

Goran Milić

Josip Juraj Strossmayer University

Faculty of Philosophy

Osijek

Petrović, Elvira, ed.: *The First 25 Years of English Studies in Osijek. Anthology*. Osijek: Josip Juraj Strossmayer University, Faculty of Education, 2002. viii + 209 pp.

As the title suggests, the present volume marks the occasion of 25 years of English studies at the then-Faculty of Education. The Faculty has since “evolved” into the Faculty of Philosophy and the Department of English Language and Literature has developed into the School of English Studies, consisting of three separate departments.

The latter reorganization is prefigured in the present volume, which is a compilation of papers by former and present members of the Department. Consequently, it covers three components of the curriculum at the Department and reflects the academic interests of its members. The areas include linguistics, literature and ELT methodology. As the editor (the then-Head of Department) clearly emphasizes in the Preface, the number and distribution of articles in the anthology is aimed at reflecting two commitments the Department strives for: equal attention paid to these respective fields of study in general and, consequently, lack of any favouritism in their treatment.

This commitment has influenced the organization of the Anthology. Rather than being ordered in thematic sections mirroring the above fields, the contributions are arranged by the alphabetic order of the authors, which has resulted in the mix of academic fields and topics of interest. Granted, one could find this kind of organization erratic and difficult to follow, especially if interested in a particular field. However, even a cursory look at the titles of papers in the table of contents at the very beginning of the volume makes it very easy to distinguish between the different areas of study.

For present purposes, we will “override” the original organization of the volume and group the contributions according to the above mentioned fields. The volume thus features five contributions in the field of linguistics, four papers concerned with language teaching and four papers dealing with English literature. We will pay more attention to the former two and gloss over the papers having to do with literary issues.

As lucky (and rather convenient) chance would have it, the first of the five contributions in linguistics seems to pretty much prefigure the general orientation and preference of the linguistic community at the Department, viz. a pronounced interest in the cognitive-linguistic paradigm. In his contribution *Metonymy in a contrastive valency lexicon: A stumbling or a building block* Mario Brdar starts off with a practical aim in mind. By specifically concentrating on the issue of semantic compatibility between predicative expression and their arguments, Brdar suggests metonymy as a means of organizing dictionary entries in a more compact, streamlined way without a decrease in their reliability and exhaustiveness. His case study of the collocational range of a single predicative adjective *compatible* is the ground for the introduction of conceptual metonymy as a powerful organizing principle which helps organize what is often a seemingly heterogeneous group of arguments by providing internal motivation for their choice. Brdar draws on the nature of metonymy as a 'mental shortcut' to conceptual entities which are not readily accessible and argues for the existence of a 'hidden logical compatibility' achieved via the metonymic link which speakers automatically establish between the overtly expressed argument as a metonymic vehicle and the unexpressed, but implied metonymic target. According to Brdar, the metonymy in question, PHYSICAL-OBJECT-FOR-MENTAL-OBJECT metonymy is a special case of PART-FOR-WHOLE metonymy. Furthermore, Brdar observes that the abstract target accessed by the above metonymy greatly coincides with the domains figuring highly in dictionary definitions of the adjective (beliefs, ideas). This helps him provide a rationale for a better status of some items as arguments of *compatible* by positing that the metonymic vehicle and the intended target belong to the same domain or ICM, or at least to closely related ones in a domain matrix. The link can either become conventionalized and serves as a salient element used to refer to the appropriate abstract target within the ICM, or it arises locally in the appropriate context. Brdar pushes the idea further and suggests that a similar metonymy PHYSICAL-OBJECT-FOR-ACTIVITY can be seen as a special case of the PARTICIPANT-FOR-ACTIVITY, which can in turn be used to account for the collocational ranges of adjectives such as *fond*, *sorry*, *happy* or *critical* where the arguments provide mental access to an activity as a target. Brdar concludes this well-motivated and thought-provoking study by contending for the role and inclusion of metonymy as an organizing principle into the organization of dictionary entries, which should result in a solution of three kinds of problems pointed out at the beginning (having to do with limitations in space and illustration of word meanings). However, the most interesting proposal arising from the study seems to be the expansion of the generative potential of the dictionary enabled by the inclusion of proposed metonymic principles, which should enable users to safely predict some novel combinations not recorded in the dictionary.

Gabrijela Buljan's contribution *Red and white in language and mind* takes up Langacker's (2000) usage based model and his stand on metaphor as an abstraction of a common schema in two domains motivated by metonymy as its conceptual prerequisite in an attempt to examine the complexity of conceptual categories as reflected in language. Buljan starts from the basic assumption that conceptual categories can either remain rather schematic if labelled by underspecified adjectives, or achieve additional nuances of meaning by entering into relationships with other domains via metonymic and metaphorical relationships. The ultimate goal of her analysis of different types of expressions with the two colours in Croatian, English and German is aimed at demonstrating that the conventional linguistic units red and white (as well as other colour terms) carry a lot more semantic context than can be fleshed out by structural-semantic analysis. By analysing a host of linguistic expressions ranging from novel, on-line construals created for immediate purposes (*red like a can of Coke*) to highly conventionalized ones such as *red as blood/ crven kao krv/blutrot*, Buljan posits two types of processes motivating these linguistic expressions and providing access to different conceptual readings. It is argued that these processes motivate the degree to which the three languages overlap. An analysis of comparative construction *as red/white as NP* leads Buljan to distinguish between 'purely metaphorical expressions' and metaphorical expressions characterized by an additional metonymic layer active in the conceptualization of the target domain. Buljan's comparative analysis shows that the former (which are according to Langacker inherently underlain by metonymy) show a greater degree of difference between languages, even if their source domain in general seem to elaborate a common schema (living organisms). The source domain in these expressions sanctions the exact hue of the relevant colour, but its choice is often restricted to what is culturally or experientially salient, or hinges on one individual salient aspect (courtesy of inherent metonymy). Buljan notes a greater degree of overlap between languages in metaphorical linguistic expressions characterized by an additional metonymic mapping which has to be activated to arrive at the interpretation of expressions like *red in the face/Sva se zajapurila/Röte stieg ihr ins Gesicht*. The additional meaning is inferred by our interpretation of the redness of the face as an instance of the EFFECT-FOR-CAUSE metonymy which enters in the final stages of categorization and enables us to activate additional knowledge structures related to (different) emotions on the basis of physiological effects, thus affecting the implicit whole of the target domain through a motivated choice of the source domain. The grounding of metonymy on the latter (and bodily experience in general) makes it a potent motivating factor for this kind of conceptual reading and a plausible explanation for the greater overlap between languages in this respect. However, Buljan is also careful to note the limiting factors and exceptions such as physical racial differences in the conceptualization of salient physical consequences of emotions.

On the whole, Buljan's contribution is an interesting account of motivation behind a group of linguistic expressions and succeeds in its attempt to establish itself as a more comprehensive means of analysis than structural semantic approaches.

The third contribution with the common denominator of Cognitive linguistics is the one by Tanja Gradečak- Erdeljić who addresses the issue of *Metaphoric motivation for collocations creation/activation verb+ nouns in English*. Gradečak-Erdeljić adopts the cognitive view of lexical units being motivated by certain metaphoric links to counter the traditional view of recognizing and categorizing collocations. After presenting the traditional view of collocations, she points out its shortcomings, the major one being a degree of arbitrariness in the recognition of collocations and their categorization. The author suggests metaphor as a very powerful tool in organizing the lexicon and a way out of collocational restrictions. She suggests the conceptual metaphor as a motivating factor in the construction and use of this type of collocations, more precisely in the choice of the nominal part of the collocation. When coupled with a verb, this NP is supposed to convey the idea of something being created made by different processes. The author also addresses the first part of the collocation by acknowledging its contribution to the whole construction. Gradečak-Erdeljić starts from the assumption that different creation/activation verbs used in the construction are derived by semantic extension from the light verb *make* as a 'central model.' She notes the 'bland taste' of expressions involving the verb *make* in comparison to some verbs gained by extension from this verb (*build, cook, draw* etc.) and argues for the role of these semantically extended verbs in attracting the abstractness of the concepts involved and enhancing the metaphorical profile of the construction. Furthermore, she also points to the nuances in meaning between the expressions to *build a relationship* and to *forge a relationship* and makes the case for the crucial role of additional semantic components 'donated' by the verb, by positing a model of conceptual integration consisting of 3 input spaces, two of them being the source and target domain of ABSTRACT IDEAS ARE OBJECTS, responsible for the nominal part and the third one being the verbal part of the collocation. The partial mapping of qualities associated with the verb *to forge* (to invest a lot of time and hard work) and the meaning of the lexical item *relationship* contributes to the emergent meaning of the construction as a whole. Finally, Gradečak-Erdeljić suggests that we can predict the profile of lexical units entering this type of collocation which makes these units a cohesive tool in discourse and text and postulates conceptual integration for other light verbs (*give, make, have, take*) by using the metaphor ACTIONS ARE TRANSFERS as the extension of the above metaphor in similar constructions.

Gradečak-Erdeljić's proposal presents another interesting attempt at finding an underlying factor motivating a wide range of linguistic expressions by means of cognitive mechanisms. One must also greet her idea of using such ideas and insights as a potential way of explaining these constructions to both native speakers and ESL students. As such it echoes the idea of practical application of academic findings in the actual teaching process already hinted at by Brdar, but common to many other contributions to the volume.

Syntax is represented in the Anthology by Dubravko Kučanda's paper on *Middle constructions in English and Croatian*. The author takes up the issues of English sentences such as *The book would not translate well.* and *The stone moves*, as examples of the so-called *middles* and *ergatives*, respectively. These constructions, which are often discussed together in English syntax and subsumed under the term 'reflexives' in Croatian, have a common denominator in that the verb in both constructions is the same as in the transitive constructions with the same verb, yet the subject in *middles* and *ergatives* does not have the Agent role. In what follows, the author takes great care to delimit the two notions and focuses on the latter constructions. His analysis of syntactic and semantic differences of middles in English and Croatian is preceded by an in-depth and often critical (re-)examination of a number of issues related to these constructions as treated in the frameworks of different theories (GB theory, Functional Grammar). Kučanda pays special attention to the difficulties and misconceptions regarding their characterization and classification (especially within the GB framework) and specifies the conditions of their use.

In what follows, Kučanda provides some cross-linguistically attested morpho-syntactic and semantic properties as a basis for the comparison between English and Croatian constructions. With respect to the latter, he introduces the issue of the Croatian reflexive marker *se* which turns out to be of great importance for the analysis of Croatian counterparts of middle constructions. After pointing to lively discussions on the matter between the adherents of FG (Dik and Gvozdanović (1981) Gvozdanović (1986)) and himself (Kučanda 1984, 1987) in the 1980s, Kučanda argues for a distinction between 2 types of constructions with *se*, based on their morphology and the different degrees of transitivity of sentences they occur in.

Finally, a thorough analysis of English and Croatian middles based on the above mentioned (seven) formal and distributional properties of middles proposed by Abraham (1988) leads Kučanda to suggest that the same process is at work in both languages, despite some differences. In both languages middle constructions feature AGENT demotion and PATIENT promotion to topic. However, Kučanda's careful analysis of differences between the two languages

will probably be of more interest and use to scholars interested in the field. They can undoubtedly profit from the insights presented in this paper.

The paper by Marija Omazić, *Modifications of phraseological units in English-presentation of a project*, has since grown into a PhD dissertation. Judging from the presentation at hand the dissertation is bound to whet the appetite of all scholars interested in the field. Omazić presents a clear case for an in-depth analysis of ad hoc modifications of phraseological units and the creative use of PUs by focusing on three major research questions: the issue of structural patterns involved in the process, the mechanisms underlying it and the types of registers they occur in. The author aims to develop a framework within which they can be best described and strives to show that this is not just an interesting fringe phenomenon to be left at the periphery of phraseology. Quite the contrary, the goal of her study based on the British National Corpus and her own collection of PU modifications is to begin building a picture of their preferred patterns in English.

The strongest point of Omazić's proposed study is an impeccably clear organization of the research design into eight clear steps ranging from an extensive analysis of previous studies to a clear presentation of her own (pilot) studies, and of preliminary findings as answers to the research questions. The author is insightful enough to acknowledge various difficulties the subject matter brings about and tackles them very systematically. The 'practical' problems include difficulties with identifying cases of modification in corpus searches due to their unpredictability and sorting out relevant examples by careful building of queries. The author uses examples from her pilot studies to illustrate these points and offers ways of solving them. Omazić's inclusion of pilot studies aimed at educating herself on what she could expect (so that she could make them more refined and successful) is by all means commendable.

The results of these preliminary analyses are also very useful, even though the author is careful to acknowledge the limited corpus the research is based on. In terms of the first research question, the findings show a pronounced preference towards lexical modification as a pattern used in creating PU modifications, at the expense of other possible structures (syntagmatic and paradigmatic modification, structural modification). In terms of underlying mechanisms, the author offers three mechanisms (cognitive mechanisms, knowledge of the language, figurative patterns) and notes a great degree of overlap between them as a common problem not only in this field of research, but in others (especially in metaphor and metonymy research). Finally, in terms of register 11 alternatives cropped up, ranging from journalism to web language, but their statistical values

(which are offered for most of the above research questions) have been left out because some of these registers do not appear in the BNC.

Omazić concludes her presentation with insightful suggestions for further research and enumerates possible implications of her research for other fields of research. Her study certainly speaks in favour of further research in the field and the guidelines she suggests should turn out to be most useful.

The first contribution in the field of ELT methodology is one by Romana Čačija entitled *Extensive Reading and Book reports as Extracurricular ESL Activities*. As the title suggests, the author aims to introduce the practice of extensive reading, or 'pleasure reading' as a technique of second language acquisition beneficial to both students and teachers in a number of ways. The author convincingly argues for the inclusion of this part of ELT methodology into the EFL curriculum by enumerating its many advantages. Some of these include the reduction of teachers' demands on students, fostering of students reading habits by letting them pick their preferred book and enjoy the story (as opposed to reading focusing on the close study of short texts aimed at lexical, semantic and syntactic analysis or translation). Extensive reading enables students to derive pleasure from reading and should thus result in a myriad of positive effects.

The author contributes to the popularization of extensive reading by outlining the extracurricular activity of 'reader interview', which she herself implements as a part of her course in English language practice classes in the Department. This well-organized activity involves a number of phases described in great detail and asks for continuous active involvement of both students and the teacher. Roles and tasks of both are clearly presented. The activity puts some minor basic constraints in 'technical terms' (number of pages required, the form of the written part) and on basic requirements (reading the book, writing a summary, an essay and a vocabulary list), but allows students great freedom of choice in view of the former two. The benefits of the process seem to be manifold. By reading the book, writing the required assignments and having an informal interview with the teacher (including the self-correction of possible errors made in the written part) the student gets to actively use three of four basic skills and the organization of the course does not seem to imply any significant psychological pressure on the student, which promises to live up to the advantages and goals advocated by the author. As for the teacher, the activity does not seem to put too much strain on her/him, but provides an extra chance for an insight both into the progress/difficulties of individual students and into their needs and interests in general. The author attends to the latter by providing a list of students' preferences (400 of them) in terms of genre as well as their English proficiency which

could serve as a guideline for anyone decides to implement this rewarding activity.

The contribution by Elvira Petrović—*The best way of learning and teaching foreign languages - Is there one?*—provides a comprehensive, first-hand overview of the developments in the field of language teaching methodology both in the 20th century in general and in Croatia, starting with the advent of the Reform movement with its methodology based on insights from the linguistic theory as a reaction against the long-standing tradition of approaches favouring deductive learning and learning long vocabulary lists while ignoring pronunciation. By drawing on her rich personal experience both as a learner and a teacher of English in Croatia, Petrović presents and examines the effects, advantages and shortcomings of this approach and others following it with a special emphasis on the state-of-affairs in Croatia. The author's experience and role as one of the founders of ESL study programmes in the country enabled her to follow the developments in the field in practice, i.e. by implementing them often in difficult conditions due to the lack of proper technical equipment, appropriate textbooks and exposure of students to native speakers.

In the light of such circumstances and further developments, the author takes a stand towards different approaches to TOEFL such as audio-lingual and audio-visual approaches and LSP, labelling the former as a “blind alley” for neglecting the intellectual abilities of learners. Furthermore, her analysis of the advantages of a new approach to language teaching (based on insights from linguistics) emphasizes some new problems arising from these improved, still not foolproof approaches. Petrović answers the question she posed in the title by arguing for a separate consideration of various different situations noting that a universal syllabus which would be appropriate in all situations can hardly be developed. She, therefore, argues for a focus on the development of learning strategies and materials which would make use of each learner's own abilities, which would enable students to continue using them on their own. Petrović aptly ends her paper with the corollary of the above mentioned argument, i.e. the idea that future teachers should select their own sources in designing their syllabus and not teach as they were taught by their teachers.

Petrović's ideas seem to be prefigured and implemented in the best possible way by Višnja Pavičić in her paper, *Vocabulary learning strategies used by university students*, which precedes Prof. Petrović's paper. Pavičić sets out to analyse a number of issues related to vocabulary learning strategies as a complex group of actions, behaviours, steps and techniques used by students to discover and process lexical items which should help them enhance their comprehension, storing or retention of these information. The definition itself reflects the cur-

rent, much needed shift of emphasis from the teacher to the student. After presenting the finer points of VLSs and related findings, Pavičić goes on to analyse the difference in the choice and degree of use of VLSs by two groups of students in different learning situations i.e. with different goals, needs and exposure to the study of English. The author's statistical analysis of the use of 54 VLSs obtained by a questionnaire from students of English language and Economics (respectively) was aimed at establishing if the former students use a wider variety of VLSs to approach lexical learning, as a result of their needs with respect to their field of study. Students of economics were expected to use less (elaborate) VLSs as a result of different demands imposed on them by their course of studies, different approaches and goals related to the learning of ESL. The results of the analysis speak largely in favour of the author's hypothesis that the choice of strategy depends on the concrete language tasks and students' goals. Students of English showed their preference for more numerous and elaborate types of VLSs (*attending to form, guessing from context, association with known terms in English* etc.) and their consistent use, whereas students of economics tended to use VLSs which suffice for their immediate purposes and goals (such as *looking up Croatian translations in the bilingual dictionary, asking for translation* etc.). Pavičić puts the tendency of both groups to use the VLS of *Watching films and TV programmes, Listening to songs in English* down to the typical interests of this age group and labels them as extremely important, but warns of their negative side having to do with incidental, uncontrolled learning.

These and other results of this worthwhile (albeit limited) study have met their goal of revealing and classifying the general strategic approaches to vocabulary learning of two groups of university students, which the author sees as a first step towards any strategy training plan. Furthermore, the author's call for further research finds its justification in the methodological implications of the study. These include a host of benefits, such as the raising of learner's awareness of all existing VLSs and of their ability to choose the most appropriate ones. The author's numerous suggestions concerning the possibilities of implementation of VLSs and the role of the teacher in the process deserve careful consideration and praise.

The final paper concerning the field of ELT methodology is one by Jadranka Zlomisljić on *The Relationship Of Preference, Knowledge And Usage Of American And British English*. The author follows the commendable practice and tradition observed in two other contributions to the volume (Čačija, Pavičić), namely the research on ELT-related issues involving students at the home institution. Zlomisljić takes up the issue of British English and American English as two dominant variants in ELT which students frequently mix in their usage. She offers some reasons for the apparent preference of American English over Brit-

ish English (which is supposed to be the norm in ELT in Croatia) and sets out to test if this preference coincides with the students' performance, i.e. if they really use the variety they prefer. The test was based on a three-part questionnaire made up of closed-type questions about their preferences concerning the two varieties, a translation task (translating words from Croatian into the two varieties as well as indicating their first choice) and a paraphrase of words used in both BrE and AmE but with a different meaning, followed by an indication of their first choice. The McNemar test showed a better knowledge and more frequent usage of American English, regardless of the students' preference. The study brings two issues to light: the above mentioned preference of AmE, and a tendency for students to mix the two varieties often without being too aware of the differences. The author ascribes both tendencies to the students' exposure to other sources, predominately to the globalization of mass media. Furthermore, she rightfully emphasizes the emergence of this mixed English as a *lingua franca* and calls for further analysis needed to examine its role in ELT.

As we have already mentioned, the Anthology also features four contributions from the field of literature: Boris Berić's *Windows XP of visual epistemology and devotional poetry*, Sanja Brekalo's *The construction of national identity in Sir Walter Scott's Waverly*, G. Myrl Jones's *The Kentucky circle and re-reading American culture*, and Sanja Runtić's *The Awakening's awakening: Routes toward American female literary tradition*. The diversity of topics and the quality of these contributions is bound to raise interest of scholars in the field.

On the whole, the present volume fully succeeds in its attempt of presenting a snapshot of the Department's activities. The range and quality of the articles reflect the lively academic atmosphere that the Department as a whole has been striving for. Finally, one must commend the pronounced commitment of many authors to practical implementation of their findings in the actual process of teaching English as a foreign language, as well as the inclusion of students at their home institution in their research. These two initiatives are bound to vouch for further development of the Department and further success in both academic work and the training of future teachers and scholars in many years to come.

References:

- Dik, Simon C., Jadranka Gvozdanović (1981). Subject and Object in Serbo-Croatian. Hoekstra, Teun, Harry van den Hulst, Michael Moortgat, eds. *Perspectives on Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris, 21-39.
- Gvozdanović, Jadranka (1986). Subject and Object in Serbo-Croatian and evidence for linguistic theories. *Filologija* 14: 97-108.

- Kučanda, Dubravko (1984). On Subject assignment in Serbo-Croatian within the framework of Functional Grammar. *Lingua* 64: 99-114.
- Kučanda, Dubravko (1987). 'True' reflexives and pseudo-reflexives with particular reference to Serbo-Croatian. Auwera, Johan van der, Louis Goossens, eds. *Ins and Outs of the Predication*. Dordrecht: Foris, 77-92.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2000). A dynamic usage-based model. Barlow, Michael, Suzanne Kemmer, eds. *Usage-Based Models of Language*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 1-63.