

SYNTACTIC AMBIGUITY AND THE TEACHING OF WRITTEN  
ENGLISH TO ADVANCED POLISH LEARNERS — NORM AND  
USAGE

ELŻBIETA MUSKAT-TABAKOWSKA

*The Jagellonian University of Cracow*

Third in a series presented under the common heading "Syntactic ambiguity and the teaching of written English to advanced Polish learners", this paper is a continuation of my earlier investigation. Consequently, the analysis is based upon the assumptions which were outlined in part one (Muskat-Tabakowska 1974) and then reformulated in part two (Muskat-Tabakowska 1975).

Parts one and two dealt with some selected examples of syntactic ambiguity in written work produced by advanced Polish learners of English (students of the Department of English of the Jagellonian University). However, while carrying out an analysis of these materials I have been more frequently coming across instances of what will be most adequately described as 'extralingual ambiguity', i.e., discrepancy between the meaning of a given sentence as intended by the writer and the meaning actually imposed upon the reader, due to an intervening error of some sort. Such sentences may easily seem grammatical and will be often considered fully acceptable; the misunderstanding is discovered and the error responsible for its occurrence revealed only after the relevant context (linguistic or extralinguistic) has been analysed.

The existence of such camouflaged errors has long been acknowledged; cf. for example S. P. Corder (1967: 168): "an utterance which is superficially non-deviant is not evidence of a mastery of the language systems which would generate it in a native speaker, since such an utterance must be semantically related to the situational context".

A preliminary analysis of the sample materials makes it possible to formulate the following hypotheses:

1. on advanced stages of language learning 'extralingual ambiguity'

on the level of syntax is directly related to high syntactic complexity of sentences;

2. certain types of 'extralingual ambiguity' are systematic, i.e., they reflect the learner's transitional competence;
3. 'extralingual ambiguity' can occur as a result of the interference of the learner's mother tongue or/and excessive normative teaching;
4. 'extralingual ambiguity', like other types of linguistic error, provides a profitable starting point for contrastive analysis, which, though partially discredited as a reliable method of error prediction, can be legitimately applied when looking for an explanation of errors that have been actually attested. It can also supply valuable insights concerning remedial procedures.

The sample analysis presented informally further in this paper resulted from purely practical considerations. (1) below comes from a summary of an essay on life in tropical countries; it was written by a first year student and seems fairly typical for written performance of Polish learners after a standard four-year secondary school course of English:

1. People can get everything, which is necessary to live without hard work.

Apart from its semantic contents, syntactic considerations imply the following interpretation of (1). The presence of the comma which terminates the main clause excludes the possibility of interpreting the relative clause as a case of restrictive modification on the second NP (cf. \**People can get everything, that is necessary to...*); for a discussion, see e.g. Stockwell et al. (1968:448). Moreover, the possibility of nonrestrictive NP modification is ruled out for semantic reasons, as it seems to be an inherent property of the universal pronoun *everything* that it cannot constitute "the head [that] can be viewed as a unique or as a member of a class that has been independently identified" — a condition necessary for nonrestrictive modification (Quirk et al. 1972:858). Hence, the relative clause in (1) can be unambiguously interpreted as a nonrestrictive appositive with a sentential antecedent (cf. Quirk et al. 1972:871 ff., Stockwell et al. 1968:448).

Thus, (1) could be considered grammatical only if semantically equivalent to, e.g.

- 1a. People can get everything, and being able to get everything is necessary to live without hard work.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Semantic acceptability of (1a), however, has been questioned by most of my native informants, who considered the sentence to be 'rather meaningless, with a comma placed like this'.

Yet it is only the consideration of the *intended* meaning of (1) (easily inferred from the argument presented in the original essay on which the student's summary was based) which makes it obvious that the sentence is in fact deviant in several ways. These errors become evident when one compares (1) to (1b) below, which is the (contextually) correct version of (1), offered by one of my British informants:

- 1b. People can, without hard work, get everything  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{that} \\ \text{which} \end{array} \right\}$  they need to live on.

One could list the following errors:

1. Awkward wording. *Everything which is necessary* was classified as 'a rather mild error of style'. Though judged as an example of interference from Polish, alone it was not considered to affect the acceptability of (1).
2. One-word verb used instead of the corresponding prepositional verb. Correction was considered necessary in view of the semantic import of (1): the obviously implied meaning being 'to depend upon for support rather than meaning 'to be alive' in a more general sense. It may be worth noticing at this point that using the prepositional verb would also reduce the possibility of ambiguous reference of the adverbial phrase in (1a), cf.:

- 1c. People can get everything that they need to live on without hard work.

which is a less formal version of (1b), acceptable in spoken English.

Errors listed under 1. and 2. are both errors of style and, as such, they are par excellence token- and not type-oriented (for a discussion, see Muskat-Tabakowska 1974). Thus they cannot be easily classified as belonging to one or other category of systematic errors.

3. Faulty insertion of the comma, which separates the main clause from the restrictive relative clause — an error which appears frequently in the written work of students of junior years. Apart from sentences which, due to an analogous error, become clearly ungrammatical, cf.:

2. \*Machines were the most important things, that ancient man had not got.
3. \*An allophone is a phone-type, which does not differentiate between meanings of words.

I found in the students' compositions instances of sentences whose constituent clauses might be interpreted (semantically) as alternatively restrictive or nonrestrictive, eg.:

<sup>2</sup> All examples — unless specified otherwise — come from précis pieces written by my first year students.

4. ? Ancient man had not got machines, which do nearly everything for mankind in our times.,

cf.:

4a. Ancient man had not got (the) machines that do nearly everything for mankind in our times.

4. Ambiguous reference of the adverbial phrase *without hard work*: misinterpretation results from associating the adjunct with the right-most VP in (1a), which accounts for the possibility of postulating the existence of

1d. People live without hard work as  
an element of the deep structure of (1a).

Although no regular attempt was made to collect a representative sample of material which might confirm this hypothesis, it seems that potential ambiguity, resulting from unclear reference of adjuncts, is frequent in written performance of Polish students of English, who tend to produce sentences of high syntactic complexity (i.e., including numerous VP's). If those instances go unnoticed, it is because potential ambiguity is frequently resolved by extralinguistic factors, cf., e.g.:

5. Modern man has numerous advantages which his ancestors lacked due to the use of machines.

(5) is considered nonambiguous as semantic considerations prevail over the requirements of syntactic rules; compare, however, the ambiguous

5a. Mr X has numerous advantages which Mr Z lacks due to his old age.

It must be admitted that -- in cases in which semantic import of a sentence ensures its unambiguous interpretation -- this type of potential ambiguity can be also found in the written language of native speakers, especially in informal, journalistic prose, e.g.:

6. If I put every project question I'm asked on the page, there'd be no room for anything else (from the 'Problem Page' in a girls' magazine).

Without the help of contextual (and/or situational) factors, however, this type of ambiguity may go unnoticed only because syntactic requirements impose upon the reader a single -- though not the intended one! -- interpretation, cf.:

7. People find peculiar satisfaction in creating something beautiful in every detail.

the intended meaning of which is shown in

7a. People find peculiar satisfaction in creating a complete and finished article which is beautiful.

It must be noticed that the surface structure of (1), (2) and (3) allows for a spoken realization which would render all these sentences grammatical; it is only the function of the commas in evoking the unacceptable intonation patterns that makes them erroneous. On the other hand, (4), (5) and (7) would have to be disambiguated in speech, as division into tone groups implies the choice between restrictive and nonrestrictive modification (in (4)), as well as an indication of the reference of adverbial phrases (in (5) and (7)).

Consequently, errors listed under (3) and (4) above might result either from transfer of errors of intonation from spoken to written language, or else from inadequate knowledge of the conventional aspect of punctuation rules. Moreover, in their written representation, (4), (5) and (7) are erroneous only because of what I propose to call 'extralinguistic ambiguity'. From the point of view of a language teacher this type of errors is especially difficult to cope with: the learner must be made aware of the fact that what is ungrammatical and/or unacceptable in a given context, is a legitimate product of applying a certain set of rules, and would -- under different circumstances -- be explicitly required. Simple provision of a contextually correct form can in such cases lead to 'unteaching' of a rule which had already become part of the learner's competence, or else, to blocking the way towards his forming and testing of new hypotheses.

As the problem seemed rather typical of the students' performance, it became an incentive for further practical investigation, which resulted in the following observations.

Interestingly enough, with senior students the instances of 'surplus' commas in sentences including restrictive relative clauses was noticed to decrease rapidly, and -- what is more -- inadequate punctuation (i.e., the lack of commas which should cut off nonrestrictive modifiers or subordinate clauses of other types) became much more frequent. A pilot study of a set of 46 written summaries produced by first year students as a part of the requirements for the annual examination in practical use of English resulted in the following data:

	Table 1 <sup>3</sup>
The total number of 'comma mistakes'	89
Inadequate punctuation (omission of commas)	76
Superfluous punctuation (unnecessary commas)	13

<sup>3</sup> These results agree with an interesting statistical report presented in Wyatt (1973:177); this might suggest a more universal character of this type of error.

Next, the punctuation of relative clauses was investigated (only those were considered which were nonreduced and had the relative pronoun overtly present in the surface structure). The results are given below:

Table 2

	With commas	With incomplete punctuation	Without commas
Restrictive* clauses	3	—	10
Nonrestrictive clauses	8	2	16
Total	11	2	26

\* Relatively small number of restrictive clauses results from the fact that cases involving deletion of relative pronoun were not considered.

Out of the total of 39 relative clauses, 18 were punctuated correctly (8 nonrestrictive and 10 restrictive). Among the remaining 21 there were only 3 cases of superfluous punctuation of restrictive clauses and 16 cases of omission of commas that cut off nonrestrictive clauses. In the 2 cases of 'incomplete' punctuation the second of the two commas was missing.

Thus, out of the 13 cases of superfluous punctuation (Table 1) only 3 were cases of restrictive relative clauses. By no means could it be maintained that these results have a definite scientific value. Any statistic study would require a more systematic investigation and more sophisticated methods<sup>4</sup>. I think it justified, however, to use the data as a basis for formulating the following hypotheses:

1. at the less advanced stages of learning the rules<sup>5</sup> of punctuation of restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clauses show a high degree of interference from Polish;

<sup>4</sup> For example, I am fully aware of the fact that the choice of structures used in my materials was to a certain extent imposed upon the students by the contents and structure of the original passage.

<sup>5</sup> As far as one can apply this term to a set of what would be more justifiably called 'tendencies' or 'regularities' (cf. e.g. Quirk et al. 1972: 1060). In the case presently under consideration, however, the term 'rule' can be legitimately applied, as the use of comma is today in a great extent conventional (even though in Polish it is more so than in English; cf. Przylibscy 1973: 22). In the present discussion I make no reference to other punctuation marks — the dashes and parentheses — which can be used instead of commas to cut off nonrestrictive relative clauses. The same alternative exists in Polish, though the comma is more frequently chosen in both languages. Whatever the choice, however, my basic argument remains unchanged.

4. ? Ancient man had not got machines, which do nearly everything for mankind in our times.,  
cf.:

4a. Ancient man had not got (the) machines that do nearly everything for mankind in our times.

4. Ambiguous reference of the adverbial phrase *without hard work*: misinterpretation results from associating the adjunct with the right-most VP in (1a), which accounts for the possibility of postulating the existence of

1d. People live without hard work as  
an element of the deep structure of (1a).

Although no regular attempt was made to collect a representative sample of material which might confirm this hypothesis, it seems that potential ambiguity, resulting from unclear reference of adjuncts, is frequent in written performance of Polish students of English, who tend to produce sentences of high syntactic complexity (i.e., including numerous VP's). If those instances go unnoticed, it is because potential ambiguity is frequently resolved by extralinguistic factors, cf., e.g.:

5. Modern man has numerous advantages which his ancestors lacked due to the use of machines.

(5) is considered nonambiguous as semantic considerations prevail over the requirements of syntactic rules; compare, however, the ambiguous

5a. Mr X has numerous advantages which Mr Z lacks due to his old age.

It must be admitted that — in cases in which semantic import of a sentence ensures its unambiguous interpretation — this type of potential ambiguity can be also found in the written language of native speakers, especially in informal, journalistic prose, e.g.:

6. If I put every project question I'm asked on the page, there'd be no room for anything else (from the 'Problem Page' in a girls' magazine).

Without the help of contextual (and/or situational) factors, however, this type of ambiguity may go unnoticed only because syntactic requirements impose upon the reader a single — though not the intended one! — interpretation, cf.:

7. People find peculiar satisfaction in creating something beautiful in every detail.

the intended meaning of which is shown in

Yet it is only the consideration of the *intended* meaning of (1) (easily inferred from the argument presented in the original essay on which the student's summary was based) which makes it obvious that the sentence is in fact deviant in several ways. These errors become evident when one compares (1) to (1b) below, which is the (contextually) correct version of (1), offered by one of my British informants:

1b. People can, without hard work, get everything  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{that} \\ \text{which} \end{array} \right\}$  they need to live on.

One could list the following errors:

1. Awkward wording. *Everything which is necessary* was classified as 'a rather mild error of style'. Though judged as an example of interference from Polish, alone it was not considered to affect the acceptability of (1).
2. One-word verb used instead of the corresponding prepositional verb. Correction was considered necessary in view of the semantic import of (1): the obviously implied meaning being 'to depend upon for support rather than meaning 'to be alive' in a more general sense. It may be worth noticing at this point that using the prepositional verb would also reduce the possibility of ambiguous reference of the adverbial phrase in (1a), cf.:

1c. People can get everything that they need to live on without hard work. which is a less formal version of (1b), acceptable in spoken English.

Errors listed under 1. and 2. are both errors of style and, as such, they are par excellence token- and not type-oriented (for a discussion, see Muskat-Tabakowska 1974). Thus they cannot be easily classified as belonging to one or other category of systematic errors.

3. Faulty insertion of the comma, which separates the main clause from the restrictive relative clause—an error which appears frequently in the written work of students of junior years. Apart from sentences which, due to an analogous error, become clearly ungrammatical, cf.:<sup>2</sup>

2. \*Machines were the most important things, that ancient man had not got.
3. \*An allophone is a phone-type, which does not differentiate between meanings of words.

I found in the students' compositions instances of sentences whose constituent clauses might be interpreted (semantically) as alternatively restrictive or nonrestrictive, eg.:

<sup>2</sup> All examples -- unless specified otherwise -- come from précis pieces written by my first year students.

2. teaching techniques and learning strategies result in overgeneralization of these rules at later stages of learning.

The arguments that speak in favour of the first of these assumptions are provided by the analysis of a maximally congruent Polish translation of (1):

1c. Człowiek może zdobyć wszystko, co jest niezbędne do życia, bez ciężkiej pracy.

With correct punctuation (i.e., with two commas cutting off the relative clause) (1e) involves no ambiguity. It seems that the 'categorically demanding rule' ('przepis bezwzględnie nakazujący' in Jodłowski's terms, cf. Przyłubscy 1973:22) that requires both the 'opening' (otwierający) and the 'closing' (zamykający) commas is gradually acquiring the status of a normative prescription, in view of what becomes the common practice of native speakers of Polish (cf. Przyłubscy 1973:46); out of the group of 25 students on whom I tested this tendency, only 4 used the 'closing' comma. Therefore, one should rather expect

1f. Człowiek może zdobyć wszystko, co jest niezbędne do życia bez ciężkiej pracy.

An interpretation of the modifying clause in (1f) as having a sentential antecedent would be, for semantic reasons, as unlikely as the analogous interpretation of the English counterpart (1a). Nonrestrictive modification is also ruled out by semantic considerations, whose nature seems universal, at least in respect of the two languages under consideration (cf. the argument on p. 320 above). Thus, (1c) reflects the intended meaning of (1), and is both correct and nonambiguous.

Unlike in English, in written Polish sentences with embedded relative clauses are systematically ambiguous (in all cases in which their semantic contents allows for the alternative possibility of both restrictive and nonrestrictive modification), cf., e.g.:

8. Wiem przecież, że rondo to nie najlepsze rozwiązanie, szczególnie na skrzyżowaniach, gdzie rozłożenie ruchu pojazdów nie jest równomierne z poszczególnych kierunków. (from a daily newspaper),

cf.

- 8a. ...especially at the intersections  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{,where the distribution of traffic...} \\ \text{where the distribution of traffic...} \end{array} \right\}$

The ambiguity can be resolved only by supplying additional syntactic and/or semantic signals, e.g.:

- 8b. ...szczególnie na *tych* skrzyżowaniach, gdzie rozłożenie ruchu...

This type of ambiguity may partially account for the difficulties that Polish linguists encounter while trying to establish formal criteria of differentiation between what is called (after Klemensiewicz) 'zdanie przydawkowe' (attributive clause) and 'zdanie rozwijające' (developing clause)<sup>6</sup>. Moreover, restriction of investigation to written texts only, conditioned probably by the rare occurrence of the 'developing' type in spoken language, results in the negligence of the fact that, in spoken Polish, the rules of tonality require that pauses set off nonrestrictive clauses, just as it is the case with English (for discussion, see e.g. Marek 1975).

Consequently, the rules governing the use of commas in such -- and similar -- cases are generally considered as a matter of pure convention (cf., e.g. Saloni 1971: 111 ... 'czysto konwencjonalne są na przykład zasady użycia przecinka'...), as well as for the developing of the techniques of teaching punctuation to Polish children (cf. e.g. Cofalik et al. 1973: 245 ff.).

The emphasis on purely conventional character of punctuation in Polish seems to facilitate negative transfer at the early stages of learning English, which is proved by numerous instances of students' written performance, cf., e.g.:

9. \*The fact, that the life of ancient man was less safe...
10. \*The general result was that he had to do himself anything he wanted.
11. \*His life was less comfortable, than nowadays.
12. \*I found the stories and poems, we used to read at school not very interesting.

Doubtlessly, it is the systematic correction of such errors that leads towards overgeneralization, which becomes clearly visible already in those compositions which are written by first year students towards the end of the first year of academic study (cf. the high percentage of omitted commas, Table 1). Admitting no restrictions to the newly formulated 'no comma' rule results in frequent occurrence of sentences like

13. \*Although Henry was clever his life was a failure.
14. \*Because ancient man had no machines he did everything with his own hands.

In numerous cases faulty punctuation (or rather lack of punctuation) leads to difficulty of semantic interpretation:

15. \*In modern times men have many advantages as machines which are mastered by men work for their comfort.

or to distortion of originally intended meaning (i.e., to 'extralinguistic ambiguity'):

<sup>6</sup> For a discussion, see e.g. Tabakowska (1966).

16. ? Our notes should have logical structure which is not easy to achieve. with the meaning actually conveyed, i.e.,
- 16a. Our notes should have logical structure that is not easy to achieve. different from that actually intended:
- 16b. Our notes should have structure, which is not easy to achieve., cf.
- 16c. Notatki powinny mieć logiczną konstrukcję,  $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{co} \\ \text{która} \end{array} \right\}$  niełatwo osiągnąć<sup>7</sup>.

A diligent Polish pupil, who learned both Polish and English in a Polish secondary school, may well develop the conviction that there exists a convention in Polish that requires cutting off relative clauses by means of commas, and another one in English that strictly forbids it. In respect of English, the problem is first introduced in Grade II (units 16 and 17), where the intonation of restrictive relative clauses is described and illustrated with examples; hypotheses concerning discrepancies in punctuation between Polish and English can be formed by those attentive pupils who might have carefully analyzed the English examples and their Polish counterparts. The rules of the use of comma in written English are discussed only in Grade IV (unit 8), but with no reference to intonation. Nonrestrictive modification, formally realized as relative clauses, is mentioned to be "another type of attributive clause, very rare in speech, but found in written language" (Smólska, Zawadzka 1973, part IV:132). It is illustrated by several examples of such clauses, a short explanation of their semantic function and the rule that requires the use of the (pair of) commas. With the very restricted use of written English (both in the sense of interpretation of written texts and independent writing) in the textbook (which is in accordance with the requirements of the teaching programme), it cannot be justifiably expected that the rule will actually become a part of pupils' competence. That it does not, is clearly proved by first year students' written performance: the students do not use the commas even when they consciously aim at nonrestrictive modification. Moreover, many are unaware of the fact that the presence or absence of commas distinguishes between the two types of modification.

(16) and (16b) were given to a group of 19 first year students, whom I asked to analyze the sentences and then choose one of the three suggested opinions. The results are given below:

Table 3

There is no difference in meaning	11
There is a difference in meaning	6
I don't know	2

<sup>7</sup> Syntactic ambiguity of (16b), shown overtly in (16c), results from the possibility of double reference of the nonrestrictive relative clause, i.e., to the second NP of the

The same students easily differentiated between an analogous pair of sentences which were read to them; it is plausible that the discrimination was facilitated by the analogous (in this respect) tonality of Polish.

Strangely enough, similar conclusions follow from the analysis of the second of the two errors exemplified in (1).

The teaching of the position of the Adverbial Prepositional Phrase inside a sentence is traditionally done according to the rule which states that "end position (i.e. after a verb and complement/object if any) is the most frequent" (Quirk et al. 1972: 334). Except for the adverbs of frequency, the elastic positioning of which is the subject of numerous exercises in numerous textbooks, the problem of adverbial modification is hardly discussed. The rough-and-ready rule advises the learners to position adverbials 'at the end of a sentence,' in accordance with the rule for manner, place and time adverbs. Adherence to this rule, when combined with the tendency to generate syntactically complex structures, results in the production of sentences like (5) and (7) above. Unless the sentence includes some additional semantic signals, the prepositional phrase is in such cases taken to refer to a verb other than the one intended by the writer. A maximally congruent translation of (5) shows that in Polish analogous misinterpretation is prevented only by rigorous application of the normative rule of the 'closing' comma:

5b. Współczesny człowiek korzysta z licznych udogodnień, których jego przodkowie byli pozbawieni, dzięki stosowaniu maszyn.

cf.:

5c. Współczesny człowiek korzysta z licznych udogodnień, których jego przodkowie byli pozbawieni dzięki stosowaniu maszyn.

In case of a reduced clause, however, the distortion of the intended meaning does occur:

7b. Ludzie znajdują osobliwą satysfakcję w tworzeniu czegoś pięknego w każdym szczególe.

cf.

7c. ? Ludzie znajdują osobliwą satysfakcję w tworzeniu czegoś pięknego, w każdym szczególe.

In the Polish counterparts of both (5) and (7), however, the preferred word order would be, respectively,

main clause or to the whole main clause. In this case, however, this does not lead to significant discrepancies in semantic interpretation.

5d. Współczesny człowiek korzysta (,) dzięki stosowaniu maszyn (,) z licznych udogodnień, których jego przodkowie byli pozbawieni<sup>8</sup>.

or

5e. Współczesny człowiek (,) dzięki stosowaniu maszyn (,) korzysta...

and

7d. Ludzie znajdują osobliwą satysfakcję w tworzeniu w każdym szczególe czegoś, co jest piękne.<sup>9</sup>

and also

1g. Człowiek może (,) bez ciężkiej pracy (,) zdobyć wszystko co jest niezbędne do życia.

or

1h. Człowiek może zdobyć (,) bez ciężkiej pracy (,) wszystko, co jest...

and finally

1i. Człowiek (,) bez ciężkiej pracy (,) może zdobyć wszystko, co jest...

In all the three sentences, placing the prepositional phrase in sentence initial position would be felt as an instance of marked theme (for discussion, see Quirk et al. 1972: 945 ff.). Thus (5c), (7c), (1g), (1h) and (1i) are shown to conform to the respective rule for English, which states that — although for adverbial prepositional phrase the medial (or 'parenthetical') position is the least usual — it is nevertheless used "where factors such as focus and the complexity of the sentence make the other positions undesirable or impossible" (Quirk et al. 1972: 335). In such cases, most acceptable medial positions are those between the auxiliary and the main verb (1g), between the verb and complement or object (5c, 7c, 1h) or after the subject (5d, 1i). In the case of (1), the first of these was proposed by the native informant (cf. 1b), while the remaining two, i.e., respectively,

1k. People can get, without hard work,...

and

1m. People, without hard work,...

were considered as acceptable alternatives. The initial position was ruled out, as an implication of marked theme. It seems that none of these alternative positions was used by the authors of (1), (5) and (7) because of their 'dogmatic' attitude to the normative rule concerning the end position of adverbials. To test this hypothesis, I asked a group of 20 fourth year students

<sup>8</sup> Commenting upon the optional use of commas in (5b)–(1i) would unduly prolong the discussion. Therefore, I decided to confine myself to mere indication of such an option.

<sup>9</sup> For rhythmical reasons, non-reduced clause is preferred.

to translate (1g) into English. The following positionings of the adverbial phrase were chosen:

End position	7
Middle position (analogous to 1g) <sup>10</sup>	6
Initial position (i.e., marked theme) <sup>10</sup>	7
Total:	20

Thus 35% students use the 'standard' end position, even though in 3 cases the writers tried to prevent the misreference by setting the adverbial phrase off by means of a comma. Although the positioning of the phrase in (1g) was a temptation to produce a congruous translation, another 35% tried to convey the intended meaning by choosing the only normatively attested alternative concerning the positioning of the adverbial, i.e., the initial, even though the semantic import of (1g) clearly does not call for the marked theme.

Samples of students' written performance, as well as the results of tests (however limited and unsophisticated) seem to justify the assumption that both types of errors discussed in this paper (i.e., the omission of commas setting off nonrestrictive relative clauses and misreference of adverbial modifiers in syntactically complex sentences) might result from the excess of normative teaching.

In both, traditional teaching techniques follow the conclusions, concerning error prediction, which might result from contrastive analysis, however informal and impressionistic: due to interference, Polish learners *will* place commas in front of all relative pronouns, and they *will* tend to place adverbial prepositional phrases in any of the middle sentence positions, thus showing a tendency to use word order that in English often becomes definitely marked. Fighting against these predilections might indeed prevent the occurrence of errors at early stages of learning. With advanced students, however, it might become responsible for the "surprising tendency to dogmatism about *correct* and *incorrect* forms" (from the report on the written performance in English of a group of top fourth year students, members of a language course in Britain), which might in turn result in errors of overgeneralization (cf. inadequate punctuation) or lack of clarity (cf. ambiguous reference of adverbials).

The discussion presented in this paper seems to prove once again that contrastive analysis and error analysis should complement each other: while contrastive analysis can "only point toward a potential learning problem or difficulty, on the other hand, error analysis can tell us (...) the size of the problem" (Banathy, Madarasz 1969: 92), as well as provide insights concerning

<sup>10</sup> With or without the separating commas; cf. note 8.

remedial procedures. Errors discussed in this paper show clearly that "simple provision of the correct form may not always be the only, or indeed the most effective, form of correction" (Corder 1967: 168). For instance, the contrast between restrictive and nonrestrictive modification is dealt with in most textbooks (cf. e.g. Allen 1959: section 46; Hornby 1961: § 94; Kingdon 1958: 205; Smólska, Zawadzka 1973: part IV, unit 8). But the effectiveness of instruction suffers from a too strict separation between spoken and written language.

Even though nonrestrictive relative clauses are not frequent in spoken language — either English or Polish — it is generally acknowledged that the use of punctuation is closely related to the interpretation of a written text. On the other hand, intonation is a crucial factor responsible for the occurrence of punctuation errors — a fact that has been often mentioned in theoretical and practical works (cf. e.g. Saloni 1971: 112).

Much more research will be needed before it can be stated "what specific items of grammatical knowledge hold the greatest promise for improving composition skill" and "what degree of mastery of this knowledge is required before we may reasonably expect transfer to writing skill"<sup>11</sup>. But whenever distortion of intended meaning in written performance is caused by transfer from spoken language, one cannot expect effective instruction to be carried out without ample reference to the spoken medium. The Polish learner should be made aware that modifying relative clauses, which in written Polish are systematically ambiguous in respect of their restrictive or nonrestrictive character, are in fact distinguished by differing patterns of intonation. This could facilitate the understanding of the analogous function of these two types of modification in the two languages. On the other hand, practising oral interpretation of written texts according to their punctuation can effectively break up the false conviction about purely conventional character of the rules of comma usage.

Similarly, teaching word order to advanced learners should go beyond the level of simple sentences and become more closely connected with the problem of semantic function of sentence stress and intonation.

#### REFERENCES

- Allen, W. S. 1959. *Living English structure*. London: Longmans.  
 Banathy, B. H. and P. H. Madarasz. 1969. "Contrastive analysis and error analysis". *Journal of English as a second language* 4. 277-292.  
 Cofalik, J. et al. 1973. *Nauczenie języka polskiego w klasie V*. Warszawa: PZWS.

<sup>11</sup> Meckel, H. C. 1963. "Research on teaching composition and literature". In Gage, N. L. (ed.). *Handbook of research on teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally. Quoted in Jakobovits (1969:78).



- Corder, S. P. 1967. "The significance of learner's errors". *IRAL* 5/4, 161-170.
- Fisiak, J. (ed.). 1974. *Papers and studies in contrastive linguistics 2*. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.
- Fisiak, J. (ed.). 1975. *Papers and studies in contrastive linguistics 3*. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.
- Hornby, A. S. 1961. *A guide to patterns and use in English*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Jakobovits, L. 1969. "Second language learning and transfer theory: a theoretical assessment". *Language learning* 19/1, 2, 55-86.
- Kingdon, R. 1958. *The groundwork of English intonation*. London: Longmans.
- Marek, B. 1975. "Intonation and emphasis in Polish and English." In Fisiak, J. (ed.), 1975. 159-165.
- Muskat-Tabakowska, E. 1974. "Syntactic ambiguity and the teaching of written English to advanced Polish learners: stating the problem and sample analysis". In Fisiak, J. (ed.), 1974. 369-385.
- Muskat-Tabakowska, E. 1975. "Syntactic ambiguity and the teaching of written English to advanced Polish learners: grammar or style?" In Fisiak, J. (ed.), 1975. 99-111.
- Przyłubscy, E. and F. 1973. *Gdzie postawić przecinek?* Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and J. Svartvik. 1972. *A grammar of contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Saloni, Z. 1971. *Błędy językowe w pracach pisemnych uczniów liceum ogólnokształcącego*. Warszawa: PZWS.
- Smólska, J. and A. Zawadzka. 1973. *We learn English*. Parts 1-4. Warszawa: PZWS.
- Stockwell, R., Schachter, P. and B. Partee. 1968. *Integration of transformational theories on English syntax*. Los Angeles: The University of California Press.
- Tabakowska, I. 1966. "O zdaniach rozwijających (pozornie przydawkowych): Uwagi dyskusyjne". *Zeszyty naukowe WSP w Katowicach. Prace językoznawcze* 3. Katowice: Drukarnia WSP.
- Wyatt, V. 1973. "An analysis of errors in composition writing". *English language teaching* 27/2, 177-187.