause level, before narrowing down to prototypes ("by far the commonest") adjuncts, subject complements, predicate complements and noun-group qualifiers (ibid). Thus the prototypical syntactic categories used in our investigation are in the order of their frequency:
3. The starting point: Contexts of with

Altogether the analysis of our subcorpus of more than 112,000 words revealed more than 700 occurrences of *with*, that is an average of 0.63% of all words. But this does not mean very much. A closer look is necessary at the distribution of *with* across text types and syntactic categories, for this is by no means uniform in our original English texts.

Table 2 shows the absolute distribution and the relative distribution of *with* according to text type (in rows) and per word (in columns). The table documents very clearly that, whereas *with* is used once in about a 120 words in tourist brochures and literary texts, it occurs only half that often in the European documents and scientific texts (0.89%/0.81% versus 0.37%/0.50%).

The differences between the use of *with* in these text types are, however, not absolute, but interesting as far as the syntactic function of this preposition is concerned. Our classification ranges from more verbal through more nominal to more clausal functions. It shows that the relative proportion of verbal usages of *with* per words is not as strikingly different as the modifying nominal and adverbial usages; the occurrences of obligatory verbal *with* range from 0.18% of all words in documents to 0.27% in science texts, where they amount to 55% of all *with*-occurrences in this text type. Whereas adnominal and clausal *with* are particularly frequent in tourist texts (45% of all *with*-forms in tourist brochures), literature uses more adverbial *with* (34% of all *with* forms in literature). The real differences between text types occur in the adnominal and adverbial *with*-functions; here the discrepancies are not only doubled but multiplied by five or eight. These differences can well be explained by the discourse requirements of the respective text type.

Tourist brochures are often written in an informal style where *with*-adnominals can be used (even more than in the written-to-be-spoken political documents), and adnominal modification helps to identify or characterize persons and objects in space (and time) and to create a vivid impression of the scene.

Other uses seem to be less important, like the obligatory noun complementation (in S7), the adjective complementation (in S8) and the other clausal (adjunct or disjunct) uses outside the normal clause structure (in S9).

To conclude our theoretical preliminaries, we can state that it is possible to distinguish between prototypes in the syntax and semantics of *with* and use these distinctions as a basis for our quantitative empirical comparison.
4. Choices in German: For *with* take *mit*?

The first surprising result of our comparative examination is that the prototypical equivalent preposition *mit* is used in less than half of all cases. The principal alternatives chosen by translators are:

- other prepositions, as in
  (S10) And *with* a city as compact as Cardiff there are places to stay in all price brackets within a very short distance of the Castle, the Shopping Centre and the rail and bus termini. (TOU: WLS2E: 10)

(S10D) Und *bei* einer kompakten Stadt wie Cardiff finden Sie immer das richtige Preisniveau in kürzester Entfernung vom Schloß, dem Einkaufszentrum und den Bahn/Busstationen. (TOUD: WLS2D: 10)

- adjective, especially in adnominal function, of course, as in
  (S11) It had been *with* shame and some irritation that he had recognized in himself for the first time the nagging of jealousy. (LITE: 138.)

(S11D) Irgendwie *beschämt* und auch irritiert stellte er fest, dass sich in ihm erstmals der Stachel der Eifersucht regte. (LITD: 166)

- zero-translations
  (S12) One must agree with Gellner that the apparent universal ideological domination of nationalism today is a sort of optical illusion. (SCIE: 78)

(S12D) Es ist Gellner darin zuzustimmen, daß die universelle ideologische Vorbereitung des Nationalismus heute eine Art optische Täuschung darstellt. (SICD: 94/95)

which are not to be confused with

- omissions of the entire sense element
  (S13) 'Made in Italy' remains a label synonymous *with* flair and style. (DOC7E: 7)

and finally there are also many other solutions.

Table 3 lists these possibilities in their distribution across text types again and once more emphasizes the relative frequency, first of the different translation equivalents and second of their occurrence in word frequency. The results show an interesting difference between text types: whereas science texts contain 63% *mit* of all *with*-equivalents, European documents contain only 38% and literature only 40%. The opposite dichotomy can be found in the case of zero translations: science texts contain only 20% zero translations, literary ones 43%, so that for every three hundred words of translation there is a case where an English *with* cannot be equated directly with a German equivalent. As the absolute figures get rather low in most cells of Table 3, other differences should not be overinterpreted, but it might be interesting to pursue the question of why in our political documents, mainly speeches, the omission of semantic elements is so high.

5. Translations and translator's choice

These analyses show that there are significant differences between the German and English versions of texts in the representation of the semantic content of *with*; thus, it is necessary to ask for the underlying reasons, especially with respect to the question of whether they are simply structural necessities or whether the translator actually had a choice between the cognate *mit* and decided against it (or not). The conscious decisions of translators are of course the most interesting cases in our investigation as this indicates the feeling that prototypical solutions¹ may not be the best choice.

Certainly, occasionally translators had no choice but to translate the English *with* as German *mit*, as in:

(S14) Within minutes she had found one and had prised it loose *with* her penknife. (LITE: 159)

(S14D) Als sie nach einigen Minuten einen geeigneten Quader gefunden hatte, wuchtete sie ihn *mit* dem Taschenmesser heraus. (LITD: 190)

There are of course also cases where the German equivalent to an English *with* is clearly a different preposition (S15), an adjective (S16), or a zero translation (S17):

(S15) Let me welcome all of you at this Investment Forum this morning, and also a special warm welcome to those who travelled from so very far away to be *with* us here in Belfast this morning. (DOC10E: 1)

(S15D) Ich möchte Sie alle am heutigen Morgen auf der Investitionskonferenz begrüßen und einen ganz speziellen Willkommensgruß an all jene richten, die von weit her angereist sind, um heute hier bei uns in Belfast zu sein. (DOC10D: 1)

(S16) With an international reputation of excellence, the Welsh National Opera, one of the world's top companies, are also at home in Cardiff each spring and autumn at Cardiff's beautifully restored Edwardian New Theatre. (TOUE: WLS2E: 10)

(S16D) Die international berühmte Welsh National Opera, eine der besten Truppen der Welt, ist jeden Frühling und Herbst in Cardiff im hervorragend restaurierten New Theatre aus der Jahrhundertwende zuhause. (TOUD:WLS2D: 10)
With the great depression of the 1930s behind them, the founders of the modern European socioeconomic system saw the world in terms of boom and depression. (EUE: 14)

Die Schöpfer der modernen europäischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialordnung hatten unter dem Eindruck der Weltwirtschaftskrise der dreißiger Jahre vor allem den Konjunkturverlauf im Auge. (EUD: 13/14)

But in most cases the decision is not made so easy, for usually translators have a choice; they can decide for or against the direct translations by mit. Thus a simple German adverb can be used instead of the noun phrase introduced by with; this classic alternative was chosen in S18, but not in S19, as our options S18D2 and S19D2 show:

They must seize it with ambition, with energy, with courage, and with vision. (DOC7E: 3)

Die Wirtschaft muß diese Chance wahrnehmen, und zwar ehrgeizig, energisch, mutig und vorausschauend. (DOC7D: 5)

Die Wirtschaft muß diese Chance wahrnehmen, und zwar mit Ehrgeiz, Energie, Mut und Voraussicht.

That means jobs, it means opportunities, it means a better future for many of the young men and women who otherwise would perhaps have looked forward with less optimism than they will now be able to. (DOC10E: 3)

Das bedeutet Arbeitsplätze, das bedeutet neue Möglichkeiten, das bedeutet eine bessere Zukunft für viele junge Männer und Frauen, die sonst vielleicht mit weniger Optimismus nach vorne geschaut hätten als sie es jetzt können. (DOC10D: 6)

Das bedeutet Arbeitsplätze, das bedeutet neue Möglichkeiten, das bedeutet eine bessere Zukunft für viele junge Männer und Frauen, die sonst vielleicht weniger optimistisch nach vorne geschaut hätten als sie es jetzt können.

The noun phrase -> adverbial-option is of particular interest stylistically because it helps to avoid the "typically German" nominal style and deserves special attention because conscious translators can almost always use it (see below) and thus counterbalance the general trend.

Chosen translations are not always restricted to the choice of alternative prepositions alone, for if prepositions are directly governed by verbs or nouns, the choice of verb or noun (if it renders the same semantic content) determines the preposition, as in S19, where the structure of the sentence has been changed considerably (and perhaps unnecessarily):

Who, in the Departments of Haut-Rhin and Bas-Rhin, has joined with the traitors to call the Prussian and the Austrian on our invaded frontiers? (SCIE: 21)

The quantitative analysis of these options shows some surprising results. They are summarised in Table 4 from a text-type perspective and in Table 5 from a syntactic perspective.

First, some general results are:

- Almost half (46%) of all chosen with-mit-solutions have an alternative.
- Only 46% of mit-solutions have alternatives, others (except prepositions) have over 50%.
- About a third of all chose alternative translations, although a with-construction was possible.
- The most frequent alternatives are in absolute terms zero options and in relative terms adverbial constructions, where there is almost always a choice.
- Most choices for non-mit translations in absolute terms occur with zero options.

Second, some syntax-specific results are:

- There are only rarely choices when with introduces a complement after a verb and, even less, after a noun.
- There are usually alternatives to with in adnominal and in adjunct constructions.
- There are few choices when mit is not used with adjunct constructions.

Third, some text-type specific results are:

- Relatively speaking, science texts had most mit-constructions and only a very few where this was not possible.
- EU translators most often made the choice against mit; they chose only 38% and rejected 42% of with-constructions that would also have been possible.

6. Conclusions for teaching and translation studies

This detailed investigation clearly shows that (experienced) translators do not go for the simple word-class based equivalent(s) of with, which can be found in bilingual dictionaries (cf. Langenscheidts Handwörterbuch 1988 above).
Such ‘databases’ hardly ever indicate structurally different translation options that are obviously experienced translators’ choices, such as the relative constructions or zero-translations discussed above. One reason why dictionaries obviously do not reflect the reality of translation may be the traditional division of labour between dictionaries and grammars, as prepositions and, in particular, their alternative choices are often neglected in either. The solution of some dictionary makers to include ‘grammar in the dictionary’ has its limits because the amount of syntactic information tolerated in the established bilingual or monolingual learners’ dictionary is considered very limited. Cobuild2 (1995) is the only dictionary that tried and even became famous for its grammar column.

The translators’ choices revealed in this analysis suggest that a purely meaning-based categorization of with is so insufficient that we might as well try a functional grammar approach as a primary classification. A simplified sample entry for with in a German-English dictionary would therefore look very different from a conventional one. The entry below presents prototypical uses (not meanings) first, non-prototypical later and collocationally very restricted idioms last. Within these categories the order is according to wordclass, syntax (including government or dependency relations) first and semantic roles later, which are again listed according to frequency and proximity, but because the two hardly ever overlap, both may have to be indicated. The meaning is indicated by semantic-role categorization of the noun phrase, the English synonym or paraphrase, the typical sample phrase/clause/text, the German equivalent, possibly cross-references and possible synonyms/paraphrases again. Finally even text-type preferences may have to be indicated.

\[
\text{with [wi5] PRP. typical 1. (phrasal) V+with+obl.N cope}
\text{~ difficulties \bewältigen 2. (V)+with+N 2.1. N=instrument (using): cut \mit (mit Hilfe, vermittels) 2.2. N=company (accompanied by): he went (together) \mit his friends (zs.) =mit 2.3. N=part (having, possessing) a coat \mit three pockets =mit (besitzend); +negation+N (->without) \no hat \mit is nice 2.4. N=manner (deadjectival) \mit care \mit, mit 2.5. N=reason tremble \mit fear \mit aus Furcht zittern 3. ADJ+with+N 3.1. N=reason wet \mit tears \mit von Tränen 3.2. ADJ=feeling N=reason sick, hungry, \vor 4. N=with+N (inclunding) \mit all expenses \mit einschließlich, nebst. CONJ? adjunct: you can’t leave \mit your mother so ill du kannst nicht weghen, wenn deine Mutter so krank ist; angesichts; in Anbetracht der Tatsache, daß Idiom: COPULA- PRON I am quite \mit you ich bin ganz Ihrer Ansicht od. ganz auf Ihrer Seite, it rests \mit you to decide die Entscheidung liegt bei dir; get \mit it! ‘macht mit!, sei kein Frosch!
\]

Admittedly, such entries require fairly advanced dictionary users and they can become unwieldy rather soon, but it would be of interest as an option at least for language specialists, including translators. The difficulty in producing a bulky specialist dictionary can, of course, be overcome nowadays when our suggestions can be implemented as a modern computer-based translation aid, which is user- and context-sensitive. It can be user-sensitive by including only limited depth in a window depending on identification details entered by the user when starting the tool and it can be context-sensitive by presenting only information that may be relevant for a highlighted translation problem. Such a computer-based dictionary would have the additional advantage that it can be organized in hypertext format, i.e. the users can choose whether to read more specific information or not or they can choose a more semantic or syntactic approach to a grammatical or translation problem. In the last resort, it will remain open to the users whether they choose to look at an abstract grammar explanation or more concrete examples to solve their specific problem.

Conclusions from our analysis for language teaching can be drawn on several levels. First, it is obvious that the prototypical equation with = mit is unsatisfactory in many respects, quantitatively and qualitatively: quantitatively because the probability that experienced translators choose “the simple option” seems surprisingly low, qualitatively because the “meanings” of with seem so heavily collocationally and syntactically conditioned that it seems impossible to isolate and learn them out of context. Thus, contextualized learning seems to be the name of the game (also for TELL/CALL applications) when the emphasis in language teaching and learning is to be on natural language first and grammatically correct language later. Downing and Locke (1992: 580) point out that “a notable feature of the English language is the extremely wide lexicogrammatical use it makes of prepositions”. Corpus-based translation studies of the type illustrated here can help then to corroborate this thesis. Our small pilot study illustrates that even the apparently simple equivalent of with = mit is not as simple as one might think and leads to more choices than the prototypical view suggests. Thus translation texts illustrate that more complex decisions can take place in translation but may be assumed.

Notes

1 This contribution was written within the Nordic network of parallel corpora. I am grateful to my colleagues in Oslo, Bergen, Lund, Aarhus and Jyväskylä, as well as my colleagues in the Chemnitz project, Kirsten Malmkjær (Cambridge), Elke Evers (Brussels), Diana Hudson Ettle, Gráinne McGuinness, Claudia Claridge, Marie-Luise Egbert and Barbara Fink (Chemnitz), for regular feedback and support.

2 Interestingly, there seem to be no non-figurative meanings as “with basically expresses the notions of association and equivalence” (ibid: 555) and even the most prototypical meanings companion and instrument are listed. The really “figurative” meaning may be found in the “accompanying manner/circumstances/inner cause/concession” entries 8 to 12, but they
depend so much on the collocational and textual context that it is difficult to isolate more abstract meanings.

3 The correlation of adnominal = optional is only a rough functional equation for our argumentation and not always semantically correct, as the following example shows: Indeed, the New English Dictionary itself defined the word 'nation' not just in the usual manner familiarized in Britain by J.S. Mill, but as an extensive aggregate of persons with the required characteristics (SCI).

4 “Prototypical solutions” may be related cognates in the etymological sense or default translations in quantitative terms; in the case of mit/mit “what comes to mind first” is not an issue, but in other cases only psycholinguistic translation experiments can show to what extent the mapping of a source-language structure on the target language works in both directions.

References


Downing, Angela and Philip Locke 1992 A University Course in English Grammar. New York, etc.: Prentice Hall.


Corpus Texts (quoted as NAME: page number)

Political Speeches:

Speech by the Prime Minister, Mr John Major to the Institute of Directors, Europa Hotel, Belfast, 21 October 1994 (DOC6E)

Rede des britischen Premierministers Major über die jüngsten Entwicklungen in Nordirland, gehalten am 21. Oktober 1994 vor dem Institute of Directors im Europa Hotel in Belfast (DOC6D)

Speech by Mr David Davis, Minister of State, to the Institute for the Study of International Politics (ISPI) Milan, 27 October 1994 (DOC7E)

Tourist Brochures:

Scotland: where to go and what to see (Scottish Tourist Board, 1993) (SCOT1E)

Grampian Highlands & Aberdeen: Whisky, Castles and Gardens (Scottish Tourist Board, 1993) (SCOT3E)


Cardiff: Capital of Wales (Wales Tourist Board, 1993) (WLS2E)

EU Publications:

European Social Policy. Options for the Union (1993), p. 6-49. (EUE)

Scientific Textbooks:


Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIDE</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>COBUILD</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 COMPANY</td>
<td>She's in the kitchen with her father. He lives with his grandmother.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1 COMPANY</td>
<td>With her were her son and daughter-in-law.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 METHOD</td>
<td>He was shot at close range with a pistol.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3 INVOLVE</td>
<td>He walked with her to the front door.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>I'd like a double room with a sea view.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>5 TOOL</td>
<td>Remove the meat with a fork.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>How are things with you? Russia has drawn up a trade agreement with Norway.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>7 POSSESSION</td>
<td>He was tall and blond, with bright blue eyes.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SHOW</td>
<td>She led the table with the best china. He一丝 with pain.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>11 INDICATE</td>
<td>Our aim is to allow student teachers to become familiar with the classroom.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 CAUSE</td>
<td>The current was with them on the way back.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>He still has a serious</td>
<td>money. +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 TIME</td>
<td>The wine will improve with age. Stopping distances for cars vary with their speed.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>9 OPPOSITION</td>
<td>She has fought a constant battle with depression. You're either with me or against me.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SUPPORT</td>
<td>Are you with me? We'll decide to break up the pact.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>She found it hard to part with the baby.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 SEPARATION</td>
<td>With all her faults, she's still the best teacher we have.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13 DESPITE</td>
<td>I'd like a steak and baked potato with some chocolate sauce for dessert.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 AND</td>
<td>Away with you! Off to bed with you!</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15 COMPARISON</td>
<td>A man came round with a tray of chocolates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 EXPRESSIONS</td>
<td>It's different with us.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17 COMPARISON</td>
<td>He was in an argument with his landlord downstairs.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 AND</td>
<td>Serve hot, with pasta or rice and Fresh beans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 CARRY</td>
<td>A man came round with a tray of chocolates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 WAY</td>
<td>He agreed, but with reluctance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 CIRCUMST.</td>
<td>He opened the window and closed her eyes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 APPEARANCE</td>
<td>Joanne stood with her hands on the sink, staring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 SITUATION</td>
<td>With the win, the US reclaimed the cup for the first time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Choice equivalents of English *with* in German translations according to text type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equiv.</th>
<th>mit</th>
<th>prep</th>
<th>adj</th>
<th>others</th>
<th>omission</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>choice?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adnom.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Choice equivalents of English *with* in German translations according to syntactic function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>words</th>
<th>mit</th>
<th>prep</th>
<th>adverb.</th>
<th>others</th>
<th>omission</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>choice?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOU</td>
<td>20811</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPE</td>
<td>22099</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>20279</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>29/38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>25890</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>82/63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>23441</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>76/40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112520</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>347/49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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