Rudolf Filipović

The Second Phase of the Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian—English Contrastive Project*

1.0 *Introduction.* At the Zagreb Conference on English Contrastive Projects[1] (held 7—9 December 1970) I reviewed the work of the Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian — English Contrastive Project in its first phase[2] (1967—1970). During that phase, besides the basic work on the organization of the project, (1) questions on the approach to the contrastive analysis and on its application were decided, (2) the aim of the project was determined (it would be twofold: general linguistic and pedagogical), (3) the relationship of the project to linguistic theory and to individual linguistic models was established, (4) the question of the method and the methodology of work was settled, (5) the translation method was accepted and it was decided to work with a corpus and its translation into Serbo-Croatian, (6) the topics to be analyzed contrastively were adopted and it was decided to analyze them on three levels: a) phonological, (b) morphological, and c) syntactic, (7) the decision was made to use the American Brown corpus (the Standard Sample of Present-Day Edited American English), (8) this corpus was purposely shortened to half and translated into Serbo-Croatian, and this shortened and translated version of the Brown Cropus was termed the Zagreb Version of the Brown Corpus, (9) this shortened version was coded so that all

* The report of the first phase was printed in *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia*, 29—32, 1970—71, pp. 19—54 under the title "Problems of Contrastive Work".

[1] R. Filipović, ed., *The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project, Studies 4: Zagreb Conference on English Contrastive Projects.* Zagreb, 1971, 242 pp.

[2] R. Filipović, "Problems of Contrastive Work", *SRAZ*, 29—32/1970—71, pp. 19—54.

those morphological and syntactic elements which the analysts would need in their work could be obtained, (10) with the help of a computer contrastive concordances were obtained in which each coded grammatical unit is noted in its English or Serbo-Croatian context.[3]

1.1 *The First Phase of the Project.* After all this preparatory work was completed, the contrastive analysis and error analysis themselves were begun. In my report given at the Zagreb Conference I presented the results of that period. All these results were made available to the scientific public in the publications of the project: *Studies,*[4] *Reports,*[5] and *Pedagogical Materials.*[6]

1.1.1. By the time of the Zagreb Conference 12 contributions in three volumes[7] of *Studies* had been published which discussed questions of the contrastive approach in our project. In the *Reports* series of publications were published the first analyses of individual grammatical units on the morphological and syntactic levels, 26 contributions in three volumes.[8] In that phase the first volume[9] of the third series, *Pedagogical Materials,* was also published, containing six articles. The significance of this last volume is twofold: first, we showed the pedagogical application of the results of the contrastive analysis and how we came to accept the final form and method of working with those materials; second, we published, in that volume of *Pedagogical Materials,* the results (in lengthy resumés of three M.A. theses) of the error analysis[10]

---

[3] *Ib.*, pp. 37—51.

[4] R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Studies,* Zagreb, Institute of Linguistics.

[5] R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports,* Zagreb, Institute of Linguistics.

[6] R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Pedagogical Materials,* Zagreb, Institute of Linguistics.

[7] R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Studies 1,* Zagreb, 1969, 46 pp.; *Studies 2,* Zagreb, 1970, 104 pp.; *Studies 3,* Zagreb, 1971, 63 pp.

[8] R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 1,* Zagreb, 1969, 70 pp.; *Reports 2,* Zagreb, 1970, 134 pp.; *Reports 3,* Zagreb, 1970, 152 pp.

[9] R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Pedagogical Materials 1,* Zagreb, 1971, 111 pp.

[10] Vera Andrassy, "Errors in the Morphology and Syntax of the Parts of Speech in the English of Learners from the Serbo-Croatian-Speaking Area", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Pedagogical Materials 1,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 7—31.

Jasna Bilinić, "Errors in the Morphology and Syntax of the Verb in the Speech of Learners of English in the Serbo-Croatian-Speaking Area", *Ib.*, pp. 32—59.

Stanka Kranjčević, "Errors in the Syntax of the Sentence in the Speech of Learners of English in the Serbo-Croatian-Speaking Area", *Ib.*, pp. 60—80.

which we were working on at the same time that we were working on the contrastive analysis.

In "The Use of Contrastive and Error Analyses"[11] I emphasized our viewpoint that contrastive analysis cannot be successfully applied without error analysis and that only on the basis of both kinds of results (CA and EA) could good teaching materials be compiled. It is thus our belief that such materials must be based on: a) the results of contrastive investigation, b) the findings of error analysis, c) the experience of analysts with errors which students of a foreign language make, and d) methodologist' knowledge of which method to apply and how to apply it.[12]

A detailed investigation of errors made by those learning a foreign language offers material for a compromise system,[13] which we can construct to give the teacher a systematic list of errors, their nature and their causes. Such a list serves the teacher as a handbook whenever he wants to identify and eliminate some error. Errors arrise as a result of language transfer or some other reason which has no connection with transfer. Therefore the teacher must know not only the causes of errors based on interference from the mother tongue but also causes such as false analogy, the study or knowledge of another foreign language, taking up another grammatical unit before the first has been fully mastered, a student's abandoning of the system of his native language before he has mastered the new system of the foreign language and thus under the influence of the stimulus "this is new, this is different from my native language", he creates his own transitional systems which have no connection with transference.

1.1.2. On the basis of the results attained in the first phase of work on contrastive and error analysis, we came to the very convincing conclusion that the general linguistic goals of CA can be attained by conducting CA alone, but that the pedagogical goals and the application of the results of CA cannot be realized without conducting error analysis. Thus both analyses (CA and EA) must be conducted parallelly so that on the basis of their results the planned final products of our

[11] In: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Pedagogical Materials 2*, Zagreb, 1974, pp. 3—17.

[12] *Ib.*, pp. 6—7.

[13] R. Filipović, "A Compromise System. A Link between Linguistic Borrowing and Foreign Language Learning", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Studies 5*, Zagreb, 1972, pp. 19—29. Also in: *IRALSONDERBAND*, Kongressberricht der 3. Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für angewandte Linguistik GAL e.V. Herausgegeben von Gerhard Nickel and Albert Raasch. Julius Gross Verlag, Heidelberg, 1972, pp. 197—206.

project could be obtained: a contrastive grammar, a compromise system, and teaching materials.

To check the applicability of the results of CA we began already in the fist phase to test the results of CA completed to that time, and we came up with some very interesting findings.[14] We used two types of tests: the first served to test the applicability of the pedagogical materials in classroom teaching and thus to assertain how much and when they could be used in the teaching process, and the second kind of test actually represents a continuation and completion of the error analysis (done earlier mainly on a spoken corpus) because the tests were compiled separately for just those areas which we wished to investigate more carefully and thus obtain supplementary information on the types and causes of mistakes. This second type of test served also to check the results obtained in CA as areas of interference. Occasionally those results were of particular interest for establishing the relation of CA and EA.

2.0 *The Second Phase of the project — Results, Plans, and Goals.* The work that we reviewed in the preceeding (Introduction, 1.0 — 1.1.2.) was not all completed in the first phase (1967—70) and is continuing in the second. This holds especially for the analysis of individual grammatical units and the publication of results in the *Reports,* for testing those results and compiling pedagogical materials. In the second phase of the project two main goals were set: a) to determine the way in which the studies, the final result of the contrastive analysis, would be written, and b) to establish the form of pedagogical materials intended for the teacher of English.

Even at the very beginning of the project (which I reviewed at the AILA Congress at Cambridge,[15] August, 1960) the difference between articles printed in the *Reports* and those in the *Studies* series was defined. Later the aim and method were defined more precisely for both kinds of articles, those in *Reports* and those in *Studies.* At the Zagreb Conference (December 1970) I developed the methodology for preparing reports. All contributions printed in *Reports* up to the end of 1970 were done according to this much more developed

[14] R. Filipović, "Testing the Results of Contrastive Analysis". A paper read at the 3rd AILA Congress in Copenhagen, 1972. *Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata,* V, 2, Roma, 1973, pp. 155—163, and in G. Nickel (ed.), AILA Third Congress — Proceedings Vol. 1, *Applied Contrastive Linguistics,* Heidelberg, 1974, pp. 97—109.

[15] R. Filipović, "The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian—English Contrastive Project", in: G. Nickel, ed., *Papers in Contrastive Linguistics,* Cambridge, 1971, pp. 107—114.

concept, and the results were presented by me in my report at the Zagreb Conference.

In the second phase of the project (YSCECP) we followed the same concept, i. e. each article for the *Reports* is to be written on the basis of the literature available, existing descriptive grammars and other sources, as well as the intuition and experience of the analyzer, but without the use or documentation of the corpus. Reports were used as a place for project workers to publish the results of their work in progress and to discuss openly questions which appear during their work. Although discussion on the results of analyzing individual grammatical units was carried on in regular Project meetings, some discussion appeared in the publications as well.[16]

Whatever differences concievably exist between reports from the first phase and those done during the second phase, these differences are the result of greater experience on the part of project workers and of wider acquaintance with the material and aims of the project. Sometimes the difference represents a step closer to a study. This is especially true for those reports which were done after we developed in a more detailed fashion the concept of a study. The best example of this is an article on adjective comparison[17] in which the author prepared a theoretical introduction on the basis of the latest literature. This introduction will serve the author well when he is writing the chapter on comparison in his study on adjectives.

In the *Studies* series of publications we foresaw publication of two types of contributions: (a) articles which would treat questions and problems of contrastive linguistics directly or indirectly connected with the organization and work of our project; (b) articles representing the final product of the contrastive analysis of some grammatical unit, written on the basis of an analysis completed with the Zagreb Version of the Brown Corpus, i. e. an analysis supplemented by material from the corpus to revise of complete, with the aid of the contrastive concordances, the results from the "Report" stage.

---

[16] Cf.: Vladimir Ivir, "Notes on Linking Verbs and Complements in English and Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 5*, Zagreb, 1971, pp. 173—183.
Midhat Ridjanović, "More on Linking Verb + Complement in English and Serbo-Croatian", *ib.*, pp. 184—204.
Wayles Browne, "Notes on Adjectives and Stress", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 6*, Zagreb, 1972, pp. 85—88.

[17] Vladimir Ivir, "Adjective Comparison in English and Correspondent Structures in Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 8*, Zagreb, 1973, pp. 52—79.

In the first phase of the Project we published four volumes of *Studies* and in the second phase one volume with articles of the first type. In the second phase we worked on articles of the second type, i. e. project workers reworked their reports into studies with the help of material from the Corpus. Several such studies are still in progress, and the first such study has been published in Volume 6 of *Studies*.

At the end of the first phase we solved, after lengthy experimentation, the question of how to write pedagogical materials as we intended them at the conception of our project, i. e. that the results of pedagogical materials should be applied in practical teaching. Two contributions printed in the first volume of *Pedagogical Materials*[18] reveal our path: the first contribution was written before the substance of my article "The Role of Linguistics in the Development of Modern Language Teaching"[19] was put into practice and reveals our search for the best solution; in the second the application of my teaching scheme consisting of two stages and five phases was detailed. This approach has proved to be very suitable for classifying teaching material. The pedagogical justification of my scheme and the proper method for its application in compiling teaching materials was given by Mirjana Vilke in her contribution "On Compiling Pedagogical Materials."[20] Thus we obtained practical directions for compiling teaching materials as this project's immediate practical results to be used directly in teaching. In this way we continued work on pedagogical materials in the second phase as well.

2.1. *Analysis Completed and Results Published.* In the second phase, since the Zagreb Conference 59 contributions have been published: 45 in six volumes[21] of *Reports* (Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9), seven contributions in one *Studies* volume[22] (No. 5) and seven in one volume[23] of *Pedagogical Materials* (No. 2). By

---

[18] Mirjana Vilke, "Teaching Problems in Presenting Modal Verbs", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Pedagogical Materials 1,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 81—97.

Mirjana Vilke, "Teaching Problems in Presenting Relative Pronouns", *ib.*, pp. 98—111.

[19] R. Filipović, "Udio lingvistike u formiranju modernih metoda u nastavi stranih jezika", Pedagoški rad, Zagreb 1970, XXV, 7—8, pp. 375—391.

[20] In: R. Filipović, ed., YSCECP, *Studies 6,* Zagreb, 1975, pp. 63—77.

[21] R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 4,* Zagreb, 1971, 147 pp.; *Reports 5,* Zagreb, 1971, 204 pp.; *Reports 6,* Zagreb, 1972, 124 pp.; *Reports 7,* Zagreb, 1973, 119 pp.; *Reports 8,* Zagreb, 1973, 231 pp.; *Reports 9,* Zagreb, 1974, 118 pp.

[22] R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Studies 5,* Zagreb, 1972, 159 pp.

[23] *R. Filipović, ed., YSCECP, Pedagogical Materials 2,* Zagreb, 1974, 91 pp.

the same system (which I described at the Zagreb Conference) project workers have continued contrastive analysis of other previously determined topics. In the fifth volume of *Studies* the publication of theoretically oriented contributions giving further treatment to theoretical questions of CA was continued. The second volume of *Pedagogical Materials* contains, in addition to an introductory article which shows synthetically the pedagogical application of CA and EA, articles with teaching materials for practical treatment of the individual units theoretically detailed in the *Reports*.

2.1.1. *Reports*. In this phase of work the analysis of verbal forms was continued. Dr. Leonardo Spalatin[24] distinguished among the various uses of the English preterit and pluperfect which in Serbo-Croatian very often have the perfect as an equivalent. This then leads to difficulties for Serbo-Croatian speaking students. Dr. Damir Kalogjera[25] took up the various methods of studying the future tense in both languages (English and Serbo-Croatian), comparing their meanings and restrictions in usage.

Verbal aspect, a finely developed grammatical category in Serbo-Croatian, was the subject of two articles. Dr. Midhat Ridjanović[26] in a lengthy article gave a universal classification of verbs and showed that the same categories are important in both languages but in different ways. Mira Vlatković[27], in an article dealing with both aspect and verbal tense, showed how to express simultaneous actions.

The remaining contributions on verbal forms and their use discussed the passive. Dr. Ljiljana Mihailović[28] published

---

[24] L. Spalatin, "The English Preterit Tense and Its Serbo-Croatian Equivalents", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 4*, Zagreb, 1971, pp. 103—111., and in: *Reports 5*, Zagreb, 1971, pp. 131—142.

L. Spalatin, "The English Past Perfect Tense and Its Serbo-Croatian Equivalents", in: *Reports 4*, pp. 112—124.

[25] D. Kalogjera, "The Expression of Future Time in English and in Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 4*, Zagreb, 1971, pp. 50—72.

[26] M. Ridjanović, "Contrastive and Non-Contrastive Aspects of Aspect", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 8*, Zagreb, 1973, pp. 80—114. This article is based on sections of M. Ridjanović's, Ph.D. dissertation entitled "A Synchronic Study of Verbal Aspect in English and Serbo-Croatian", which was completed at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA, 1969.

[27] M. Vlatković, "Expressions of Simultaneity in English and Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 6*, Zagreb, 1972, pp. 113—124.

[28] Lj. Mihailović, "Passive Sentences in English and Serbo-Croatian — Part I", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 9*, Zagreb, 1974, pp. 32—75. The second part of this article is coming out in *Reports 10*.

the first part of a detailed analysis of passive constructions, and Dr. Leonardo Spalatin[29] treated the English passive and its various translations in Serbo-Croatian by both passive and active as well as reflexive constructions, third person plural, etc. Mira Vlatković[30] analyzed the English imperative and its corresponding forms in Serbo-Croatian.

Linking verbs formed a topic of discussion between Dr. Vladimir Ivir[31] and Dr. Midhat Ridjanović.[32] In addition, in a separate article Dr. Ridjanović[33] analyzed the uses of linking verbs in exclamatory sentences.

Dr. Vladimir Ivir carried on a syntactic analysis of adjectives in four contributions. The first article deals with the use of prenominal and postnominal adjectival constructions.[34] Comparative adjectives were the topics of the second[35] and third[36] articles; they were shown to be very similar in both languages. The fourth contribution discussed the superlative.[37] Wayles Browne contributed two notes to the articles on adjectives cited above: one examined the accentuation of adjective-noun groups,[38] and the second, modifiers of the comparative.[39]

Several articles dealt with pronouns. Maja Dubravčić[40] analyzed personal pronouns in English and Serbo-Croatian;

---

[29] L. Spalatin, "Some Serbo-Croatian Equivalents of the English Passive", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 8,* Zagreb, 1973, pp. 115—131.

[30] M. Vlatković, "The Imperative and Its Periphrases", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 5,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 159—172.

[31] Vladimir Ivir, "Notes on Linking Verbs and Complements in English and Serbo-Croatian", *ib.,* pp. 173—183.

[32] M. Ridjanović, "More on Linking Verb + Complement in English and Serbo-Croatian", *ib.,* pp. 184—204.

[33] M. Ridjanović, "Exclamatory Sentences with Linking Verbs in English and Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 6,* Zagreb, 1972, pp. 103—112.

[34] Vladimir Ivir, "Patterns for English Adjectives and Their Contrastive Correspondents in Serbo-Croatian", *ib.,* pp. 56—84.

[35] Vladimir Ivir, "Adjective Comparison in English and Correspondent Structures in Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 8,* Zagreb, 1973, pp. 52—79.

[36] V. Ivir, "Semantic Aspects of Adjective Comparison in English and Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 9,* Zagreb 1974, pp. 19—31.

[37] V. Ivir, "Superlative Structures in English and Their Correspondents in Serbo-Croatian", *ib.,* pp. 5—18.

[38] W. Browne, "Notes on Adjectives and Stress", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 6,* Zagreb, 1972, pp. 85—88.

[39] W. Browne, "A Note on Modifiers of Comparatives in English and Serbo-croatian", in: R. Filipović, *YSCECP, Reports 9,* Zagreb, 1974, pp. 3—4.

[40] M. Dubravčić, "The English Personal Pronouns and Their Serbo-Croatian Equivalents", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 5,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 11—39.

Dr. Leonardo Spalatin[41] examined the use of the pronoun *it* and its equivalents in Serbo-Croatian; Vjekoslav Suzanić in one article described the different uses of English *one* and its equivalents (or lack of equivalents) in Serbo-Croatian,[42] and in a second article treated indefinite adjectives and pronouns and their use in the noun phrase;[43] Dr. Željko Bujas[44] discussed demonstrative pronouns and their translation equivalents, viewing them as a problem of translational conversion; Dr. Ljiljana Mihailović[45] analyzed demonstratives and other elements of the structure of the noun phrase.

The distinctions, formerly quite elusive, among the English prepositions *over, under, above,* and *below* were analyzed by Dr. Ranko Bugarski.[46] He concluded that they correspond fairly well to the distinctions in Serbo-Croatian among *nad, pod, iznad* and *ispod.*

In the field of derivational morphology only one contribution has appeared. Here Dr. Željko Bujas[47] examined translational conversion, showing that a typical feature of English words — that they are used in functions outside those of their basic part of speech — is not as rare in Serbo-Croatian as was previously thought.

A large number of articles was devoted to the syntax of the simple sentence. Dr. Vladimir Ivir[48] examined number agreement between subject and verb and between members of the noun phrase. Ljubica Vojnović[49] analyzed the types of

---

[41] L. Spalatin, "The English IT and Its Serbo-Croatian Equivalents", *ib.*, pp. 117—130.

[42] V. Suzanić, "*One:* Its Forms and Uses", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 6,* Zagreb, 1972, pp. 89—102.

[43] V. Suzanić, "Indefinites in English and Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 8,* Zagreb, 1973, pp. 132—164.

[44] Ž. Bujas, "Demonstratives in Serbo-Croat to English Translational Conversion", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 8,* Zagreb, 1973, pp. 21—51.

[45] Lj. Mihailović, "Additional Notes on Noun Phrases in the Function of Subject in English and Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 4,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 73—84.

[46] R. Bugarski, "A System of English Prepositions and Their Serbo-Croatian Equivalents", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 8,* Zagreb, 1975, pp. 139—147.

[47] Ž. Bujas, "A Contrastive Analysis Evaluation of Conversion in English and Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 6,* Zagreb 1972, pp. 41—55. On translational conversion see the article by Ž. Bujas, "On Translational Conversion in English: Serbo-Croat Contrastive Analysis", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Studies 6,* Zagreb, 1958, pp. 139—147.

[48] V. Ivir, "Number Agreement in English and Correspondent Structures in Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 4,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 23—49.

[49] Lj. Vojnović, "Adverbial Modifiers in Intransitive Sentences in English and Serbo-Croatian", *ib.*, pp. 125—147.

intransitive sentences and the distribution of adverbial modifiers. Radmila Šević[50] detailed the use of adverbial modifiers in transitive sentences. Dr. Dragica Pervaz[51] studied verbs which take one object, and Radmila Šević,[52] verbs with two objects. Mladen Mihajlović[53] contrastively analyzed a general syntactic problem in an article on elliptic sentences. Dr. Ljiljana Bibović[54] showed in her discussion of word order that the theme — rheme structure is an important determinant in word order, especially in Serbo-Croatian.

The structure of complements or the use of "transformed clauses" as parts of other clauses was examined in several articles: Omer Hadžiselimović[55] studied a series of English constructions with non-finite verbal forms after the main verb and their various equivalents (clauses or lexical units) in Serbo-Croatian. Dr. Dragica Pervaz[56] in one contribution distinguished among several types of English structures which have a direct object followed by a non-finite verbal form. Dr. Ljiljana Bibović[57] analyzed the English gerund used as subject and its equivalents in Serbo-Croatian (clause, infinitive, verbal noun).

Four contributions treat complex sentences: Zorica Grdanički[58] examined the use of clauses as subject of a second clause; Gordana Gavrilović[59] analyzed three types of adverbial

[50] R. Šević, "Adverbials with Transitive Verbs in English and Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 7,* Zagreb, 1973, pp. 101—114.

[51] D. Pervaz, "Verbs with One Object in English and Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 5,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 55—116.

[52] R. Šević, "Verbs with Two Objects in English and Serbo-Croatian", *ib.,* pp. 143—158.

[53] M. Mihajlović, "Elliptical Sentences in English and Their Serbo-Croatian Equivalents", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 4,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 85—102.

[54] Lj. Bibović, "On the Word Order of Subject and Predicate in English and Serbo-Croatian from the Point of View of Functional Sentence Perspective", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 5,* pp. 1—10.

[55] O. Hadžiselimović, "Intransitive Verbs + Adverbials or Complements Containing Non-Finite Verb-Forms", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 4,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 11—22.

[56] D. Pervaz, "Some Predicate Complement Constructions in English and Their Equivalents in Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 7,* Zagreb, 1973, pp. 82—100.

[57] Lj. Bibović, "The English Gerund as a Subject and its Serbo-Croatian Equivalents", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 7,* Zagreb, 1973, pp. 3—21.

[58] Z. Grdanički, "Subject Composed of Clause", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 5,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 40—55.

[59] G. Gavrilović, "Adverbial Clauses of Cause, Place and Manner in English and Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 4,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 1—10.

clauses; Mladen Vitezić,[60] in a lengthy condensation of his MA thesis, treated relative clauses from a practical standpoint; and an article by Dr. Ljiljana Mihailović[61] on relative clauses was of a theoretical or general syntactic character.

An article by the three authors Ivir, McMillan and Merz described S-relators[62] (conjunctions, adverbs, prepositional phrases, etc.) as the means by which various logical relations between clauses and sentences may be studied. The article contains a comprehensive list of relations and S-relators, with examples.

2.1.2. *Studies.* In this time period only one volume of *Studies* (*Studies* 5, Zagreb 1972) has been published. It contains, as did earlier volumes, articles which have more of a theoretical value for contrastive linguistics and are not directly connected to work on our project (YSCECP). Four of these articles were written by members of the project and the other three by foreign linguists.

The members of the project contributed the following studies: Dr. Midhat Ridjanović[63] took up the question of verbal aspect as a grammatical category and presents part of the results of his research into that question. This article represents part of his as yet unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Dr. Vladimir Ivir[64] analyzed adjectives with *that*-complements, e.g., *happy that you can come,* and classified them according to the various transformations that the complement can undergo. Dr. Ljiljana Mihailović[65] studied existential sentences and contributed to the study of word order as well as to general and contrastive syntax. In his theoretically-oriented article, Dr. Rudolf Filipović[66] sought to draw a parallel between compromise systems which a student unconsciously forms while studying a foreign language and systems which appear when one language adopts elements of another.

The articles written by non-members of the project treat several questions. The value of R.L. Allen's notion of sector

---

[60] M. Vitezić, "Relative Clauses in English and Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 8,* Zagreb, 1973, pp. 165—224.

[61] Lj. Mihailović, "The Source of Relative Clauses", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 7,* Zagreb, 1973, pp. 65—81.

[62] V. Ivir, D. McMillan, T. Merz, "S-Relators", *ib.,* pp. 22—64.

[63] M. Ridjanović, "A Reinterpretation of Verbal Aspect in Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Studies 5,* Zagreb, 1972, pp. 110—159.

[64] V. Ivir, "Case Frames and Transformations for Clause-Expanded Adjectives", *ib.,* pp. 30—45.

[65] Lj. Mihailović, "Existential Sentences in English and Serbo-Croatian", *ib.,* pp. 67—109.

[66] R. Filipović, "A Compromise System", *ib.,* pp. 19—29.

analysis to contrastive syntactic studies was shown by T.K. Adeyanju.[67] Dr. Carl James[68] pits CA against error analysis and throws light on two problems: (a) interference which arises in studying a foreign language which is similar or typologically different from the native language of the student, and (b) interference caused by a foreign language which the student has previously studied. Dr. W. R. Lee[69] stressed the use of language in communicative situations; his opinion is that contrastive studies are useful to foreign-language teaching but they should not lead to exaggerated emphasis, during classroom work, of the differences between two languages. Dr. Olga Tomić[70] proposed a classification of definite determiners and WH-words in English and Serbo-Croatian.

Although during the first phase of our project intensive work was being done on the "first" studies, the final products of the analysis of individual grammatical units, thus far only one has been completed and published.[71] This study by Dr. Dora Maček, entitled "Relatives in English and their Serbo-Croatian Equivalents", was written on the basis of her article "Relative Pronouns in English and Serbo-Croatian", published in *Reports 3* (Zagreb 1970) and completed with the help of the bilingual (contrastive) concordances from the Brown Corpus. This study serves as a pilot study, as a model for other project workers in writing their studies.

The discussion of this study pointed to many methodological questions which had to be formulated in that last phase of work. The discussion also offered some solutions on which project members can rely when they are writing other studies. The genesis and structure of a study is discussed in section 3, pp. 186—189.

2.1.3. *Pedagogical Materials.* In the second phase, work on pedagogical materials was continued according to the principles we established at the end of the first phase and which I reviewed in my paper "The Use of Contrastive and Error

---

[67] Th. K. Adeyanju, "The Use of Sector Analysis in Contrastive Studies in Linguistics", *ib.*, pp. 3—18.

[68] C. James, "Some Crucial Problems in the Theory of Contrastive Linguistics", *ib.*, pp. 45—56.

[69] W. R. Lee, "How Can Contrastive Linguistic Studies Help Foreign-Language Teaching?", *ib.*, pp. 57—66.

[70] O. Mišeska Tomić, "The Definite Determiner in English and Serbo-Croatian", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 9*, Zagreb, 1974, pp. 79—89.

O. Mišeska Tomić, "English and Serbo-Croatian WH-Words, Their Derivatives and Correlates", *ib.*, pp. 90—107.

[71] In: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Studies 6*, Zagreb, 1975, pp. 27—62.

Analysis to Practicing Teachers" read the International Conference of Teachers of English in Budapest,[72] 9—11 April 1974. Because of its synthetic character I published that contribution as the introductory article in the second volume of *Pedagogical Materials*.[73] In that paper I cited those results of CA and EA obtained by our project which serve the practical teacher in teaching a foreign language, and I particularly stressed the application of the results of CA and EA in writing pedagogical materials.

The basis for writing pedagogical materials is formed around my five-step scheme which consists of two stages (habit-formation and cognitive) and five phases in accordance with which the exercises are built. Both analyses, CA and EA, lead to the establishment of a compromise system[74] showing the stages through which the student goes in the process of learning a foreign language when he gives up using his native language's system as a model but hasn't yet mastered the system of the target language.

In this phase one volume of *Pedagogical Materials*[75] was published with seven contributions. Besides the above-noted introductory article, in six contributions on practical materials, exercises for mastering individual units, based on tests taken in Zagreb schools, are given. Radmila Djordjević wrote three contributions to the Pedagogical materials following the Filipović scheme: 1) In one she analyzes types of errors which occur in the use of noun phrases as subject in English[76] and suggests a three-step review of the problems met in this area: from the most common ("yes/no questions" and their answers) to the less common and harder (agreement of subject and verb, inversion of subject and verb). 2) In the second, making use of the results of the tests, R. Djordjević suggests stages through which the student of English can be led so that he meets the fewest possible difficulties in mastering English constructions with noun phrases as subject,[77] where one finds demonstratives, personal pronouns, a proper noun in the genitive, or *all, both*

[72] The Conference was organized jointly by the Hungarian foreign language teachers' section of T.I.T. and I.A.T.E.F.L. (London).

[73] R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Pedagogical Materials 2*, Zagreb, 1974, pp. 3—17.

[74] See: *Note 13*, p. 175.

[75] Vol. 2, Zagreb, 1974, 91 pp.

[76] R. Djordjević, "Some Problems in Teaching English Noun Phrases as Subject to Serbo-Croatian Speakers", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Pedagogical Materials 2*, Zagreb, 1974, pp. 18—25.

[77] R. Djordjević, "Problems in Teaching the Structure of Some English Noun Phrases as Subject to Serbo-Croatian Speakers", *ib.*, pp. 26—39.

and *half*. 3) In the third contribution R. Djordjević discussed questions of pronominalization in English[78] creating problems for the student of English — especially the use of the indefinite pronoun *one* and certain personal pronouns. The areas in which these difficulties occur are treated so that they can be easily handled in the classroom: from the less difficult to the most complicated questions.

In three articles Dr. Mirjana Vilke follows the structure of the Filipović scheme: in the first stage, consisting of three phases, the approach is toward habit formation, and in the second stage of two phases the approach is cognitive. For every phase not only what needs to be worked on is shown but examples of exercises, drills and dialogues for classwork are given. M. Vilke developed materials in this way for covering modals,[79] the perfect tense,[80] and the imperative.[81]

3.0. *New Studies.* The main reason that the studies, which we envisioned as the final product of analysis of each unit, couldn't be published in the first five volumes of the series of our publications was that the reworking of the corpus took a long time and we wished to and had to work without a corpus in the first phase of CA, using a method explained several times earlier. This is apparent from the work methodology which we followed that sought to do CA on the basis of other sources and not a corpus.

Only after getting "bilingual contrastive concordances" through computer treatment of the corpus did we fulfill the basic conditions for work on the studies as the final products of our project's CA. In addition, experience gained in writing articles (anticipated for publication in the *Reports)* and discussions carried on during the work on them and after their publication in the *Reports* gave us some new ideas and knowledge which we incorporated into the conception of writing studies.

Thus when we started to work on the studies with the help of computer concordances we could formulate the goal of the studies writer more concretely and precisely than earlier when we decided (theoretically) that the final product of the CA of each unit would be a study.

---

[78] R. Djordjević, "Some Problems in Teaching English Pronominalization to Serbo-Croatian Speakers", *ib.*, pp. 39—48.

[79] M. Vilke, "Teaching Modal Verbs to SC Learners of English", pp. 49—70.

[80] M. Vilke, "Teaching the Present Perfect Tense in the SC Speaking Area", *ib.*, pp. 71—82.

[81] M. Vilke, "Teaching the Imperative in SC Speaking Areas", *ib.*, *ib.*, pp. 49—70.

3.1. The first and fundamental principle was that each unit for which we completed CA ought to have its own study based on the results obtained from work on the *Reports* article and should be further documented with examples from the corpus. The transformation of a *Reports* article into a study does not have just the formal character of supplementing with the help of examples from the corpus. By our principle the analyst reworks the *report* into a *study* so that it includes all new findings and later results of the analysis obtained in researching the corpus. Thus a study shows which results the analyst has incorporated into it from existing literature and from his own experience and knowledge of English and which he included on the basis of his analysis of the corpus. The examples from the corpus are designated with computer numbers and the rest are not. Thus the study does not toss aside the article; rather, the article is supplemented and all its results are tested with the help of the corpus since the study must be the full-circle totality of our work on one topic.

In this totality all accessible literature on the subject is reviewed so that the reader — teacher or student — gets an overview of the linguistic knowledge on the grammatical unit. This overview covers the approaches to the problem from the oldest to the most modern. In this way supplemental information is obtained on the linguistic approach to some unit through all the main trends in linguistics (from classical through structural to transformational-generative).

One of the reasons for such an approach is that we will in this way introduce the reader (who frequently has gotten his linguistic knowledge through a classical or perhaps structural approach) to the most modern linguistic approach to language, that of transformational-generative linguistics.

3.2. Of the five studies which are in progress one has been completed and published in Volume 6 of *Studies*[82] as a pattern for producing the rest of the studies. Discussion held on this study at the sixth working meeting of YSCECP showed that it can be taken as a basis for further work but that there are still possibilities for improving its form and content. The other studies which are in progress will certainly profit from the discussion at the meeting, but since they each have their own problems, they will present some other difficulties which manifest themselves during the writing of a study.

One group of studies contains contributions, each of which is tied to an article published in the *Reports;* each of these

[82] D. Maček, "Relatives in English and Their Serbo-Croatian Equivalents", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Studies 6,* Zagreb, 1975, pp. 27—62.

treats one single theme. Included here are the above-mentioned study by Dora Maček on relatives and two others, one by Maja Dubravčić[83] on the present perfect tense and the second by Mira Vlatković[84] on the imperative. Another group of studies grew out of several articles on one theme and presents a sort of synthesis of a project member's work up to the present supplemented by the results of corpus analysis. Vladimir Ivir is writing such a study on adjectives on the basis of his six articles[85] and Damir Kalogjera, on modals based on his three articles.[86]

Project workers have one more valuable and useful source of information for the analysis of some units: senior theses for the B. A. degree, as well as M. A. theses of students doing Master's degree work in linguistics at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb. Thus far we have tried whenever possible to publish lengthy condensations of these works in our publications. Those which are unpublished are frequently cited in project members' articles as having been used. Although these works with one exception are not based on our corpus, they occasionally give data on the topics they treat which are useful from a contrastive standpoint, because they approach the topic from the opposite angle, i. e., from Serbo-Croatian.

The publication of studies in the series bearing that name has as its aim their presentation of the work to the linguistic

---

[83] M. Dubravčić, "The English Present Perfect Tense and Its Serbo-Croatian Equivalents", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 3,* Zagreb, 1970, pp. 13—45.

[84] M. Vlatković, "The Imperative and Its Periphrasis", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 5,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 159—172.

[85] V. Ivir, "An Outline for the Contrastive Analysis of English and Serbo-Croatian Adjectives", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 1,* Zagreb, 1969, pp. 31—38.

V. Ivir, "Predicative Patterns for English Adjectives and Their Contrastive Correspondents in Serbo-Croatian", *Reports 2,* Zagreb, 1970, pp. 10—55.

V. Ivir, "Patterns for English Adjectives and Their Contrastive Correspondents in Serbo-Croatian", *Reports 6,* Zagreb, 1972, pp. 56—84.

V. Ivir, "Adjective Comparison in English and Correspondent Structures in Serbo-Croatian", *Reports 8,* Zagreb, 1973, pp. 52—79.

V. Ivir, "Superlative Structures in English and Their Correspondents in Serbo-Croatian", *Reports 9,* Zagreb, 1974, pp. 5—18.

V. Ivir, "Semantic Aspects of Adjective Comparison in English and Serbo-Croatian", *ib.,* pp. 19—31.

[86] D. Kalogjera, "A Survey of Grammatical Characteristics of English Modal Verbs with Regard to Interference Problems", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Reports 1,* Zagreb, 1969, 39—44.

D. Kalogjera, "Ten English Modals and Their Equivalents in Serbo-Croatian", *Reports 3,* Zagreb, 1970, pp. 62—87.

D. Kalogjera, "The Expression of Future Time in English and in Serbo-Croatian", *Reports 4,* Zagreb, 1971, pp. 50—72.

community and their improvement on the basis of the principles and criticism of the studies. The studies, discussed and evaluated in this way, will help first in writing the final monograph "A Contrastive Analysis of Serbo-Croatian and English" and second in applying the results of these studies to practical aims in writing a contrastive grammar of English for the Serbo-Croatian speaking area.

4. *Perspectives.* From this review of the results obtained during the second phase, it is clear that the Project will continue into a third phase (1976—1980), since several studies and the remaining pedagogical materials must be completed yet, in order to obtain all necessary analytic material for writing the final synthetic monograph. In the third phase two new aspects of contrastive analysis will be studied, the psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic. Present-day research in psycholinguistics is opening new possibilities and directions for studying the process of foreign-language teaching. Dr. Gordana Opačić[87] suggests that "in order to shed some light on the psycholinguistic nature of contrastive factors in second-language teaching and learning, the existing studies — e. g. those based on error--analysis — be examined for possible correlations of the nature and frequency of errors and the degree of remoteness of particular linguistic sequences from underlying semantically-based cognitive structures." New research in sociolinguistics shows that the spheres of our contrastive analysis, pronunciation and grammar, must be widened and that the study of sociolinguistic aspect of contrastive analysis promises new and very interesting results.

[87] G. Opačić, "On Psycholinguistics and its Assumed Relevance to Contrastive Analysis", in: R. Filipović, ed., *YSCECP, Studies 6*, Zagreb, 1975, pp. 165—172.