

THE APPLICATION OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS THE CASE OF LEARNING LATIN LANGUAGE

Viator Lumban Raja¹, Jontra Jusat Pangaribuan²

Universitas Katolik Santo Thomas Medan, Indonesia

Email ; jontra_pangaribuan@ymail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper tries to answer the question whether or not the Contrastive Analysis Theory can be applied in the methodology of teaching all languages universally. Some linguists and methodologists of teaching such as Lado, Fries, Lee, Corder, Stockwell and Martin, claimed that this theory is applicable in teaching second or foreign language. This paper will argue that it is not, and it will be supported with an example of the case I learning Latin language.

Key words: declension – conjugation – gender - case

INTRODUCTION

Methodologists of teaching have been trying onto find out the most effective method in teaching languages, both second and foreign language. Deeply rooted in *behaviorism* and *structuralism*, the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (henceforth CAH) claimed that the principal barrier to second or foreign language acquisition is the interference of the first language system (L1) with the target language (L2), and that a structural analysis of the two languages in question would yield a taxonomy of linguistic contrasts between them which in turn enables the linguist to predict the difficulties a learner would encounter (Brown,1987: 153). Thus, by making a linguistic contrast between the first language (L1) and the target language (L2), it will help the teachers to teach the foreign language to their students.

Lee (in Ellis, 1986) gave a strong claim about this CAH, saying that the main cause of difficulty and error in foreign language learning was the interference of the native language. Thus, in learning a foreign language the interference of the native language (L1) will cause difficulty and errors. This interference is of two kinds, namely positive transfer and negative transfer. The former refers to similar elements between the native language and the target language which will facilitate the students in learning the target language. Whilst the latter refers to the dissimilar ones between the two which interfere the students in learning the target language. Therefore, in teaching a foreign language, the most effective materials are those that are based upon a scientific description the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner (Fries, 1945: 9). Lado (1957) further said that in comparison between the native and foreign language lay the key to ease of difficulty in foreign language learning. He also proposed that culture should be inserted in the comparison of the native and the target language. Thus, the change that has to take place in the language behavior of a foreign language students can be equated with the differences between the structure of the student's native language and culture and that of the target language and culture.

Based on this reason, linguists thought a comparison of learner's L1 and L2, where CAH should reveal areas of difficulty for L2 students, thereby providing

teachers and developers of L2 materials with specific guidelines for lesson planning (Dulay, et.al, 1982: 97) .

RESEACRH METHOD

It is obvious that CAH is intended to help students in learning a foreign language by the comparison of the native language with that of the target language and to predict what errors might be produced by the students. CAH is a research hypothesis stating that where structures in L1 differ from those in L2, errors that reflect the structure of L1 will be produced, and where structures in L1 and L2 are the same, no errors will be made (Dulay, et.al, 1982: 276). This statement implies that the greater the similarities between L1 and L2, the fewer errors will be made, and the greater the differences between the two, the more errors will be made. This CAH then assigns that it will be effective if it is applied in teaching languages deriving from the same language family.

Some linguists are not satisfied with the result of CAH. Research conducted by Whitman (in Brown, 1987: 161) to 2500 Japanese learners of English inferred that the predictions of CAH were not theoretically and practically proved about the interference problems of a language learner (only 33% errors due to the interference-problems). Another research by Dulay, et.al (1982) stated that the incidence of errors that are traceable to characteristics in the first language is relatively low: around 4% to 12% for children, and 8% and 23% for adults. Then, Stockwel and Martin (in Brown, 1987: 155) proposed hierarchy of difficulty by which linguist or teacher can make a prediction of relative difficulty of a given aspect of the second language. In other words, there were still many kinds of errors besides those due to interlingual interference that could neither be predicted nor explained by CAH. From the explanation above, it can be concluded that only a few of interference problems produced by the students in learning a foreign language with respect to CAH. There are still many errors which cannot be explained by CAH or not at all related to it.

3. Error Analysis Theory

Due to dissatisfaction, Error Analysis Theory arose. In this theory, there are several terms, namely: *Idiosyncretic dialects* (Corder, 1971a), *Approximative Systems* (Nemser, 1971), and *Interlanguage* (Selinker, 1969). These three views essentially contain the successive linguistic system that a learner constructs on his way to the mastery of a target language (Sridar, 1980). This system is neither that of the learner's native language nor that of the target language, but it lies in between. According to this theory, errors produced by the learners are inevitable and evidence of that system itself (Corder, 1967). Thus, error is something natural that will be produced by a learner when learning a foreign language. Later, the learner will reach at the point where he will be able to improve the error. Therefore, there is no reason to give punishment to the learners who make errors when studying a foreign language.

Further, Selinker (1972) said that a learner of a native language inclined to defend his linguistic subsystem and rules in learning a target language, and this will produce such as the case of *fossilization*. This fossilization consists of two parts: (1) latent psychological, that is a tendency of an adult learner to interpret the target language being learned based on his mother tongue. This covers language transfer,

transfer of training, strategies of second language learning, strategies of second language communication and over-generalization. (2) latent linguistic structure, that is the interference of the mother tongue which covers hypercorrection, spelling, pronunciation, cognate pronunciation, and avoidance.

Then, Corder introduced an important distinction between **errors** and **mistakes**. Mistakes are deviations due to performance factors such as memory limitations (tenses, agreement, plurality, etc). This mistake can be corrected by the learner himself when attention is given to it. Whilst errors are systematic and consistent characteristics of the learner's linguistic system which becomes the evidence of the system itself. According to him, this kind of errors can be corrected by giving the correct form or a chance to the learner to find themselves.

The pedagogical implication of the Error Analysis Theory can be concluded as follows: (1) in general it is expected that there would be a radical change in the teacher's attitude towards the learner's performance, (2) in particular, the teacher should give up the unreasonable expectation of the target language performance from the learner at the early start, (3) the existing variability is used to measure the learner's attempt in learning a target language in a given sociolinguistic situation (Sridar, 1980)

It seems that both CAH and Error Analysis Theory can be applied to languages that do not have many differences, or say, languages deriving from one language family. For example, teaching English to the students whose native tongue is Dutch, or teaching Dutch to the students whose native tongue is German since these languages derive from the Indo-European language. If, however, they are applied to languages that have highly many differences, they might not work at all. For example, teaching Latin to the students whose native tongue is Indonesian. For that purpose, the highly big differences between Latin and Indonesian under discussion is restricted to the syntactical aspect only.

4. The Case of Learning Latin

In Latin, there is no word order like in Indonesian or English. What to be taken into account is declension of noun, adjective, and pronoun which determines cases, classes and number according to their uses in sentences. Besides, the verb form must also be memorized. In other words, Latin is inflected language which neglects the word order.

Declension shows case, number, and gender. Cases consist of nominative (subjective case), genitive (possessive case), dative (indirect object case), accusative (objective case), vocative (exclamatory case), and ablative (locative, temporal, and agent case).

4.1 Nouns

There are five declensions in Latin with a lot of particular ones. The followings are only given in those five declensions.

a) Declension 1

The gender is feminine, except the word which indicates profession or status is masculine like *agricola* = farmer

Case	Singular	Plural	Meaning
Nominative	rosa	rosae	rose

Genitive	rosae	rosarum	
Dative	rosae	rosis	other words:
Accusative	rosam	rosas	vita = life
Vocative	rosa	rosae	femina = woman
Ablative	rosa	rosis	anima = soul
			scientia = knowledge

b) Declension 2

The gender is masculine if the nominative case ends in {-us} and {-r}, and if it ends in {-um}, then it is neuter.

Case	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Nominative	equus	equi	vir	viri
Genitive	equi	equorum	viri	virorum
Dative	equo	equis	viro	viris
Accusative	equum	equos	virum	viros
Vocative	eque	equi	vir	viri
Ablative	equo	equis	viro	viris

Meaning: equus = horse ; vir = man

Other words : amicus = friend puer = boy
 vicinus = neighbor liber = book
 populus = people

c) Declension 3

The gender is masculine if the nominative case ends in {-er}, {-or}, {-os}, it is feminine if the nominative case ends in {-as}, {-aus}, {-es}, {-is}, {-o}, {-x}, {-s}. And it is neuter if the nominative case ends in {-ar|, {-ur}, {-us}, {-c}, {-l}, {-e}, {-t}, {-o}, {-n}

Case	Singular	Plural	Meaning
Nominative	orator	oratores	speaker
Genitive	oratoris	oratorium	Other words:
Dative	oratori	oratoribus	donor = giver
Accusative	oratorem	oratores	salvator = saviour
Vocative	orator	oratores	aggressor = aggressor
Ablative	oratore	oratoribus	rumor = rumour

Case	Singular	Plural	Meaning
Nominative	dux	duces	leader
Genitive	ducis	ducem	Other words:
Dative	duci	ducibus	lex = law
Accusative	ducem	duces	civis = citizen
Vocative	dux	ducibus	vices = crime
			multiplex = multiple

Case	Singular	Plural	Meaning
Nominative	mare	maria	sea
Genitive	maris	marium	Other words:
Dative	mari	maribus	animal = animal
Accusative	mare	maria	corpus = body

Vocative	mare	maria	crimen = crime
Ablative	mari	maribus	litus = shore pronomen = pronoun

d) Declension 4

The gender is masculine, except *domus*, *manus*, *actus*, and *tribus* are all feminine.

Case	Singular	Plural	Meaning
Nominative	fructus	fructus	fruit
Genetive	fructum	fructum	Other words:
Dative	fructui	fructibus	manus = hand
Accusative	fructum	fructus	domus = house
Vocative	fructus	fructus	acus = needle
Ablative	fructu	fructibus	tribus = tribe impetus = attack saltus = jump

Those exceptional words have the ablative cases in {-o} like *domo*, not *domu*, and {-os} for the plural accusative cases like *domos*, not *domus*, *manos*, not *manus*.

e) Declension 5

The gender is generally feminine.

Case	Singular	Plural	Meaning
Nominative	dies	dies	day
Genetive	diei	dierum	species = species
Dative	diem	dies	facies = face
Accusative	diem	dies	fides = faith
Vocative	die	dies	acies = battle field
Ablative	dies	diebus	

Having described those five declensions, a question might arise, as to how the gender can be identified. Is it usually marked with the genitive suffix? For example, *femina-ae*; *vicinus-I*; *fructus-us*, etc. These genitive suffixes determine the gender of the noun and its conjugation should match each declension. The gender is sometimes written alongwith the noun such as *nomen-nominis*, N (neuter); *iudex-iudicis*, M (masculine); *laus-laudis*, F (feminine). Thus, we have to choose which declension suits its conjugation. For example, when we want to say “a great name” in Latin as a nominative case (subject), we first check the gender of the noun, then the adjective adapts to it. So, “a great name”, name = *nomen*--□ neuter, great = *magnus-a -um*. Since *nomen* is neuter, then the adjective should adapt to it, in this case *magnum*. Therefore, “ a great name” = *magnum nomen* ; a great praise = *magna laus* (F).

4.2 Adjectives

The Latin adjectives are divided into four groups, they are (1) those ending in {-us-a-um} like *bonus - a - um* = good, (2) those ending in {-er-a-um} like *puclher - a - um* = beautiful, (3) those ending in {-is - is - e} like *fortis - e* = brave, and (4) those ending in {-bilis - e} like *laudabilis - e* = praiseable; *audibilis - e* = audible.

These adjectives must also be conjugated like the nouns to match the gender, case and number. Say, for example, an Indonesian learner wants to say the following in Latin: wajah yang cantik □ *facies pulchra* (feminine)

rumah-rumah besar □ *domus magna* or *magna domus* (feminine)

orang jahat □ *populus malus* (masculine)

perempuan yang malang □ *femina misera* (feminine)

kata-kata yang sulit □ *difficilia verba* (Neuter plural)

verbum difficile (singular)

lelaki yang berani □ *fortis vir* (masculine)

pemimpin yang patut dihormati □ *respectabilis dux* (feminine)

laut-laut yang ganas □ *ferocia maria* (neuter, plural)

In short, all adjectives must be subject to the nouns according to case, gender, and number.

4.3 Verbs

The Latin verbs are divided into four groups which are called conjugation, they are (1) the first conjugation ends in suffix {-are}, (2) the second conjugation ends in suffix{-ere}, (3) the third conjugation in suffix {-ere}, and the fourth conjugation ends in suffix {-ire}. Each conjugation has a mode of indicative and conjunctive. The former states the affirmative and the latter states persuasive, expectation wish, etc.

There are six tenses in Latin with their progressive forms respectively. They are Praesens (simple Present), Imperfectum (Past Tense), Futurum (Future), Perfectum (Present Perfect), Plusquam Perfectum (Past Perfect), and Futurum Exactum (Present Perfect Future). The first three tenses will be described as an example.

a) Conjugation 1: e.g. amare = love

PRAESENS			
ACTIVUM		PASSIVUM	
Indicative	Conjunctive	Indicative	Conjunctive
Amo	amem	amor	amer
Amas	ames	amaris	ameris
Amat	amet	amatur	ametur
Amamus	ametis	amamur	amemur
Amatis	ametis	amamini	amemini
Amant	ament	amantur	amentur

All verbs are conjugated with the pronoun as subject such as I, you, he/she, it, we, you, they. So amo = I love; amas = you love; amat = he loves; amamus = we love; amatis = you love ; amant = they love; amem = may I love, etc.

IMPERFECTUM			
ACTIVUM		PASSIVUM	
Indicative	Conjunctive	Indicative	
Conjunctive			
Amabam	amarem	amabar	amarer
Amabas	amares	amabaris	amareris
Amabat	amaret	amabatur	amaremur
Amabamus	amaremus	amabamur	amaremur
Amabatis	amaretis	amabamini	amaremini
Amabant	amarent	amabantur	amarentur

FUTURUM			
ACTIVUM		PASSIVUM	
Indicative	Conjunctive	Indicative	Conjunctive
Amabo	amaturus-a-um sim	amobur	
Amabis	amaturus-a-um sis	amaberis	
Amabit	amaturus-a-um sit	amabitur	Infinitivus
Amabimus	amaturi-ae-a simus	amabimur	passivi
Amabitis	amaturi-ae-a sitis	amabimini	AMATUM
Amabunt	amaturi-ae-a sint	amabuntur	IRI

Amabo = I will love; amaturus sim = may I will love ; amobur = I will be loved
 Sim amatum iri = may I will be loved; Infinitivus passive is followed by the
 conjugation of pronoun sim, sis, etc (I, you, etc) .

b) Conjugation 2, e.g.: videre = see

PRAESENS			
ACTIVUM		PASSIVUM	
Indicative	Conjunctive	Indicative	Conjunctive
video	videam	videor	videar
vides	videas	vidris	videaris
videt	videat	videtur	videatur
videmus	videamus	videmur	videamur
videtis	videatis	videmini	videamini
vident	videant	videntur	videantur

IMPERFECTUM			
ACTIVUM		PASSIVUM	
Indicative	Conjunctive	Indicative	Conjunctive
videbam	viderem	videbar	viderer

videbas	videres	videbaris	videreris
videbat	videret	videbatur	videretur
videbamus	vidremus	videbamur	videremur
videbatis	videretis	videbamini	videremini
videbant	viderent	videbantur	viderentur

FUTURUM			
ACTIVUM		PASSIVUM	
Indicative	Conjunctive	Indicative	Conjunctive
videbo	videratus-a-um sim	videbor	
videbis	videratus-a-um sis	videberis	Infinitivus
videbit	videratus-a-um sit	videbitur	passive
videbimus	viderati-ae-a simus	videbimur	VIDETUM
videbitis	viderati-ae-a sitis	videbimini	IRI
videbunt	viderati-ae-a sint	videbuntur	

c) Conjugation 3: e.g. credere = believe

PRAESENS			
ACTIVUM		PASSIVUM	
Indicative	Conjunctive	Indicative	Conjunctive
credo	credam	credor	credar
credis	credas	crederis	credaris
credit	credit	creditur	credatur
credimus	credamus	credimur	credamur
credits	credatis	credimini	credamini
credunt	credant	creduntur	credantur

IMPERFECTUM			
ACTIVUM		PASSIVUM	
Indicative	Conjunctive	Indicative	Conjunctive
credebam	crederem	credebar	crederer
credebas	crederes	credebaris	credererisc
credebat	crederet	credebatur	crederetur
credebamus	crederemus	credebamur	crederemur
credebatis	crederetis	credebamini	crederemini
credebant	crederent	credebantur	crederentur

FUTURUM				
ACTIVUM			PASSIVUM	
Indicative	Conjunctive		Indicative	Conjunctive
credam	crediturus-a-um	sim	credar	
credes	crediturus-a-um	sis	crederis	
credit	crediturus-a-um	sit	credetur	Infitivus
credemus	creditori-ae-a	simus	credemur	Passivi
credetis	creditori-ae-a	sitis	credemini	CREDITUM
credent	creditori-ae-a	sint	credentur	IRI

d) Conjugation 4: e.g. audire = listen

PRAESENS			
ACTIVUM		PASSIVUM	
Indicative	Conjunctive	Indicative	Conjunctive
audio	audiam	auditor	audiar
audis	audias	audiris	audiaris
audit	audiat	auditor	audiatur
audimus	audiamus	audimur	audiamur
auditis	audiatis	audimini	audiamini
audiunt	audient	adiuntur	audiantur

IMPERFECTUM			
ACTIVUM		PASSIVUM	
Indicative	Conjunctive	Indicative	Conjunctive
audiebam	audirem	audiebar	audirer
audiebas	audires	adiebaris	audireris
audiebat	audiret	audiebatur	audiretur
audiebamus	audiremus	audiebamur	audiremur
audiebatis	audiretis	audiebamini	audiremini
audiebant	audirent	audiebantur	audierentur

FUTURUM			
ACTIVUM		PASSIVUM	
Indicative	Conjunctive	Indicative	Conjunctive
audiam	auditurus-a-um	sim	audiar
audies	auditurus-a-um	sis	audieris

audiet	auditurus-a-um	sit	audietur	
audiemus	audituri-ae-a	simus	audiemur	Infinitive
audietis	audituri-ae-a	sitis	audiemini	passive
audent	audituri-ae-a	sint	audientur	AUDITUM
				IRI

What has been described here is only a part of the complexity of the Latin Language. And what has not yet been described is much more than that of what has been here.

To be more precise, let us try to assume what probable errors an Indonesian learner might produce in constructing a Latin sentence, consisting of noun, verb, and adjective only.

1.Noun : five declensions three genders six cases two forms (singular and plural)	}	$5 \times 3 \times 6 \times 2 = 180$
--	---	--------------------------------------

2.Adjectives: The same number as the noun because the adjective should match the noun in all aspects. That means 180.

3.Verb: four conjugations six tenses two modes two forms (active and passive)		$4 \times 6 \times 2 \times 2 = 96$
--	--	-------------------------------------

Thus, an Indonesian learner should consider so many variables (around 450) in constructing a correct sentence in Latin. Then, we may rise a question, could CAH exactly predict the errors that might be produced by an Indonesian learner?

It is really impossible due to the number of variables to be considered; and therefore, this theory can not give at once the panacea or remedy to those probable errors made by Indonesian learner. Again, CAH can predict the errors produced by the learners if the native language of the students belongs to the same family or L1 and L2 are closely related, and that will facilitate the learners to study it.

CONCLUSION

The system of an Indonesian learner's language does not facilitate at all in learning Latin, but not interfere either since these two languages are totally different. Thus, there is nothing left to compare. The learner is completely faced to something new in which he has to start from zero point.

In conclusion, as it has been stated in the introduction of the this paper, both CAH and Error Analysis cannot be applied in teaching all languages universally. They might be applicable to those languages emanating from one family.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, H.Douglas.1987. **Principles of Language Learning and Teaching**. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall
- Corder, S.Pt.1967. *The Significance of Learner's Errors*, in **International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5: 161-170**
- Fries, Charles C.1945.**Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language**. Ann Arbor: University Michigan Press
- Dulay, Heidi, et.al 1982. **Language Two**. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, Rod.1986. **Understanding Second Language Acquisition**. London: Oxford University Press.
- Lado, Rober.1957. *Linguistics Across Culture*. New York: The University Press.
- Selinker,Larry.1972. *Interlanguage*, in Brown.
- Sridar, S.N.1980. *Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis and Interlanguage* : Three Phases of One Goal, in Kenneth Croft (ed) **Readings on English as a Second Language**. Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- Winamaja, S.J.1964. **Elementa Linguae Latinae**. Surabaya: PN.Karya Tjotas.