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Grammatically, languages do not differ in what they can and cannot convey. *Any language is able to convey everything.* However, they differ in what a language must convey.

Roman Jakobson

**Resumo:** O texto relata os resultados de uma análise contrastiva pedagógicamente orientada e baseada em um corpus voltado para complementar e suplementar os resultados do Projeto Contrastivo Inglês-Serbo-Croata Yugoslavo, representando também uma contribuição para a edição revisada da Gramática Contrastiva Inglês-Serbo-Croata. A análise especificamente focaliza a reflexividade verbal e middleness nas duas línguas, restringindo-se aos chamados ‘se – verbos’, verbos seguidos do morfema *se* em Serbo-Croata e em seus equivalentes, na tradução para o inglês. Algumas inovações teóricas e metodológicas em pesquisa linguística contrastiva são discutidas na primeira parte do texto, concluindo que novas pesquisas na estrutura proposta podem gerar resultados contrastivamente valiosos que podem ser futuramente aplicados a uma variedade de campos de estudo, prioritariamente para a pedagogia da linguagem.
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**Abstract:** The paper reports on the results of a corpus-based and pedagogically orientated *contrastive analysis* envisaged to complement and supplement the results of the Yugoslav Serbo-Croat—English Contrastive project, representing also a contribution to a revised edition of *Serbo-Croat—English Contrastive Grammar*. The analysis specifically focuses on verbal *reflexivity* and *middleness* in the two languages, confining itself to the so-called ‘*se*-verbs’, verbs followed by the morpheme *se* in Serbo-Croat and their English translation equivalents. Some theoretical and methodological innovations in contrastive linguistic research are discussed in the first part of the paper, concluding that further research within the proposed framework can yield contrastively valuable results that can be further applied to a variety of study fields, primarily to *language pedagogy*.
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Resumen
El texto relata los resultados de un análisis contrastivo pedagógicamente orientado y basado en un corpus que tiene por meta complementar y suplementar los resultados del Proyecto Contrastivo Inglés-Serbio-Croata Yugoslavo, representando también una contribución para la edición revisada de la Gramática Contrastiva Inglés-Serbio-Croata. El análisis específicamente se centra sobre la reflexividad verbal en las dos lenguas, atañéndose en los llamados ‘se’ – verbos, verbos seguidos del morfema se en Serbio-Croata y en sus equivalente, en la traducción para el inglés. Algunas innovaciones teóricas y metodológicas en investigación lingüística contrastiva son discutidas en la primera parte del texto, llevando a la conclusión de que nuevas investigaciones en la estructura propuesta pueden generar resultados contrastivamente valiosos que podrán ser, futuramente, aplicados a una variedad de campos de estudio, prioritariamente para la pedagogía del lenguaje.

Palabras-clave: Análisis contrastivo, Gramática Contrastivo Inglés-Serbio-Croata, reflexividad, pedagogía del lenguaje

1. Contrastive Analysis – theoretical considerations, modern approaches and new perspectives

Contrastive analysis is traditionally defined as a method which helps the analyst to ascertain in which aspects the two languages are alike and in which they differ (cf. FILIPOVI, 1975, p. 13). It includes two main processes – description and comparison (cf. JAMES, 1980, p. 63; also CHESTERMAN, 1998, p. 52), set up in four basic steps: a) assembling the data, b) formulating the description, c) supplementing the data as required, and d) formulating the contrasts (JAMES, 1980 & CHESTERMAN, 1998, p. 52). Although the term contrastive analysis is widely accepted and used, the problem of terminological diversity was very present in the relevant linguistic literature throughout the 20th century. Thus, this discipline has also been referred to

In its early days in the late 1940s and 1950s, contrastive analysis was seen by many linguists (e.g. FRIES, 1945; LADO, 1957; etc.) primarily as a pedagogical tool. Results of the analysis – similarities and differences found between the two language systems – were thought to be able to predict the difficulties in language learning and thus be directly relevant to language teaching methodology. In practice, these predictions did not always prove to be quite precise and successful.

Later empirical research tried to draw a distinction between theoretical and applied contrastive studies (cf. FISIAK, 1980; also CHESTERMAN, 1998, p. 40-1). Theoretical studies in this sense were close to language typology, essentially non-directional, “starting from some shared or presumably universal property and looking at its manifestations in two languages” (CHESTERMAN, 1998, p. 40), while applied studies were still of high pedagogical relevance. They were said to be directional, as they “start from a property or expression in one language and investigate its manifestation in another” (ibid.). At the same time, there were contrastivists (e.g. KRZESZOWSKI, 1990) who pointed out that both directional and non-

\[1\] See also Djordjevi 1987 and further literature recommended therein.
directional contrastive studies could be both pedagogically and theoretically relevant.

Clearly the central theoretical issue and the ultimate goal of contrastive studies is the question of establishing similarities and differences, but also the comparability criterion. Chesterman (1998), for example, makes a useful distinction between ‘similarity-as-trigger’, defining it as “the notion of a particular relation existing between entities in the world, a relation that impinges upon human perception, from matter to mind” (ibid., 7) and ‘similarity-as-attribution’, which goes in the opposite direction, from mind to matter. It is essentially a subjective, probabilistic, cognitive process that perceives two entities as being similar (ibid.). Comparability criterion, on the other hand, has to be established prior to any analysis which is to be performed. Effectively, the analyst is supposed to answer the question what can be compared in the observed languages. Traditionally, there are three main ways of dealing with the problem of comparability. Originally, it used to be established either at the semantic or formal/grammatical level. The third way of establishing comparability criterion assumes defining the relations of equivalence, similarity and difference in the observed languages2.

The notion of equivalence was originally taken from theory of translation and it involved the concept of translation equivalence (cf. IVIR, 1969). More specifically, equivalence in contrastive studies assumes that there is a universal feature, an overall platform of reference, tertium

---

2 In the classical period of contrastive analysis comparability criterion involved two basic relations, namely similarities and differences, and they were observed at three separate levels: in form, meaning and distribution. This standpoint was originally proposed by Lado (1957).
comparationis, which enables the comparison to be performed. The actual realization of that universal feature in the two languages is what the contrastivist is interested in. In other words, equivalence is one of the key issues of contrastive analysis, and the basic working law of the discipline can be presented graphically as a triangle, interrelating the contrasted features in the observed languages by means of that third element, tertium comparisonis, as shown on Fig.1 (cf. DJORDJEVI, 1987, p. 58).

![Equivalence and tertium comparisonis.](Djordjevi 1987: 58)

The notion of tertium comparisonis has evolved significantly in the course of time. In traditional contrastive studies it was defined as the common platform of reference (KRZESZOWSKI, 1990, p. 15) and the starting point of a comparison sine qua non. It is that third element which enables the two entities to be compared (cf. DJORDJEVI, 1987, p. 58). During the classical period of contrastive analysis tertium comparisonis was either formally or semantically based (cf. JAMES, 1980). In the former case, similarity was established by means of ‘formal correspondence’, a relation established at the formal level, while in the latter case, similarity judgements were essentially dependent on translation (which could include use of corpora, native speaker’s intuition, bilingual translation competence, etc.) (cf. CHESTERMAN, 1998, p. 58).

Different, sometime even opposing, approaches to language during the 20th century, most notably universalist
and relativist ones, brought about different views on the nature and role of the *tertium comparationis* in contrastive studies. It seems, however, that both of the mentioned approaches in their strong versions made the very possibility of contrasting languages somewhat problematic. Paradoxically enough, if each language is *sui generis*, influencing cognition differently in the Whorfian sense (cf. WHORF, 1967, p. 240), then the very concept of similarity is simply impossible or extremely difficult to define. On the other hand, if all languages at some point share the same universal underlying structure, then why contrast them at all?

Modern contrastive studies, though, try to find a balance between the two approaches, emphasizing the fact that “human cultures are neither all the same nor totally different” (*ibid.*, 49). Bearing that in mind, it seems only natural to accept the view that similarity observed between the two entities should be understood only in relative terms. In a more modern sense, by incorporating new interdisciplinary theoretical approaches into the contrastive analytical framework, contrastivists seem to be right to focus on “overlap between different ways speakers of different languages tend to speak” (*ibid.*, 50), committing themselves “neither to an identical universal base nor to insurmountable difference” (*ibid.*), of the languages in contrast. In tune with these new theoretical approaches, some methodological innovations have also been proposed (*ibid.*). Briefly, they take into account Popper’s view expressed in his philosophy of science (e.g. POPPER, 1972), where he claims that objective knowledge is gained through an endless process of problem solving, basically consisting of suggesting, testing and refuting initial hypotheses, which are revised and tested again, etc. Based on this line of argument, the following methodological framework has been put forward:
1) Collecting primary data against which hypotheses are to be tested. Primary data involve all instances of language use, utterances that speakers of the languages in question produce.
2) Establishing comparability criterion based on a perceived similarity of any kind.
3) Defining the nature of similarity and formulating the initial hypothesis.
4) Hypothesis testing: determining the conditions under which the initial hypothesis can be accepted or rejected.
5) Formulating the revised hypothesis.
6) Testing of the revised hypothesis, and so on.

These contrastive analytical formulations can be successfully tested by finding them in a corpus or checking the behaviour of speakers. The real task for the contrastivist is, thus, to specify the conditions under which the formulations are valid, which is essentially in traditional contrastive studies known as the contrastive rule. Depending on the comparability criterion, these conditions can be syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, stylistic, contextual, etc. (cf. CHESTERMAN, 1998, p. 60).

2. Cognitive/prototype approaches to contrastive studies – possible models of analysis

Over the last few decades cognitive and prototype approaches to various language phenomena and insightful results they brought about also proved to be very applicable to modern contrastive analysis. More specifically, Langacker’s basic claim that “language is an integral part of human cognition” (1987, p.12) has been taken
as a starting point in many studies which yielded contrastively and typologically valuable results (e.g. KALISZ, 1981; KEMMER, 1993; KRZESZOWSKI, 1986; ZHANG, 1995; MANNEY, 2000 etc). Another important standpoint that should be singled out in this context maintains that “the conceptual system that emerges from everyday human existence (...) [is] the basis for natural-language semantics in a wide range of areas” (SWEETSER, 1990, p. 1) which modern contrastivists take into account when defining their analytical prerequisites (cf. ZHANG, 1995, p. 23). The main advantage of the research performed in the cognitivistic framework should be seen in the fact that it essentially aims to reveal and explain the intricate structure of the conceptual and semantic organization of human experience (cf. RASULI, 1999, p. 51). In that context, language is seen as a manifestation of the entire human mental functioning (ibid., 43).

Although it is true that contrastive analysis based on the cognitivistic theoretical approaches is bound to be partially biased by the analyst’s own culture-specific cognitive perception of reality, there is no doubt that human beings can function mentally at the metaphorical level which enables them to perceive reality from a different perspective (CHESTERMAN, 1998, p. 52). In other words, by contrasting prototypes the contrastivist can explore to what extent they overlap, operating on “a level at which the overlaps can be formulated between such prototypes” (ibid.). Moreover, the prototype itself here actually serves as the tertium comparisonis and features are observed “as being present or absent to a certain degree, not absolutely, and similarities are assessed in terms of relative closeness to a prototype” (ibid., 8), i.e. sharing the prominent prototypical feature (ibid.). Judgements of similarity in this context are bound to be relative, variable and culture dependent.
(GOODMAN, 1972, p. 438), they “are (...) ways of organizing and clarifying one’s mental representations of the world” (CHERSTERMAN, 1998, p. 8).

In what follows we shall try to exemplify the above defined theoretical considerations utilized by modern contrastive studies. We shall present a possible model of analysis that draws on some of the basic cognitivistic concepts and incorporates them into the traditional methodological framework of contrastive analysis. More specifically, the model focuses on different segments of grammar, establishes their prototypical characteristics and examines their grammatical encoding in the contrasted languages. It is primarily pedagogically orientated, but its results can also be implemented in a range of applied linguistic disciplines, such as bilingual lexicography, translation studies, corpus linguistics, etc.

In a nutshell, the model starts from the prototypical representation of a concept and examines the ways it is encoded grammatically in the contrasted languages (cf. KURTEŠ, 1998b; 2002; 2003; 2005). It will be exemplified by defining the grammatical concepts of verbal reflexivity and middleness as ontological entities, delimiting the semantic boundaries between them and observing their grammatical manifestations in the two Indo-European languages, Serbo-Croat and English.

In an attempt to define these concepts in more precise terms, an initial distinction can be made between dynamic and stative situations. They are observed as basic and, as ontological entities, expressed in most languages of the world (ZHANG, 1995, p. 24). In the context of this work it is noteworthy to observe that the concept of ‘change’ is to be defined as being “based on an understanding of our real world experience in terms of our existence in certain
states and our motor movement from one state to the other” (ibid.). It is certainly true that our daily activities can be recognized as dynamic situations in this sense, as they all require various degrees of physical energy. Without this energy expenditure, though, “we think of ourselves as being in a state of rest, or as being in a certain emotional state, a state of certain quality, or as possessing things” (ibid.). In particular, the concepts of energy expenditure (following COMRIE, 1976) and change through time (following LANGACKER, 1987) should be seen as basic features for characterizing the main aspectual situations, dynamic and stative (ZHANG, 1995, p. 27).

Focusing more closely on reflexivity and middleness in order to define the concepts in terms of their prototypical representation, we shall take into consideration an important semantic property of the middle, termed by Kemmer (1994, p. 181; 1993, p. 73) as the relative elaboration of events, which “is the parameter along which the reflexive and the middle can be situated as semantic categories intermediate in transitivity between one-participant and two-participant events, and which in addition differentiates reflexive and middle from one another” (KEMMER, 1994, p. 181). In particular, the two participant events represent prototypical transitivity (cf. GIVON, 1984) with two clearly distinguishable participants – the animate Agent and the inanimate Patient, the relation between them involving “some kind of transmission of force or energy from the animate participant to the second affected participant” (KEMMER, 1994, p. 191). It is also important to notice that the participants are completely separate entities (KEMMER, 1993, p. 73). At the other end of the continuum, however, there is the one-participant verbal event, or prototypical intransitivity. Reflexive and middle semantic domains occupy
the central position, the former approaching the left side of the continuum, the latter coming closer to the right side. The following diagram is proposed (cf. KEMMER, 1993, p. 73; 1994, p. 209):

![Diagram](image)

Fig. 2. Degree of distinguishability of participants. (cf. KEMMER 1993, p. 73; 1994, p. 209)

What does this *de facto* mean? Reflexivity and middleness are semantically very close and very often treated as alternatives in the traditional linguistic literature. Following Haiman’s (1983) proposition of an iconic conceptual separation in the mind of a speaker between the two participants – the acting and acted-on, Kemmer argues that the crucial property of middle semantics is not the question of the subject-affectedness, as is often implied, but the low degree of participant distinguishability, approaching prototypical intransitivitiy, where this conceptual differentiation simply does not exist. The prototypical reflexive idea, however, still maintains the conceptual separation between Initiator and Endpoint, although they are co-referential, “filled by the same entity” (KEMMER, 1994, p. 207). The middle domain, on the other hand, “refers to a single holistic entity without conceptually distinguished aspects” (*ibid*). This distinction can be graphically represented as follows (cf. *ibid*):

![Graphical Representation](image)
The dotted line in Fig. 3 refers to the single entity with two participant roles (A and B, i.e. Initiator and Endpoint), while in Fig. 4 the lower degree of conceptual differentiation between the initiating and endpoint entities is represented by the single circle.

Another major theoretical standpoint, derived from Manney (2000), maintains that middleness is notionally characterized either by a non-initiative emotional response or a spontaneous change of state, whereas prototypical reflexivity, subsuming co-reference between two nominal arguments, “invokes a scene in which an individual acts on itself, intentionally or otherwise” (MANNEY, 2000, p. 214). It is also possible to observe a steady decrease in agentivity and volition, while the semantic roles occupying the subject position. Figures 5 and 6 summarize the prototypical features of reflexivity and middleness as they have been defined here:
In view of the above, we are proposing the following pair of sentences in English and Serbo-Croat to express a prototypical reflexive segment of reality as defined above:

/1/ I cut myself.

*Posekao sam se.*

cut-PART: ACT SING MASC be-PRES:1SG se-REFL.

The prototypicality of this situation type can be confirmed in all the major characteristics, including the notion of energy expenditure confirmed as a defining feature of the dynamic situation types. Moreover, it also confirms Kemmer's claim (1994, p. 207) that reflexivity maintains that conceptual separation of the Initiator and the Endpoint. Namely, /1/ can be notionally elaborated further in order to pinpoint both Initiator and Endpoint, in spite of the fact that their coreferentiality is fully maintained. Thus, a slightly rephrased version of /1/ can perhaps read:
I cut my finger.

Posekao sam prst.
cut-PART: ACT SING MASC be-PRES:1SG finger-ACC

Prototypical middleness, on the other hand, presented graphically in Fig. 4 and described as notionally clustering around two main ideas – a noninitiative emotional response and a spontaneous change of state – can be exemplified in the following pair of sentences:

Grandpa tires easily.

Deda se lako zamara.
grandpa-NOM se-MIDDLE easily tire-PRES:3SG

The prototypicality of this situation type notionally captures both major semantic domains of middleness. Moreover, it particularly emphasizes the concept of ‘change through time’ (cf. ZHANG, 1995, p. 27; also LANGACKER, 1987), with no detectable energy expenditure, internal or external, confirming the stative status of this situation type.

The above framework was used as an overall platform of reference, tertium comparationis, in a corpus based contrastive analysis that examined the ways of grammaticalization of the idea of reflexivity and middleness in Serbo-Croat and English. The performed analysis was monodirectional, starting from Serbo-Croat (confining itself only to the so-called ‘se-verbs’, verbs followed by the morpheme ‘se’, a multifunctional grammatical device) and observing their translation equivalents in English. Following the results of the analyses done so far (cf. IVI, 1962; DJORDJEVI, 1989; KURTEŠ, 2003; 2005), ten
different classes of Serbo-Croat se-forms were identified according to their form and the function they perform. The existing taxonomy was tested against the proposed model of analysis and the results showed that there was a clearly discernible semantic core denoting prototypical reflexivity grammaticalized by those se-instances known as ‘pure reflexive verbs’ (cf. /1/), while the se-forms denoting reciprocity were notionally clustering around it:

/3/ Valim o se.
love-PRES:1PL se-RECIP
We love each other.

Two basic notions of prototypical middleness, on the other hand, were found to be grammaticalized by means of the instances exemplified by the se-forms known as ‘quasi-reflexive verbs’ (cf. /2/), where the morpheme se simply stands as a verbal affix, exuding no detectable meaning on its own:

/4/ Drvo se suši.
tree-NOM se-MIDDLE wither-PRES:3SG
The tree is withering away.

Other se-manifestations embraced by the middle semantics involved some notional passives (cf. /5/), as well as some modal (cf. /6/) and impersonal structures (cf. /7/):

---

3 The notion of reciprocity is not treated separately in this context, as it is taken as a manifestation semantically embraced by the scope of reflexivity.
The book reads easily.

I feel sleepy.

People talk about that.

Reflexivity in English, on the other hand, is canonically represented by pure reflexives, verbs followed by the reflexive pronoun, which are, however, to be found relatively rarely in Modern English. Reflexiva tantum are now to be found mostly in literary discourse. These are verbs such as bethink, comport, perjure, pique, bemean, bestir, betake, etc. It is important to notice, though, that they are all semantically intransitive.

There is also a very strong tendency to omit the reflexive pronoun (cf. /8/) or to replace it with the personal pronoun or other non-standard forms (cf./9/-/10/), which is more commonly found in informal styles of communication. For example:

I overslept.

I've bought me a new car.

Had a pint after work to cheer self up.
The process of absorption of the reflexive pronoun can also be observed in a large number of verbs. At the same time, absorption of the reflexive pronoun is one of the main processes of conversion of transitives into intransitives. Such are the verbs *behave, dress, hide, oversleep, overeat, rest, wash, bathe, etc.* The same applies to the omission of the reciprocal pronoun, e.g. after verbs such as *kiss, meet, hug, embrace, marry, etc.*, or, for example, *disagree, separate, unite*, where the omission can hardly be traced any longer.

Very often the usage of the reflexive pronoun will give the sentence a metaphorical or figurative reading or simply make it stylistically marked. For example:

/11/ He felt disgusted.
/11a/ He felt himself disgraced.
/12/ He surrendered to the enemy.
/12a/ He surrendered himself to despair. (cf. SCHIBSBYE, 1967, p. 199)

When speaking about middleness in English, grammatical literature primarily focuses on the forms **NP V NP** alternating with **NP V (PP)** forms (LEVIN, 1993, p. 25), which is the situation when the subject of the intransitive verb semantically has the same role as the object of the transitive verb, or, in other words, the surface subject of the intransitive verb has been derived from the underlying object (cf. *ibid*). Here are some examples:
/13/ The butcher cuts the meat.
/13a/ The meat cuts easily.
/14/ Janet broke the crystal.
/14a/ Crystal breaks easily. *(ibid., 26)*

It is also interesting to notice that middles are very frequently used in certain discourses, such as advertising or information technology, where the idea of an agent, although not explicitly specified, is necessary for the implication of the verb, “(...) it is impossible to disregard the role played by the agent, for it is he who makes it possible for the subject to realize its proper function. (...)” *(HATCHER, 1943, p. 12).* For example:

/15/ Couches convert easily into beds.
/16/ Bed-lamps attach and adjust easily.
/17/ The clock winds easily.
/18/ This MS DOS programme has terminated.
/19/ The icon will copy to your desktop.
/20/ The menu will repeat.
3. Results of the analysis and their applicability

The results of the analysis have shown that in Serbo-Croat there is a clearly discernible semantic core denoting prototypical reflexivity grammatically encoded by the pure reflexive (and reciprocal) verbs (e.g. /1/, /3/). Two basic notions of prototypical middleness, on the other hand, are grammatically encoded by means of the quasi-reflexive verbs (e.g. /2/, /4/). Other instances, denoting, passive, modal and impersonal semantics (e.g. /5/, /6/, /7/), were found to be within the scope of middleness as defined above. Their English translation equivalents have shown a number of grammatical manifestations capable of conveying the meaning of the observed notions. Clearly they include structures with the reflexive and reciprocal pronouns as that semantic core denoting prototypical reflexivity. Verbal intransitivity, however, has proved to be the grammatical category comfortably accommodating the majority of instances expressing prototypical middleness. More precisely, mutative and inchoative semantics seemed to be occupying the central position in this context, rendering into, and being rendered from, the majority of the Serbo-Croat se-instances denoting prototypical middleness. Other relevant categories include passive, some impersonal structures, and, finally, that NP V PP type of English ‘middle’ structures, that stand further away from prototypical Serbo-Croat middleness as defined here.

The relevance and applicability of the proposed analytical model can be primarily observed in a wider applied linguistic context. Let us briefly focus on two disciplines only, theory of translation and language teaching methodology.

Theory of translation and contrastive analysis have maintained their close links, established by the very fact that
they are both branches of contrastive linguistics. They are not only tangent disciplines, but in many aspects overlapping and complementary, relying substantially on each other’s findings. On this occasion, we would like to point out one specific aspect of theory of translation that can find this type of contrastive analysis particularly useful. Namely, theory of translation focusing on literary semantics, more specifically on the ways in which the grammatical devices used to achieve a certain stylistic effect in the original text can be used in the translated version to convey the same meaning and produce the same effect. Contrastive analysis, by paying more attention to stylistic and pragmatic aspects of interlingual analysis, can provide invaluable resources for future research in this particular field of theory of translation.

Language teaching methodology, on the other hand, substantially relied on the results of contrastive analysis, as well as error analysis, particularly during the 1960s and, to a lesser degree, later on. The goals and aims of foreign language learning of that time established the grammar-translation teaching method as dominant, while, at the same time, contrastive linguistics focused almost exclusively on the various levels of language structure in its analysis, putting aside any extralinguistic and pragmatic factors that might have been worth looking at. However, with the introduction of the concept of communicative competence (HYMES, 1974) and the redefinition of the goals of the foreign language learning more in accordance with the needs of the modern

---

4 Here we are particularly referring to works and studies by Adamson (1994), Banfield (1982), Levenston – Sonnenschein (1986), Toolan (1990), Uspensky (1973), Vinay – Darbelnet (1995); also Kurteš (1998c).

5 Of course, Lado’s seminal work *Linguistics across cultures* published in 1957 is a well-known exception to this pattern.
world, teaching methods adopted a more communicative approach, emphasizing the cultural context that a human language finds itself embedded in. Pedagogical materials started being supported by communicative grammars and course books designed for learners with specific first language backgrounds, focusing particularly on culturally specific issues and putting the relevant language sequences in their naturally occurring pragmatic context. Again, the preparation of such materials would be much less successful without the readily available results of modern contrastive studies that took various extralinguistic factors as their platform of reference in the process of analysis. We believe that the results of the analysis performed and presented here can be taken as an example substantiating the above claim.

Finally, but equally importantly, let us once again reiterate the relevance of contrastive analysis and its proper place in 21st century linguistics. Why contrastive analysis? Can its relevance in a wider linguistic context be justified at all?

Our main argument remains that the vitality and resilience of the discipline have been confirmed not only by its vast research potentialities that resulted in numerous contrastive research projects and successful application of their results in the whole spectrum of study fields, but also

---

6 Simoes (1992) and Böhmerová (1996) should be particularly singled out in this context.

by its openness and adaptability to new methodologies and interdisciplinary approaches. Moreover, we maintain that contrastive linguistics should see its significant chance to take a much more prominent place in 21st century linguistics (cf. also Kurteš 2005; to appear). Namely, the 20th century witnessed the creation of some very opposing models of linguistic analysis, such as relativist vs. universalist, synchronic vs. diachronic, psychological vs. social, to name but a few, that almost obliterated the common ground defining linguistics as an integral study field. Contrastive linguistics, however, has a unique opportunity to fill in this gap and give a new impact to the development of linguistic thought. In particular, its capability to draw on and analyse data from all levels and perspectives of linguistic or interdisciplinary fields, such as phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, discourse, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, etc, should grant it a central place and integrating role among linguistic studies in the new century.

References


HATCHER, A. G. “Mr Howard amuses easily”. In Modern Language Notes. Vol. 58, 1. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 8-17; also available at the URL: http://uk.jstor.org/journals/01496611.html. 1943.


_____ “Grammaticalization of reflexivity and middleness: a model of interlingual analysis”, paper presented at the conference *New Reflections on Grammaticalization 2*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, 4-6


