

THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCES IN THE USE OF ENGLISH AND SERBIAN NONFINITE RELATIVE CLAUSES¹

The paper describes and analyses two language systems, English and Serbian, particularly one segment of the grammar of both languages – nonfinite relative clauses. The methods used are contrastive analysis, description and classification. Both English and Serbian nonfinite relative clauses function as postnominal modifiers. They are contrasted with the purpose of determining their similarities and differences. English nonfinite relative clauses are constructed using all nonfinite verb forms (infinitive, *-ing* and *-ed* verb forms) in active and passive voices and progressive, perfect and simple aspects, whereas Serbian nonfinite relative clauses are constructed using *radni glagolski pridev* (active participle) and *trpni glagolski pridev* (passive participle). These two Serbian nonfinite verb forms are limited in their use in nonfinite relative clauses depending on various grammatical aspects. The differences between the uses of English and Serbian nonfinite relative clauses are identified concerning the frequency of use and variety of meanings.

Key words: contrastive analysis, nonfinite relative clauses, nonfinite verb forms, syntactic functions, postnominal modifier

1. Introduction

1.1. The subject and goal of the analysis

This paper analyses and describes nonfinite relative clauses in their function of postnominal modifiers. English and Serbian nonfinite relative clauses are described, contrasted and classified in an attempt to contribute to the contrastive studies of the English and Serbian grammars. This contrastive analysis emphasises the similarities and differences observed in the form and function of English and Serbian nonfinite relative clauses; in cases where no direct correspondence in the structure is possible, a structure other than a nonfinite relative clause is proposed.

¹ Prepared as a part of the project *Modern Trends in Researching English Linguistics and Anglophone Literature and Culture*, conducted at the University of Niš – Faculty of Philosophy (No. 183/1-16-1-01).

2. Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework of this paper is contrastive analysis based on the description of the two language systems as presented in numerous English and Serbian grammar books and relevant articles.

2.1. Contrastive analysis

Contrastive analysis (CA) is understood as the linguistic procedure based on the systematic and detailed comparison and contrast of two languages with the purpose of defining their explicit similarities and differences (Đorđević 1987: 9), i.e. the method applied by linguists to determine the aspects which are common to two languages or which represent the point of distinction between them (Filipović 1975: 13).

The view that contrasting languages has a theoretical and practical aspect (Johansson and Hofland, 1994: 25) indicates that CA is a very important linguistic discipline: it contributes to the further improvement of the linguistic theory and facilitates foreign language teaching and learning (Jie, 2008; Wang, 2008). Selinker (2008: 96) states that the pedagogical materials resulting from contrastive analysis are based on the assumptions that CA defines language as a habit and L2 learning as the establishment of a new set of habits, that the major source of errors is the native language owing to the differences between the L1 and the L2 so that “what is dissimilar between two languages is what must be learned” (Selinker, 2008: 96, 97).

Thus, two versions of contrastive analysis emerge: the *strong* and the *weak* one. The proponents of the strong version of contrastive analysis insist on predicting the difficulties that might appear during L2 learning and the relevant teaching methods based on the comparison of phonological and grammatical properties of both the native and target language. Those who support the weak version of contrastive analysis endeavour to explore those errors that students consistently make while studying an L2, so as to define the similarities and differences between their mother tongue and the foreign/second language they are studying.

2.2 English and Serbian sources

The theoretical analysis of the similarities and differences in the use of English and Serbian nonfinite relative clauses is based on their description in reference grammar books of both languages, as well as in relevant articles and studies.

Considering the form and function of English nonfinite relative clauses, the following sources are referred to: *Essentials of English Grammar* by Jespersen (1933), *Communicate What You Mean* by Pollock (1982), *A Comprehensive*

Grammar of the English Language by Quirk *et al.* (1985), *Relative Clauses in Serbo-Croatian in Comparison with English* by Browne (1986), *Understanding and Using English Grammar* by Azar (1989), *The Oxford English Grammar* by Greenbaum (1996), *Gramatika engleskog jezika* by Đorđević (1996), *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* by Biber *et al.* (1999), *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* by Huddleston & Pullum (2002) and *Syntax for EFL Students* by Mišić Ilić (2008), unpublished doctoral dissertation *Analiza grešaka pri upotrebi nefinitnih klauza kod studenata Anglistike* by Janković (2016).

As regards the form and function of Serbian relative nonfinite clauses, the following sources are considered: *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik (gramatički sistemi i književnojezička norma)* by Stevanović (1979), *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik (gramatički sistemi i književnojezička norma), II Sintaksa* by Stevanović (1991), *Gramatika srpskog jezika* by Stanojčić and Popović (1992), *Relativna rečenica* by Kordić (1995), *Sintaksa savremenoga srpskog jezika: Prosta rečenica* by Piper *et al.* (2005), *Gramatika srpskog jezika za strance* by Mrazović (2009), *Gramatika srpskog književnog jezika* by Stanojčić (2010), *Normativna gramatika srpskog jezika* by Piper and Klajn (2013), unpublished doctoral dissertation *Relativne rečenice sa foričkim supstantivnim antecedentom u savremenom srpskom jeziku* by Rusimović (2014).

The ensuing chapters describe English and Serbian nonfinite relative clauses with reference to the theoretical framework and the author's pilot study conducted as part of her doctoral thesis research.

3. English nonfinite relative clauses

3.1 English relative clauses

English grammar sources use the terms **relative**, **adjective** or **adjectival** clauses to denote the dependent clauses functioning as postnominal modifiers. The very term **relative** defines them as the clauses closely connected and related to the noun they modify. They are the constituent part of the noun phrase and are positioned after the head word (noun) and in case of sentential relatives, after the independent clause that they modify. They are finite and nonfinite, depending on the form of the verb in the relative clause. The paper focuses on nonfinite relative clauses; therefore, finite relative clauses will not be discussed.

3.1.1. Nonfinite relative clauses

There are three types of these relative clauses: *-ing* relative clauses, *-ed* relative clauses and infinitive relative clauses. The following example sentences illustrate each of the aforementioned types (sentences 1a, 2a, 3a) and their finite paraphrases (sentences 1b, 2b, 3b).

- (1a) **The book lying on the table** belonged to my sister.
- (1b) **The book that (which) was lying on the table** belonged to my sister.
- (2a) They helped **the man injured in the accident**.
- (2b) They helped **the man who was injured in the accident**.
- (3a) They recommended **the house to rent**.
- (3b) They recommended **the house which we should rent**.

The following section discusses the three types of nonfinite relative clauses and their functions in greater detail.

3.1.1.1. *-ing* relative clauses

This type of nonfinite relative clauses functions as a postnominal modifier but the correspondence between these nonfinite clauses and the finite relative clauses is restricted to those relative clauses in which the relative pronoun is the subject. Also, both restrictive and nonrestrictive finite relative clauses can be reduced using *-ing* nonfinite relative clauses. As in the above examples, sentences *a* contain nonfinite relative clauses, whereas sentences *b* contain their finite paraphrases.

- (4a) We saw the dog **barking incessantly**.
- (4b) We saw the dog **which/that was barking incessantly**.
- (5a) The woman, **listening attentively**, was obviously interested in the lecture.
- (5b) The woman, **who was listening attentively**, was obviously interested in the lecture.
- (6a) They got hold of the reports **containing some confidential information**.
- (6b) They got hold of the reports **which/that contained some confidential information**.
- (7a) They showed me the man **resembling my father**.
- (7b) They showed me the man **who/that resembled my father**.

The example sentences (6a) and (7a) demonstrate that *-ing* relative clauses are used in English to reduce finite relative clauses whose finite verb forms are not only in progressive aspect but also belong to the group of stative verbs, i.e. the verbs that do not normally have progressive aspect and convey states, feelings, opinions, beliefs or possession (**resemble, contain, seem, ...**) (Quirk et al., 1985: 1263). “It must be emphasized that *-ing* forms in postmodifying clauses should not be seen as abbreviated progressive forms in relative clauses. Stative verbs, for instance, which cannot have the progressive in the finite verb phrase, can appear in participial form” (ibid). Moreover, it is thought that there are “sharp constraints upon aspect expression in the participle clauses used in postmodification” (Quirk et al., 1985: 1263). Namely, the aforementioned examples **containing some confidential information** and **resembling my father** obviously cannot represent the progressive. This neutralisation of the aspectual contrast can be seen in the following examples:

(8a) I know the man **working behind the desk**.

(8b) I know the man **who works/is working behind the desk**.

The perfective aspect cannot usually be expressed in *-ing* relative clauses. Actually, although being grammatically correct, such structures sound unnatural as far as the use of English is concerned, and are thus used quite rarely:

(9a) The reporter **having interviewed the famous tennis player** was my best friend.

(9b) The reporter **who had interviewed the famous tennis player** was my best friend.

(10a) All persons **having participated in that project** are under suspicion.

(10b) All persons **who participated in that project** are under suspicion.

Sentences like (9a) are uncommon in English. However, the perfective aspect of the *-ing* relative clause is more acceptable in those sentences in which the head of the noun phrase, which is modified by the nonfinite relative clause, is an indefinite noun phrase, as illustrated by the example sentence (10a).

3.1.1.2. *-ed* relative clauses

These nonfinite relative clauses reduce restrictive or nonrestrictive relative clauses whose relative pronoun functions as a subject. They are inherently passive in meaning, so that the *-ed* participle is closely related to the passive verb form in the relative clause and reduces only the relative clauses containing a transitive finite verb:

(11a) The concert hall **opened last week** is enormous.

(11b) The concert hall **that/which was opened last week** is enormous.

Exceptionally, these nonfinite relative clauses can reduce the finite relative clause containing an intransitive verb preceded by a certain adverbial (either a single-word adverbial or an adverbial phrase):

(12a) A man **just gone to India** told me about it.

(12b) A man **who has just gone to India** told me about it.

“This phenomenon is related to our ability also to premodify nouns with participles which, unless themselves premodified, can only postmodify” (Quirk et al., 1985: 1265).

However, unlike *-ing* relative clauses, *-ed* relative clauses clearly express the difference between the simple and progressive aspects:

(13a) The road **built last year** is full of holes.

(13b) The road **which was built last year** is full of holes.

(14a) The road **being built these days** will be quite safe.

(14b) The road **which is being built these days** will be quite safe.

3.1.1.3. Infinitive relative clauses

The covert relative pronoun in infinitive relative clauses can not only be the subject of the clause, as is the case with *-ing* and *-ed* clauses, but it can also function as the object or adverbial and sometimes even the complement (Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 1265). All these functions are illustrated in the following example sentences:

The relative pronoun as the subject

(15a) The man **to call you** is certainly Mr Smith.

(15b) The man **who/that will call you** is certainly Mr Smith.

The relative pronoun as the object

(16a) The place (**for you**) **to visit on your holiday** is certainly that island.

(16b) The place **which/that you should visit** is certainly that island.

The relative pronoun as the adverbial

(17a) The right time (**for us**) **to go there** is mid-July.

(17b) The right time **at which/when we should go** is mid-July.

The relative pronoun as the complement

(18a) The thing (**for you**) **to accept immediately** is a complete breakup.

(18b) **The thing that anyone will accept** is a complete breakup.

The aforementioned example sentences demonstrate that infinitive relative clauses can have an explicit subject of their own, but also an implicit one which is understood from the context, and is thus omissible. Moreover, formal English relative clauses allow for the relative pronoun to be positioned before the infinitive relative clause, this propensity being of a limited extent and referring only to the relative pronoun functioning as an adverbial. Therefore, various sentence structures are acceptable:

(19) Relative+infinitive clause: The time **when to go there** is mid-July.

(20) Preposition+relative+infinitive clause: The time **at which to go there** is mid-July.

(21) Omitted relative +infinitive clause: The time **to go there** is mid-July.

As regards aspectual qualities, infinitive relative clauses are not as limited as *-ing* and *-ed* relative clauses.

(22a) The man **to call** is Mr Smith.

(22b) The man **whom you should call** is Mr Smith.

(23a) The man **to be meeting this afternoon** is Mr Smith.

(23b) The man **whom you are meeting this afternoon** is Mr Smith.

(24a) The man **to have visited** is Mr Smith.

(24b) The man **whom we were expected to visit** is Mr Smith.

Infinitive relative clauses may be both active and passive. The following example sentences illustrate a wide range of implied tenses (time) and modality, expressed by this type of nonfinite relative clauses:

(25a) She is the best candidate **to be chosen by the committee.**

(25b) She is the best candidate **that will be (is going to be) chosen by the committee.** (implied future tense or intention)

(26a) The rare birds **to be found in the tropics are explored by many biologists.**

(26b) The rare birds **that can be found in the tropics are explored by many biologists.** (implied modality (possibility, likeliness), but also the fact that rare birds are found in the tropics)

(27a) The rules **to be obeyed in the barracks are very strict.**

(27b) The rules **that must/should be obeyed in the barracks are very strict.** (implied modality (command or suggestion))

Infinitive relative clauses cannot be passive if the subject of this type of clauses is introduced using *for*:

(28) The person **for them to consult** is Mr Smith. (The passive sentence would be incorrect: The person **for them to be consulted** is Mr Smith.)

The postmodification of infinitive clauses is evident in the structures beginning with **there**, functioning as the subject of the independent clause, and being both active and passive:

(29) There are so many places **to visit / to be visited while on holiday in Greece.**

Infinitive relative clauses function as postnominal modifiers which reduce nonrestrictive finite relative clauses, but only in those cases in which the relative pronoun is the subject, and then they can take only the passive form:

(30a) That reporter, **to be seen daily in the National Library**, has devoted his life to fair journalism.

(30b) That reporter, **who can be seen daily in the National Library**, has devoted his life to fair journalism.

4. Serbian nonfinite relative clauses

4.1. Serbian relative clauses

Serbian relative clauses refer to and describe the noun, noun phrase or pronoun, and function as nominal modifiers: **attributes** and **appositives**. The relative clause functions as an attribute when it is used to “restrict and thus identify the meaning of the noun unit” (Stanojčić and Popović, 1992: 318), i.e. when it has a restrictive function in relation to the nominal word(s) it modifies. The relative clauses which provide some additional but not essential information regarding the noun phrase they modify function as appositives.

4.1.1. Nonfinite relative clauses

For the purposes of this paper, the English term *nonfinite relative clauses* will be used throughout the analysis of the Serbian structures containing nonfinite verb forms whose meanings correspond to those of nonfinite relative clauses in English. There are five types of nonfinite verb forms in the Serbian language: infinitive (*infinitiv*), present participle (*glagolski prilog sadašnji*), perfect participle (*glagolski prilog prošli*), active participle (*radni glagolski pridev*) and passive participle (*trpni glagolski pridev*). However, the active participle and the passive participle are the only Serbian nonfinite verb forms used to construct nonfinite relative clauses. The following section discusses Serbian nonfinite relative clauses in greater detail.

4.1.1.1. Nonfinite relative clauses with the active participle (*radni glagolski pridev*)

This nonfinite verb form is primarily used to construct complex verb tenses in Serbian. A number of such participles created from intransitive verbs can be used as proper adjectives that modify the noun phrase. Only the active participles constructed from intransitive verbs expressing state (in the perfective aspect) can be used as proper adjectives, and even then they are used only in a restricted number of cases when showing a visibly altered state or characteristic of the noun phrase modified: **omršavele ruke**, **potamnelo lice**, **opalo lišće**, **zardjali nož**, **promukli glas**, etc. In certain cases, this attributive use of the active participle implies a restricted meaning as well. For example, it is possible to say **pali borac**, thus describing a soldier who was killed in a war. However, it is grammatically unacceptable to say **pali čovek** in place of **čovek koji je pao** (niz stepenice) (Klajn, 2005: 127, 219; Stanojčić, 2010: 383). In such cases, the finite relative clause is used instead of the active participle.

The active participle is used to construct nonfinite relative clauses that can be used to paraphrase both restrictive and nonrestrictive finite relative clauses containing the intransitive and imperfective main verb denoting state:

(31) Lišće **opalo po putu i požutelo na vetru** prostiralo se unedogled.

(32) Dugo su posmatrali njegovo lice, **potamnelo od sunca**.

4.1.1.2. Nonfinite relative clauses with the passive participle (*trpni glagolski pridev*)

The passive participle is used to construct passive structures in Serbian. Thus, it is formed only from transitive verbs, but not from all of them since a number of commonly used verbs, such as **imati**, **značiti**, **razumeti**, **mrzeti**, etc, cannot create the passive participle (Klajn, 2005: 127; Stanojčić, 2010: 384). The passive participle can be used as a proper adjective in the syntactic function of the nominal modifier (Stanojčić and Popović, 1992: 405): *Bežao je preko livada sa **uplakanim** detetom pored sebe. Dugo su pričali o **izmenjenim***

uslovima poslovanja. In this function, the passive participle has its declination, short and long forms and has comparative and superlative forms, just as any other gradable adjective in Serbian. Certain adjectives, such as **razuzdan**, **zabačen**, **usiljen**, **uklet**, etc., are nowadays more frequently used and more easily recognised than the verbs they derived from (Klajn, 2005: 218).

It is precisely this property that qualifies the passive participle to be used in the construction of nonfinite relative clauses that can paraphrase finite relative clauses in the syntactic function of the nominal modifier. Such nonfinite structures can paraphrase both restrictive and nonrestrictive finite relative clauses, but only those whose finite verb form is a transitive verb:

(33) To je kuća **srušena i opljačkana tokom bombardovanja**.

(34) Živeo je dugo u toj rupi, **zaklonjenoj od pogleda sa staza iznad**, i rukom dohvatao vodu.

5. English and serbian nonfinite relative clauses in contrast

The analysis of English and Serbian nonfinite relative clauses has led to certain conclusions. Namely, there have been detected numerous similarities and differences.

In English, all types of nonfinite verb forms (*-ing*, *-ed* and infinitive) are used to construct nonfinite relative clauses, whereas the situation is different in Serbian. Out of five nonfinite verb forms, two can be used in nonfinite relative clauses with some restrictions discussed in the previous chapter.

Regarding English *-ing* relative clauses, it is concluded that no counterparts can be constructed in Serbian using either the present participle or any other nonfinite verb form. However, it is possible to construct sentences in which the present participle is a proper adjective, not a constituent part of the nonfinite relative clause, but a single word that functions as a nominal modifier: **zalazeće** sunce, **leteće** bube, etc. Yet, these phrases are never expanded into nonfinite clauses.

The following example sentences illustrate the previously mentioned distinction. A sentence like (35a) is grammatically correct in English:

(35a) She watched the sun **setting in the west**.

The following example sentence is incorrect as far as the grammar of the Serbian language is concerned:

(*35b) Posmatrala je sunce **zalazeći na zapadu**.

This sentence is grammatically incorrect in Serbian since it contains a nonfinite clause with the present participle which does not have the syntactic

function of the postnominal modifier, as is the case in the corresponding English nonfinite relative clause. There are two options in the Serbian language:

The finite relative clause:

(35c) Posmatrala je sunce **koje/kako zalazi na zapadu**.

The noun phrase consisting of the adjective in the form of the present participle derived from the verb **zalaziti**, which has the syntactic function of the modifier:

(35d) Posmatrala je **zalazeće sunce na zapadu**.

According to Kordić, the present participle and relative clauses are two competitive grammatical categories, and the diachronic study of Slavic languages proves that one category expanded at the expense of the other one. “U starijim razdobljima svi slavenski jezici imali su četiri participa (aktiv i pasiv prezenta, aktiv i pasiv preterita). ... Paralelno sa slabljenjem upotrebe pojedinih participa u slavenskim jezicima povećavala se upotreba relativnih rečenica. To znači da je relativna rečenica nadomještala one participle koji su joj bili funkcionalno ekvivalentni. ... Budući da su kod participa neutralizirane opozicije jednog *verbum finituma*, particip je dvosmisleniji – određene informacije koje relativnom rečenicom bivaju eksplicitno izražene mogu se kad je umjesto nje upotrijebljen particip samo još iz konteksta rekonstruisati” (Kordić, 1995: 277-278). In the English language, nonfinite *-ing* clauses are used quite frequently in the formal written style where they show the property of the present participle to reduce finite relative clauses and thus condense the meaning – due to its being short, it is more suitable than the finite relative clause for the construction of complex structures and expression of complex ideas (Baglajwska-Miglus, 1991: 76 in Kordić, 278).

The linguistic analysis of the texts in Croatian dating from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries shows a great difference in the use of the present participle and finite relative clauses (Kordić, 279). The situation is almost identical in Serbian-speaking communities. According to Badurina-Stipčević (1992: 33, 41-42, 63-64 in Kordić, 279), the use of the present participle in the syntactic function of the nominal modifier was much more frequent than today: *vrana sedeća, meju nima gledajućima i čudećima se*, etc. Such structures sound obsolete and archaic in the contemporary Serbian language and would be unacceptable and replaced by finite relative clauses: *vrana koja sedi; među njima, koji gledaju i čude se*, etc.

The present participle, being a nonfinite verb form, is normally not declined in the Serbian language. However, the last decades have witnessed the emergence of numerous adjectives ending in *-ći*, constructed from the verb base. This trend has evolved under the influence of foreign languages, English in particular. Their nominative singular masculine form is identical

to the present participle, but these adjectives have a full declension as any other adjective in Serbian, indicating case, number and gender: *tekući, tekuća, tekuće; tekući, tekuće, tekuća*. Besides this one, very common adjectives formed in this way are *rastući, leteći, viseći, odlučujući, umirujući*, etc. These are not proper participles since they express a constant characteristic or quality of the concept modified and cannot paraphrase the finite relative clause in the same syntactic function of the postnominal modifier. Therefore, it is quite acceptable to say *neidentifikovani leteći objekat*, whereas it is ungrammatical to say **u letećem avionu*. In this case, the finite relative clause has to be used:

(36) Putovali smo avionom **koji leti preko Atlantika**.

Here are some more interesting examples:

(36a) Reku smo prešli preko **visećeg mosta**.

(*36b) U dnevnoj sobi je bila **viseća slika na zidu**.

Example sentence (36a) contains the present participle which has become a proper adjective with its declension since it expresses a constant characteristic of the noun it modifies, *most*. Example sentence (*36b) is ungrammatical since the present participle *viseći* constructed from the verb *visiti* does not denote any constant or immutable quality of the noun modified, and consequently the finite relative clause has to be used:

(36c) U dnevnoj sobi je bila slika **koja visi na zidu**.

A number of these adjectives are used exclusively with certain nouns in fixed expressions, such as: *olakšavajuće okolnosti, osiguravajući zavod, uveličavajuće staklo, drečeca boja, stojeći stav*, etc. (Klajn, 2005: 190). Some of them are recognised as proper adjectives since their verb base is almost undetectable: *moguć, nemoguć, idući, sledeći*. Being proper adjectives, they can form corresponding adverbs: *Uputio mi je užasavajuće pogrdne reči*.

The comparison of English *-ed* relative clauses with Serbian nonfinite relative clauses containing the active participle and the passive participle shows that these structures are used as postnominal modifiers in both languages, and that they can paraphrase finite relative clauses, both restrictive and nonrestrictive. However, the difference is obvious considering the variety of use. English *-ed* clauses are used to paraphrase finite relative clauses whose finite verb forms can show various tenses, as well as both voices, active and passive:

(37) We saw the trees **grown (that had grown) green in spring** while we were driving along the road.

(38a) This is the book **written (which was written) by a famous bestselling author**.

In Serbian, nonfinite relative clauses with the active and passive participles are used as postnominal modifiers. Yet, their use is restricted, since the active participle is derived only from perfective, intransitive verbs expressing state and the passive participle is formed from transitive verbs:

(39) Govorio je glasom **promuklim od pevanja na proslavi**.

(40) Gledali su u sliku **uramljenu prošle nedelje**.

Besides, passive constructions are used in particular registers in Serbian, mainly in the scientific and academic registers. Also, sometimes it is unnatural, although not ungrammatical, to construct passive in Serbian.

(38b) Ovo je knjiga **napisana (koja je napisana) od strane čuvenog pisca bestselera**.

In such cases, the active voice is preferred, which requires the use of the finite relative clause:

(38c) Ovo je knjiga **koju je napisao čuveni pisac bestselera**.

English infinitive relative clauses are used as postnominal modifiers. In the Serbian language, the infinitive is the nonfinite verb form which is primarily used in the syntactic function of the complement. However, the structure containing the impersonal forms of the verbs *trebati*, *valjati* or *vredeti* and the infinitive (Stevanović, 1991: 763) can be regarded as the structure most closely related to the meaning expressed by the English infinitive relative clause.

(39a) This is the building **to demolish**.

(39b) Ovo je zgrada **koju bi trebalo/treba srušiti**.

(40a) This is the hotel **in which/where to stay in summer**.

(40b) Ovo je hotel **u kome/gde valja boraviti tokom leta**.

(41a) They told us **when to hand in the exam paper**.

(41b) Rekli su nam vreme **do kada bi trebalo predati ispit**.

It is worth mentioning that, under the influence of English, the infinitive is often used after prepositions, which is against the grammar rules of the Serbian language:

(*42a) Ovo je kafa **za poneti**.

This is an incorrect sentence, yet, unfortunately, one commonly heard in formal and informal Serbian, both spoken and written. Such examples, although almost unrecognised as incorrect by the majority of people whose mother tongue is Serbian, may represent a deviation from the standards of Serbian. Every language is an open system, prone to changes and an influx of new words from other languages. These alterations are not so significant as long as they remain at the level of vocabulary. However, the moment the

influences from a foreign language, English in this case, start permeating the structure of Serbian, changing it to the point of simple inaccuracy, the result is then a new, hybrid language, neither Serbian nor English, often disparagingly termed Serblish (see more in Prčić, 2005: 50-89, 207-227). The example sentence (*42a) should be rephrased in the following way:

(42b) Ovo je kafa **koju možete poneti/za nošenje**.

Therefore, the option is to use either the structure containing the impersonal verb form and the infinitive or the prepositional phrase.

6. Conclusion

This paper describes and analyses English and Serbian nonfinite relative clauses with the purpose of identifying similarities and differences in the use of these clauses. The goal of this comparison and contrast research of one segment of the grammars of the two languages is to determine the degree of correspondence between English and Serbian nonfinite relative clauses. This analysis is an attempt to make a modest contribution to the contrastive study of English and Serbian nonfinite relative clauses because they are not only described but also contrasted. The common feature of English and Serbian nonfinite relative clauses is their syntactic function of the postnominal modifier. The main differences are identified in relation to the frequency of use and variety of meanings.

English nonfinite relative clauses can be constructed using all types of nonfinite verb forms (*-ing*, *-ed* and infinitive clauses) in the active and passive voice, in the progressive, perfective and simple aspects. Serbian nonfinite relative clauses are created from two types of nonfinite verb forms (the active participle and the passive participle). Their use is restricted and depends on various grammatical aspects, as it has been already described in great detail. Serbian nonfinite relative clauses with the active participle can be constructed only when the active participle is formed from intransitive or imperfective verbs denoting state. Those with the passive participle are constructed only when this nonfinite verb form is created from the transitive verb.

This analysis may have pedagogical implications, especially for university students of the English language – future language professionals. The next step in the contrastive analysis of English and Serbian relative clauses could encompass the comparison and contrast of both finite and nonfinite relative clauses.

References

- Azar, B. 1989. *Understanding and Using English Grammar*, 3rd edition. New Jersey, Prentice Hall Regents, Eaglewood Cliffs.
- Browne, Wayles. 1986. *Relative clauses in Serbo-Croatian in comparison with English*. Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics, University of Zagreb.
- Biber, D., Johanson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. and Finegan, E.. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London, Longman.
- Dorđević, R. 1987. *Uvod u kontrastiranje jezika*. Beograd, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
- Dorđević, R. 1996. *Gramatika engleskog jezika*. Beograd, Čigoja štampa.
- Fries, C. 1945. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Michigan, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- Huddleston, R. & G. K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Janković, Lj. 2016. *Analiza grešaka pri upotrebi nefinitnih klauza kod studenata Anglistike*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Filozofski fakultet, Niš.
- Jespersen, O. 1933. *Essentials of English Grammar*. London, Routledge.
- Johansson, S. And K. Hofland. 1994. "Towards and English-Norwegian parallel corpus". In U. Fries, G. Tottie and P. Schneider (eds.). *Creating and using English language corpora*. Amsterdam and Atlandta, GA: Rodopi, 25–37.
- Klajn, I. 2005. *Gramatika srpskog jezika*. Beograd, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
- Kordić, S. 1995. *Relativna rečenica*. Zagreb, Matica hrvatska i Hrvatsko filološko društvo.
- Krzyszowski, T. P., (1985), "The so-called 'sign theory' as the first method in contrastive linguistics", U. Pieper and G. Stickel (eds.), *Studia linguistica diachronica et synchronica*, Mouton De Gruyler, Berlin, pp. 485-501.
- Mišić Ilić, B. 2008. *Syntax for EFL Students*. Niš, Filozofski fakultet Niš.
- Mrazović, P. 2009. *Gramatika srpskog jezika za strance*. Sremski Karlovc, Novi Sad, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.
- Piper, P., I. Antonić, V. Ružić, S. Tanasić, Lj. Popović, B. Tošović. 2005. *Sintaksa savremenoga srpskog jezika. Prosta rečenica*. U redakciji Milke Ivić. Beograd, Institut za srpski jezik SANU, Beogradska knjiga, Matica srpska.
- Piper, P., I. Klajn. 2013. *Normativna gramatika srpskog jezika*. Novi sad, Matica srpska.
- Pollock, C. 1982. *Communicate What You Mean*. New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Eaglewood Hill.
- Prčić, T. 2005. *Engleski u srpskom*. Novi Sad, Zmaj.
- Rusimović, T. 2014. *Relativne rečenice sa foričkim supstantivnim antecedentom u savremenom srpskom jeziku*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, FILUM, Kragujevac.

- Quirk, R. et al. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, Longman
- Selinker, L. 2008. *Second Language Acquisition*. New York and London, Routledge.
- Selinker, L. Susan M. Gass (eds.). 1992. *Language Transfer in Language Learning: Revised Edition*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Stanojčić, Ž. 2010. *Gramatika srpskog književnog jezika*. Beograd, Kreativni centar.
- Stanojčić, Ž., i Lj. Popović. 1992. *Gramatika srpskog jezika. Udžbenik za I, II, III i IV razred srednje škole*. Beograd, Novi Sad, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika.
- Stevanović, M. 1979. *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik (gramatički sistemi i književnojezička norma) I i II*, drugo izdanje. Beograd, Naučna knjiga.
- Stevanović, M. 1991. *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik (gramatički sistemi i književnojezička norma) II Sintaksa*, peto izdanje. Beograd, Naučna knjiga.
- Wang, P. 2008. "Exploring Errors in Target Language Learning and Use: Practice Meets Theory". In *English Language Teaching, Vol. I, No. 2*. 182–187.

Ljiljana Janković

TEORIJSKA ANALIZA RAZLIKA U UPOTREBI NEFINITNIH RELATIVNIH KLAUZA U ENGLEKOM I SRPSKOM JEZIKU

U ovom radu se opisuju dva jezička sistema, engleski i srpski, posebno jedan segment gramatike ova dva jezika – nefinitne relativne klauze. Koriste se metoda kontrastivne analize, deskripcija i klasifikacija. Nefinitne relativne klauze imaju istu sintaksičku funkciju u oba jezika – one su postnominalni modifikatori. U ovom radu se ove klauze kontrastiraju kako bi se utvrdile sličnosti i razlike. Nefinitne relativne klauze se u engleskom jeziku mogu konstruisati upotrebom svih nefinitnih glagolskih oblika (infinitive, *-ing* i *-ed* glagolski oblici) u aktivnom ili pasivnom stanju kao i u svim aspektima. U srpskom jeziku se nefinitne relativne klauze mogu konstruisati upotrebom radnog glagolskog prideva i trpnog glagolskog prideva. Ova dva nefinitna glagolska oblika imaju ograničenu upotrebu u nefinitnim relativnim klauzama, što je uslovljeno gramatičkim pravilima srpskog jezika. Razlike u upotrebi nefinitnih relativnih klauza u engleskom i srpskom jeziku identifikovane su u pogledu učestalosti njihove upotrebe i raznovrsnosti značenja koja izražavaju.

Ključne reči: kontrastivna analiza, nefinitne relativne klauze, nefinitni glagolski oblici, sintakstičke funkcije, postnominalni modifikatori

