Jelena LJ. Biljetina¹
Univerzitet u Novom Sadu (Sombor)
Pedagoški fakultet

VERBS OF SPEAKING IN ENGLISH AND SERBIAN²

This paper is a contrastive analysis of the lexical field of verbs of speaking in English and Serbian. The main goal is to explore what similarities and differences are present within the lexical field in the two languages. Lexemes are first contrasted within one language, in order to explore the features that distinguish verbs of speaking one from the other. The meaning of verbs is analyzed by the procedure of componential analysis, by decomposing meaning into its component parts. Accordingly, English verbs are classified into semantically similar groups and analyzed one by one, with suggested corresponding Serbian equivalents. The paper tries to offer a more precise transfer of meaning of the verbs of speaking from one language to another and to provide solutions to the process of translation.

The results obtained show that all the English verbs in the research have their formal correspondent in Serbian, while some of the verbs also have their translation equivalents. The analysis, therefore, may contribute to a more precise transfer of meaning of these verbs from one language to another during the process of translation.

Keywords: verbs of speaking, lexical field, contrastive analysis, componential analysis, semantic features.

1. INTRODUCTION

The introductory part describes what the expected goals of the paper are, the methodology and the corpus used in the research.

1.1 AIMS

As this research is contrastive in its nature, the main aim of the paper is to contrast lexical fields of verbs of speaking in English and Serbian and to get insight into similarities and differences among the meanings of these verbs. In other words, such analysis shows what the relation of one lexeme towards the other in the same lexical field is, and, as such, reveals the way in which one part of English and Serbian lexicon is organized. The secondary goal in this research is to contribute to a more precise concept of speaking, in order to obtain adequate solutions during the process of translation from one language to the other.

¹ jelena.biljetina@gmail.com

² The paper was written within the master thesis and supervised by Professor Sabina Halupka-Rešetar, Faculty of Philosophy – Novi Sad.

1.2. TERMINOLOGY IN VERB ANALYSIS

In order to understand the processes underlying the analysis, it is necessary to understand some of its basic principles and the terminology relevant to it.

1.2.1. MEANING

Defining meaning is a complex task: all the aspects of meaning have to be taken into consideration, not only the abstract relations between lexical units and their functions, but also those that refer to their usage – the linguistic and extralinguistic context. This paper primarily refers to *literal meaning* (Palmer 1976: 65), the one that Austin defined as *primary nuclear meaning* (Austin 1961: 39). It is the essential, dominant meaning of a lexeme (Prčić 2008: 31). As language is part of a linguistic and extralinguistic context, in which lexemes are used in a specific sentence and situation, it is only in context that lexemes acquire their proper meaning.

Prčić defines meaning as “a set of sufficient number of descriptive features, used to define a specific class of extralinguistic entities” (Prčić 2008: 50). *Descriptive features*³ is a term referring to those relevant features that are specific for a certain extralinguistic entity defined by a linguistic sign. The sense of lexemes depends on the particular set of such features, as they represent the components of meaning (Lipka 1992: 100) and are specific for each entity.

Moreover, a set of descriptive features is used to contrast lexemes semantically. The features that are (semantically) relevant are actually those that define the sense of a lexeme and are termed *diagnostic features*⁴ as they define the typical, best example of a representative of a class of an extralinguistic entity – the prototype. Diagnostic features are used for semantic contrasting: verbs like *yell* and *whisper* share the same feature, that of the domain of speech, but each of them has its own diagnostic feature that contrasts with other within the same domain: [IN A LOUD VOICE] is the feature of the verb *yell*, while [VERY QUIETLY] is the feature of *whisper*.

1.2.3. COMPONENTIAL ANALYSIS

Decomposing the sense of a lexeme into semantic elements or components (Lipka 1992: 100) is the core of the componential analysis approach. As some sets of words share specific diagnostic features, this procedure basically deals with reducing the meaning of a word to its ultimate contrastive elements (Leech 1981: 91). Componential analysis and diagnostic features are important in terms of semantic contrast as they denote not only the sense of individual lexemes, but also the sense relations between lexemes that are related by a relevant semantic criterion (Prčić 2008: 56).

3 Apart from the expression *descriptive features*, the terms *semantic traits* and *semantic markers* are also used in semantics.

4 According to the expression diagnostic component (Nida 1975, qtd. in Prčić 2008: 52)

In this paper, verbs of speaking will be analyzed by the procedure of componential analysis; namely its variant which allows a certain feature to exhibit a higher or lower degree of belonging to a certain category (Prčić 2008: 58).

1.2.4. LEXICAL FIELDS

Relations among lexemes reflect organization of a lexicon and its content. The nature of such an organization is two-fold: in terms of linguistic criteria, lexemes are grouped into *lexical fields*,⁵ while in terms of extralinguistic criteria – they are grouped into *lexical sets* (Prčić 2008: 138).

The main idea in the theory of lexical fields, as explained by Adrienne Lehrer, is that it is necessary to examine a group of words that are semantically related (Lehrer 1985:283). It means that lexemes must have at least one diagnostic central feature in common along the same dimension in order for them to be treated as belonging to the same field. The features that define the lexeme *whisper*, for example, are the following: [SAY SOMETHING], [VERY QUIETLY], [USING BREATH]. In order to contrast this lexeme with other verbs within the same lexical field, it is necessary to see which of the features mentioned are specific for the verb *whisper*. Except for a common diagnostic feature, the condition for a lexical field is for lexemes to be in direct opposition in the same syntactic slot (Lipka 1992: 152). Lipka considers this condition as the key criterion in defining lexical fields (Lipka 1980: 98).

1.2.5. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

The method of contrastive analysis that will be applied in this analysis is used to describe similarities and differences among the elements of a language (Đorđević 1987: 1). In this paper, verbs of speaking are contrasted on semantic level, by searching for a „universal linguistic feature, or tertium comparationis“ (Đorđević 1987: 58). Diagnostic features are defined on the basis of a dictionary definition and are used as tertium comparationis (Prčić 2005: 170). In this way, it is possible to contrast lexemes within the lexical field of the language they belong to. The next level of semantic contrast is the one between the two languages, English and Serbian, where formal correspondents of the English verbs are searched for in Serbian. When contrasting lexemes, there are two possible ways of expressing the relations between them: that of *correspondence* (Đorđević 1987: 63),⁶ and that of *equivalence* (Đorđević 1987: 58).⁷ In other words, when

5 Lipka was the first to introduce such a terminology, but this terminology is not universal – various authors differ in defining basic terms. Cruse speaks about *lexical configurations* (Cruse 1987: 112), Adrienne Lehrer uses the term *lexical fields* along with *semantic fields* (Lehrer 1985: 283). Lyons also uses the term *lexical field* (Lyons 1977: 251) in the same way as *lexical field* is defined by Prčić (2008), but he makes a difference between *lexical* and *semantic field* (Lyons 1977: 268). Lipka makes a difference between *lexical fields* and the *word-field*. He justifies the *word-field* by explaining that it refers only to simple lexemes, while *lexical fields* consist of both simple and complex lexemes (Lipka 1980: 98).

6 Prčić terms this as *formal correspondence* (Prčić 2005: 170).

7 In Prčić, this is termed as *functional-communicative equivalence* (Prčić 2005: 170).

there is a (formal) correspondent in the target language, it corresponds in its form, function and content to the lexeme in L1 (Prčić 2005: 170).

In case where the target language has no lexeme which corresponds to the lexeme in L1, there is a lexical gap which can be filled with a (functional-communicative) equivalent,⁸ i.e. a linguistic device in the target language that corresponds to its function and its content to the lexeme in L1 (Prčić 2005: 171). Linguistically speaking, the only relevant sources of data about the meaning of lexemes are dictionaries. Still, extralinguistic knowledge and the specific use of the lexical system in context are equally important when equivalents need to be determined (Prčić 2008: 117).

1.3. CORPUS AND METHODOLOGY

The corpus for the research in this paper consists of 29 verbs of speaking which are most frequently used in English. They are compiled from the *British National Corpus*, an electronic dictionary of the English. The verbs chosen are those that fall within the 1000 most frequently used verbs in English language. The Serbian part of the corpus is compiled using *Englesko-hrvatski ili srpski rječnik* (1990) and *Englesko-srpski rečnik* (2002). *Englesko-hrvatski ili srpski rječnik* is a large comprehensive dictionary comprising more than 100 000 entries, while *Englesko-srpski rečnik* is smaller in its volume, but more modern and precise. The meanings of Serbian verbs were checked in *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika* (RMS 1967). One aspect that must not be neglected is affixation, as verbs in Serbian are rich in prefixes, suffixes and infixes. That is why the affixed verbs will be grouped with the verb they were derived from, but only if the affixes do not change the central meaning of the verb.

The main research method is parallel corpus analysis. The semantic analysis is one-way: L1 is English, while L2 is Serbian, which means that the analysis in the paper searches for verbs in Serbian that have the same meaning as verbs of speaking in English. The paper contrasts lexemes on a semantic level, by establishing links among similar verbs in English and in Serbian. The links are established using the available monolingual dictionaries;⁹ namely by definitions in those dictionaries that give information about all the relevant characteristics ("diagnostic features"¹⁰) that are specific for a segment of reality denoted by the given lexeme. Depending on (the combination of) those features which represent meaning components (Lipka 1992: 100), and are specific for a certain entity, we are able to find out the content, or meaning, of a

8 Ivir (1981) gives an interesting explanation of the notion of equivalence: he defines it by the way of a signature – every time someone signs his/her name, the signature is visually different from other signatures of the same individual, but is still recognized as equivalent to his/her other signatures.

9 The following English-English dictionaries will be used in the research: *Cambridge Dictionaries Online* (CDO), *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (MWD), *Oxford Dictionaries* (OD), *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED), *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries* (OLD), *Longman Language Activator* (LLA), *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (LDOCE), *Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture* (LDOELC), *Longman Dictionary Online* (LDO).

10 According to "diagnostic component" (Nida 1975b, qtd. in Prčić 2008:52)

lexeme. Once the content has been determined and the analysis done, it will be possible to see what similarities and differences there are among the verbs of speaking in English and Serbian.

2. ANALYSIS OF VERBS OF SPEAKING IN ENGLISH AND SERBIAN

Verbs of speaking have always been of interest to researchers, mostly because the process of speech is regarded as part of “the most important conceptual-experiential categories of a man’s concept of the world” (Žic Fuchs and Tuđman Vuković 2000, qtd. in Pranjeković 2007: 133).

The lexeme that is the hyperonym for the entire lexical field is the verb *speak* in English, while in Serbian it is the verb *govoriti*. Their components of meaning are [PRODUCE WORDS] and [USE VOICE] for the English verb, and [PROIZVODITI REČI] and [SLUŽITI SE GLASOM] for the Serbian verb, and they are included in the meaning of all the verbs in the corpus. The verbs that entered the corpus are the verbs of speaking that are most often used in English language, according to the British National Corpus: *accuse, advise, announce, answer, apologize, articulate, ask, ban, complain, cry, discuss, greet, inform, lie, mention, order, pray, promise, question, say, scream, shout, speak, suggest, talk, tell, thank, threaten, warn*. The meaning of each verb will be determined by reducing its meaning to its meaning components; then, formal correspondents and translation equivalents in Serbian language will be searched for by analyzing examples given in bilingual English-Serbian dictionaries (*Englesko-hrvatski ili srpski rječnik* 1990 and *Englesko-srpski rečnik* 2002). After that, the components of meaning of Serbian verbs will be checked in the monolingual Serbian dictionary *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnoga jezika* (1967). Naturally, the analysis is supported by examples, by the verbs used in context, where the examples in Serbian are taken from *Korpus savremenog srpskog jezika* (KSSJ) from the Faculty of Mathematics in Belgrade.

All the verbs in the corpus have the components [PRODUCE WORDS] and [USE VOICE] in common, but they have been classified into semantic groups according to the diagnostic features that differentiate their meaning and serve as the basis for their further categorization. Following the classification carried out by Štrbac (2011), the verbs of speaking can be divided into two large groups:

1. Verbs denoting one-way communication
 - 1.1. Typical verbs of speaking: *speak, say, tell*.
 - 1.2. Verbs denoting the manner of speaking: *articulate*.
 - 1.3. Verbs denoting the pitch of voice: *cry, shout, scream*.
 - 1.4. Verbs denoting the intention of the speaker:
 - 1.4.1. Verbs denoting information transfer: *announce, answer, inform, lie, mention*.
 - 1.4.2. Verbs denoting speaker’s attitude: *accuse, apologize, complain, thank, threaten*.

- 1.4.3. Verbs denoting contact initiation: *ask, question, greet*.
- 1.4.4. Verbs denoting activity initiation: *advise, order, pray, suggest, warn*.
- 1.4.5. Verbs denoting prohibition: *ban*.
- 1.4.6. Verbs denoting speaker's obligation: *promise*.
- 2. Verbs denoting two-way communication: *talk and discuss*.

3. ANALYSIS

This section contains subclassification of verbs of speaking in semantic groups in order to provide a precise and clear-cut distinction among the different meanings of these verbs. Each semantic group is labelled under the headings proposed in the previous section.

3.1. Verbs denoting one way communication: this large group includes verbs where flow of information is one-way: from the speaker to the listener (Štrbac 2011: 164).

3.1.1. TYPICAL VERBS OF SPEAKING

The verb *speak*, as a prototypical example of the group of verbs of speaking, has the following two components: – [PRODUCE WORDS] and [USE VOICE]. The Serbian correspondent is the verb *govoriti* (2a). *Kazati* (2b) can also correspond to *speak* in cases when its meaning is related to “speaking, stating, talking” (Štrbac 2011: 46).

- 1. a) *Don't interrupt me when I'm speaking.*(LLA)¹¹
b) *I was so shocked I couldn't speak.*(LDOCE)
- 2. a) *Samo me još nešto nemoj prekinuti dok govorim!* (KSSJ)
b) *Za trenutak nisam znala šta da kažem.* (KSSJ)

The verb *say* primarily refers to sound articulation. Its components are [ALoud] and [TO EXPRESS THOUGHTS, IDEAS], with the latter one implying what is actually being said (e.g. *They said they would come*). There are three possible correspondents in Serbian: *kazati*, *govoriti* and *reći*. The verb *kazati* refers to the subject of the speech act (4a), as does *govoriti*. Therefore, only the verb *reći* (4b) fully matches the meaning segments of the verb *say*, as it is the only verb in this group that refers to the meaning component [SOUND ARTICULATION]:

- 3. a) *Ben never forgets to say "Please" and "Thank you".* (CDO)
b) *She said goodbye to all her friends and left.* (CDO)
- 4. a) *A sin, bled i sklopljenih očiju, čuti, ali kao da hoće da kaže: Zar tako!*

¹¹ The sources used in this paper are coded in the following way: *Longman Language Activator* as LLA, *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* as LDOCE, *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English Online* as LDO, *Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture* as LDOELC, *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* as MWD, *Oxford Dictionaries* as OD, *Oxford English Dictionary* as OED, *Cambridge Dictionaries Online* as CDO, and *Korpus savremenog srpskog jezika* as KSSJ.

E, sad znam!¹² (KSSJ)

b) *Rekla sam dečku da vas dovede gore sa svećom čim dođete iz šetnje.* (KSSJ)

The component of the verb *tell* is [IN ORDER TO GIVE INFORMATION], which clearly implies that the dominant component refers to intention. In Serbian, the formal correspondent is the verb *reći* (8a). *Kazati* (8b) can also be treated as a correspondent, mostly in cases when *tell* refers to giving information orally:

7. a) *Don't tell me you've forgotten my birthday again.* (LDOCE)
8. a) *Nemoj mi reći da si se u toj 'ludačkoj košulji' pojavio pred sudijom?* (KSSJ)
- b) „Ako odbiješ *da kažeš*, pred tobom je tvoja poslednja noć.” (KSSJ)

3.1.2. VERBS DENOTING THE MANNER OF SPEAKING

The components of *articulate* are [CLEARLY] and [CAREFULLY], and they refer to expressing oneself in words precisely. The verb in Serbian that is the formal correspondent is *artikulirati*, or *artikulisati* (10b). However, there are other options, informal in their register, which can be used as translation equivalents. These are modified by the adverb of manner: (*iz*)*govoriti*, *izgovarati*, *izraziti* *razgovetno*, *jasno*, *razumljivo*.

9. a) *I found myself unable to articulate my feelings.* (CDO)
- b) *She struggled to articulate her thoughts.* (OLD)
10. a) Ja, uostalom, možda ne znam ... teško mi je *da se jasno izrazim* ... ali, u svakom slučaju, ko bi osim vas i mogao ostati ... (KSSJ)
- b) Svoj glavni argument on, pak, *artikuliše* u jeziku jednog deističkog prosvetiteljskog intelektualca. (KSSJ)

3.1.3. VERBS DENOTING THE PITCH OF VOICE

The verbs *cry* and *shout* are treated as synonymous in dictionaries, as they share the component [VERY LOUDLY]. However, the difference between them lies in the cause of speech activity: *cry* contains the component [IN PAIN, DISTRESS, SORROW] while for *shout* it is [IN ANGER, EXCITEMENT]. Bilingual dictionaries give three formal correspondents: *vikati*, *viknuti* and *izvikivati*. *Vikati* (and *viknuti*, its perfective form) (12a) entirely corresponds to the components of the English verb. The verb *izvikivati* has the connotation of repeating the action. The verbs *povikati* (12b) and *uzviknuti* (12c) are not listed in dictionaries, but should be, because the prefix only modifies the meaning of the stem (*po-* refers to the initial phase of the activity, while the prefix *uz-* refers to the moment in which the whole situation has been completed (Novakov 2005: 76)).

12 Here, the verb *kazati* is the suppletive form of the verb *reći*; in such cases it is used as a non-finite form, mostly in the present tense (Pranjeković 2007: 136).

11. a) *There's no need to shout, I can hear perfectly well.* (CDO)
b) *'Get out!' she shouted angrily.* (LLA)
12. a) Pa dobro. Nemoj *da vičeš.* (KSSJ)
b) „Napolje iz moje kuće!” *povikala je Šeron skupivši svu snagu koja joj je preostala.* (KSSJ)
c) *Pazite – uzviknula je.* (KSSJ)

The components of the verb *scream* are [IN A HIGH VOICE] and [IN STRONG PAIN, FEAR, EXCITEMENT]. There are four formal correspondents: *vrisnuti*, *vrištati*, *kriknuti* and *kreštati*. The verb *kreštati* lacks the component referring to cause. Moreover, the verb *kriknuti* does not seem to be the best solution, as the verb *vrisnuti* (and its aspectual correlate *vrištati*) is used more often than *kriknuti* in Serbian language (14a). The reason is that in certain contexts (primarily those denoting repetition) it is not possible to use *kriknuti*, as it is perfective in its aspect:

13. a) *The kids were screaming with excitement.* (OLD)
14. a) *Deca su vrištala od radosti, kao na velikom vatrometu.* (KSSJ)

3.1.4. VERBS DENOTING THE INTENTION OF THE SPEAKER

Verbs denoting the intention of the speaker have one meaning component which is common to them all, and that is [PRODUCE WORDS], but they contain at least one additional component referring to the effect that the speaker wants to achieve.

3.1.4.1. VERBS DENOTING INFORMATION TRANSFER

The components of *announce* are [PRODUCE WORDS] and [IN AN OFFICIAL WAY], but some dictionary definitions also give the additional component [ABOUT A DECISION OR A PLAN]. The verb *objaviti* in Serbian has a similar meaning (16a). *Najaviti* (16b) is also a corresponding verb, as the prefix *na-* implies the realization of the situation (Novakov 1992: 92). *Obznaniti* is one more of the formal correspondents, as is the verb *oglasiti* – it is likewise defined as giving information publicly. Bilingual dictionaries do not list the verb *saopštiti* (16c), but this verb can also be used as a formal correspondent because its meaning is “to inform someone about something, to announce”.

15. a) *The prime minister has announced that public spending will be increased next year.* (CDO)
b) *He announced his retirement from international football.* (OED)
16. a) Na sednici Predsedništva Jugoslovenskog olimpijskog komiteta Đorđe Perišić *objavio je* da se povlači sa ove funkcije posle 27. letnjih olimpijskih igara u Sidneju. (KSSJ)
b) Čangrljanje iza njih *najavilo je* kočiju lejdi Remkin. (KSSJ)
c) *Saopštio je* svoju nameru lovcu, koji bez reči ponovo pođe već prokrčenim putem na levoj obali reke. (KSSJ)

The verb *answer* refers primarily to an oral or written statement provided to a question. Its semantics implies some kind of a reaction; therefore, its additional component might be [AS A REACTION]. Its correspondent in Serbian is *odgovoriti*, as its components fully match those of the English verb.

17. a) *Julie thought for a long time before answering.* (LLA)

18. a) *Prošlo je nekoliko trenutaka dok je odgovorila.* (KSSJ)

The verb *inform* is similar in its definition to the verb *tell*. They share the components [PRODUCE WORDS] and [IN ORDER TO GIVE INFORMATION], but *inform* has the added component of [OFFICIALLY OR FORMALLY]. There are several formal correspondents in Serbian language: *informisati*, *izvestiti*, *obavestiti*, *saopštiti*, *uputiti*. The verb *informisati* is used in formal registers (20a). According to RMS, *izvestiti* implies providing information through the media. *Obavestiti* refers to the subject of information. Bilingual dictionaries also list the verb *saopštiti* (20b), while the verb *uputiti* (20c) is defined as meeting someone with something. Obviously, all of the Serbian verbs lack the component which implies that the information is given officially and could, therefore, be modified with the adverb of manner *zvanično* (20d), in order for the meaning to be precise:

19. a) *Walters was not properly informed of the reasons for her arrest.* (CDO)

b) *I informed my boss that I was going to be away next week.* (CDO)

c) *He failed to inform the suspect that he had the right to remain silent.* (MWD)

20. a) *Osnovna karakteristika srpskog potrošača je da je on nedovoljno i neadekvatno informisan o svojim osnovnim pravima i načinu ostvarivanja ovih prava.* (KSSJ)

b) *Krajem te godine, majka mi je saopštila da mora da me pošalje u školu.* (KSSJ)

c) *Dimušelov prijatelj, onaj profesor koji ih je uputio u estetiku, odgovori na njihovo pitanje jednim učenim pismom.* (KSSJ)

d) *Šefsrpske diplomatije Vuk Jeremić izjavio je da nije zvanično informisan o postizanju dogovora o učešću prištinskih vlasti na konferenciji u Sarajevu.* (KSSJ)

All the definitions of the verb *lie* imply producing content that is not true. Its components are [PRODUCE WORDS], [SAYING SOMETHING IS NOT TRUE] and [WITH INTENTION OF DECEIVING]. There are two verbs in Serbian that in their form and meaning correspond to the verb *lie*: *lagati* (22a), and its perfective form *slagati*. *Lagati* refers to deceiving and giving false information on purpose. The prefix *s-* in *slagati* refers to instantaneous realization of a situation (Novakov 2005: 79). *Govoriti laži/neistinu* (22b) can be used as a translation equivalent.

21. a) *Don't trust her – she's lying.* (CDO)

22. a) *Onaj ko vam priča da zna nešto o nekome – laže!* (KSSJ)

b) *Mekejnova kampanja zna da govori neistinu o mom energetsom*

planu, kao da se ponose svojim nepoznavanjem stvari, rekao je Obama. (KSSJ)

Mention has the following components: [BRIEFLY] and [WITHOUT GOING INTO DETAIL]. The lexemes that can be used as formal correspondents are *spomenuti* and *napomenuti*. Both are defined by the verb *pomenuti*. Its components are equal to the components of the English verb. Thus *pomenuti* (24a), and both of the prefixed verbs, *spomenuti* and *napomenuti*, can be used as correspondents.

23. a) *I get nervous every time his name is mentioned.* (MWD)
b) *She mentioned that she would be out of the office the following day.* (MWD)
24. a) Nije bilo potrebe da uznemirava gospođu Darsli, ona bi se oneraspoložila kad god se *pomene* njena sestra. (KSSJ)

3.1.4.2. VERBS DENOTING SPEAKER'S ATTITUDE

The verb *accuse* refers to the act of speaking by which someone is being blamed for something. Its components of meaning are [SAYING SOMEONE IS GUILTY] and [OF A CRIME, FAULT, OFFENCE OR FOR DOING SOMETHING BAD]. Serbian offers two formal correspondents, *okriviti* (26a) and *optužiti*. *Optužiti* implies that the context for this verb is related to officially charging someone at court (26b), while *okriviti* implies that someone is guilty, but lacks the semantic component referring to a crime, or to some other violation of law.

25. a) *Protesters angrily accused the police of violence and intimidation.* (LLA)
b) *He's accused of murder.* (LDOCE)
26. a) Organizatori ovih svojevrskih kontrola za osipanje barikada *okrivili su* novinare. (KSSJ)
b) Nizam-el-Molk je odredio primerenu kaznu: jedan ismailitski stolar *optužen je* za ubistvo, nakon mučenja bio je razapet, a zatim su njegovo telo vukli ulicama bazara. (KSSJ)

Apologize refers to the speaker's regret about something wrong he/she has done or said. Its components are [SAY YOU ARE SORRY] and [FOR DOING OR SAYING SOMETHING WRONG]. There is only one corresponding verb in Serbian, *izviniti se* (28a).

27. a) *I don't know why I apologized, because I didn't do anything wrong.* (LLA)
28. a) Istina je da je bilo verbalnog duela sa jednim od učenika, zbog čega *sam se izvinió*, jer sam shvatio da sam prenaó. (KSSJ)

Complain is the verb which is specific within this group: it expresses both the speaker's attitude and his/her state of emotions. The dominant component is [SAYING YOU ARE NOT SATISFIED ABOUT SOMETHING OR SOME-

ONE]. The formal correspondents in Serbian are *žaliti se*, *zamerati* and *tužiti se*. The verb *žaliti se* implies the same emotional component as the English verb (30a). *Tužiti se* (30b) also semantically corresponds to the verb *complain*. *Zameriti* can be used as the formal correspondent only when it is necessary to state the cause of dissatisfaction. Although not listed in bilingual dictionaries, the verb *jadati se* might also be used as one of the correspondents. Another possible correspondent not listed in the dictionaries, *tužakati se*, has the implication of childish behaviour, .

29. a) *He works hard but he never complains.* (MWD)
b) *Dan's been complaining of severe headaches recently.* (LDO)
30. a) On u šali kaže da radi kod sina i *ne žali se* na platu već na neograničeno radno vreme za šta je priznaje sam kriv. (KSSJ)
b) Kao da je i njega neka kobila udarila u glavu, Isaković *se tužio* na glavobolje, koje ga bude, noću. (KSSJ)

Dictionary entries define *thank* as expressing pleasure and gratitude for something done, and it has the meaning component [TO EXPRESS GRATITUDE]. There is one verb in Serbian with the same components, *zahvaliti (se)*.¹³ Both the English and the Serbian verbs imply a direct contact between the speaker and the listener:

31. a) *The old lady thanked me for helping her across the road.* (LDOELC)
32. a) Emina mi *je zahvalila* za poslušnost i nežno me zagrlila. (KSSJ)

The definitions of the verb *threaten* clearly state the speaker's intention is to be hostile towards someone. The component of this verb is [SAYING YOU WILL HARM SOMEONE]. This verb is often used in conditional sentences – in those cases when the speaker conditions his requirements by threats (33a). The corresponding verb in Serbian is *pretiti* (34a).

33. a) *Postal workers are threatening a strike if they don't receive a pay increase.* (LDO)
34. a) Norveške kamiondžije *prete* štrajkom. (KSSJ)

3.1.4.3. VERBS DENOTING CONTACT INITIATION

Ask is a typical representative of the group. It is semantically neutral, as its meaning component is [IN ORDER TO GET AN ANSWER OR INFORMATION]. The formal correspondent in Serbian is the verb *pitati* (36a). Other correspondents are *upitati* and *zapitati*, both perfective in their aspect. The prefixation introduces a semantic component as well: both the prefixes, *u-* and *za-* in *upitati* and *zapitati* shorten the duration of the base verb and have the meaning *to begin* (Novakov 2005: 70/90).

¹³ Klajn (1997: 198) says that the reflexive form (*zahvaliti se*) can be used only when it means *to refuse*, for example: *Zahvalio se na časti, predlažući da mesto njega uzmu nekog mlađeg.* (He thanked for the honour, proposing someone younger instead of him.) *Zahvaliti se*, therefore, can be used only if the speaker refuses the offer, but expresses his/her gratitude for it.

35. a) *What should I tell people if they ask me why you didn't come to the party?* (LLA)

36. a) *Ljudi me pitaju zašto u ovim godinama još uvek pevam.* (KSSJ)

Semantically speaking, *question* is almost the same as the verb *ask*. However, it differs in its register, because it is typically used in formal, official discourse. Other formal correspondents are *ispitivati*, *istraživati* and *saslušavati*. *Ispitivati* refers to asking questions with the intention of getting information from the listener (38a); *istraživati* may be used as a formal correspondent in certain situations, while *ispitivati* implies investigation. *Saslušavati* has the connotation of requiring information from someone involved in a crime:

37. a) *She hates being questioned about her past.* (LDO)

b) *They never questioned what crime he had done.* (OD)

38. a) *On joj daje novac, njegova žena unosi kafu i zastaje na vratima, ispituju je o Nemačkoj, o Frankfurtu, o materi, Bernisterovom bratu,...* (KSSJ)

Greet is used in order to initiate contact with the listener, with the implication of addressing the listener politely upon meeting him/her. The corresponding verb in Serbian is *pozdraviti*:

39. a) *He greeted me at the door.* (CDO)

40. a) *Pomalo oronuo i kao smežuran, pozdravio nas je Fokner, umorno, blago.* (KSSJ)

3.1.4.4. VERBS DENOTING ACTIVITY INITIATION:

Advise is the verb which implies making a suggestion; its meaning component is [TO SAY WHAT SOMEONE SHOULD DO], and it has an additional component, [WHEN YOU KNOW MORE THAN THEY DO], implying that the speaker gives advice relying on his/her own experience. The only formal correspondent of this verb in Serbian is *savetovati* (42a) which refers to expressing opinion about what should be done and how.

41. a) *We advised them to save their money.* (MWD)

42. a) *Savetovali su mi da provodim što više vremena na čistom vazduhu.* (KSSJ)

OED defines *order* as “give an authoritative instruction to do something”. The components of this verb are [USING POWER OR AUTHORITY] and [SAYING SOMEONE MUST DO SOMETHING]. There are two verbs in Serbian that correspond to the aforementioned verb: *narediti* and *zapovediti*, although *narediti* lacks the component which explicitly states that the speaker has the authority:

43. a) *The soldiers were ordered back to the base.* (MWD)

44. a) *Stvarno, tako mi je zapovedeno da vam kažem.* (KSSJ)

Pray is the verb with the meaning of addressing God, and is, therefore, a specific verb, as the addressee does not exist in the real world. Its components are [TO GOD OR ANOTHER DEITY] and [IN ORDER TO ASK FOR SOMETHING OR EXPRESS THANKS]. The Serbian correspondent is the reflexive verb *moliti se* (46a):

45. a) *She knelt and prayed silently.* (CDO)

46. a) *Ona se bila vratila sa prozora koji je ostao otvoren i glasno se molila tonom koji bi dirnuo i najneosetljivija srca.* (KSSJ)

The semantics of the verb *suggest* refers to the speech activity by which a speaker expresses opinion about a possible manner of doing something. Although semantically being close to the verb *advise*, *suggest* has the feature which makes the difference: [IN ORDER TO CONSIDER IT]. *Predložiti* (48a) and *savetovati* are the corresponding verbs in Serbian, but *savetovati* bears a stronger connotation of doing as said, while *predložiti* implies only giving an opinion:

47. a) *It was a sunny afternoon, and Jim suggested a trip to the beach.* (LLA)

48. a) „*Predlažem da nam mlada dama ispriča jednu priču.*” (KSSJ)

The verb *warn* refers to giving information about a possible problem or danger that should not be overlooked or neglected. The component of this verb is [TO SAY THAT SOMETHING UNPLEASANT MIGHT HAPPEN]. The verb in Serbian that semantically corresponds to this verb is *upozoriti* (50a). *Opomenuti* may also be used as a correspondent to *warn*, although it does not reflect the implication of a possible misfortune:

49. a) *Nobody warned me about the dangers.* (MWD)

50. a) *Ako nije smogao snage da umiri želudac, zašto me nije upozorio bar jednom rečju, već je ćutke šmugnuo kroz otvorena vrata?* (KSSJ)

3.1.4.5. VERBS DENOTING PROHIBITION

Ban implies that a certain activity is not allowed to happen because the speaker is producing the content by which the listener is not allowed to do something. The components of this verb are [OFFICIALLY] and [TO SAY THAT SOMETHING MUST NOT BE DONE]. The corresponding verb in Serbian is *zabraniti* (52a), as its meaning matches the meaning of the English verb.

51. a) *The school banned that book for many years.* (MWD)

52. a) *Žetva je u Evropi bila loša, Rusija je zabranila izvoz pšenice, a i malo je brašna u regionu.* (KSSJ)

3.1.4.6. VERBS DENOTING SPEAKER'S OBLIGATION: PROMISE

The components of *promise* are [TO SAY THAT SOMETHING WILL BE DONE] and [CERTAINLY]. This verb refers to verbally assuring some-

one that something will be done. The verb in Serbian language with the same meaning components is *obećati* (54a). Another possible formal correspondent is *zavetovati* (*se*), but it bears additional features referring to something important and solemn.

53. a) *Hurry up, we promised that we wouldn't be late.* (LLA)

54. a) *Dolazili smo pre tri meseca i obećali smo da ćemo pomoći.* (KSSJ)

3.2. VERBS DENOTING TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION

There are two verbs in the corpus that belong to this sub-class: *talk* and *discuss*.

Talk is a semantically neutral verb, as it refers to information exchange and has no implications regarding style, or register. The dominant component of *talk* is [AS PART OF A CONVERSATION]. The Serbian equivalent is the verb *razgovarati* (56a):

55. a) *We sat around talking for hours.* (LLA)

56. a) *Razgovarali smo cele noći, čini mi se, ali kao da ta noć i taj razgovor još nisu završeni.* (KSSJ)

The semantics of the verb *discuss* partly overlaps with that of *talk*, but *discuss* implies that the conversation is about a topic which is viewed from various angles. Meaning components of this verb are, thus, [ABOUT A TOPIC] and [IN ORDER TO EXCHANGE IDEAS]. There are several verbs in Serbian that correspond to the verb *discuss*: *diskutovati*, *raspravljati*, *polemisati*.¹⁴ *Diskutovati* (58a) exhibits the same semantic neutrality as *discuss*. *Raspravljati* has a more negative implication, while *polemisati* represents the most intense and fierce discussion out of the three suggested formal correspondents:

57. a) *The two families got together to discuss the wedding arrangements.* (LLA)

b) *I discussed the matter with my wife.* (OD)

58. a) *Diplomate su tako imale priliku da diskutuju o burnom razvoju situacije.* (KSSJ)

3.3. SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

As the goal of the paper was to contrastively analyse verbs that belong to the lexical field of speaking in English and Serbian, the analysis showed that all the English verbs from the corpus have a formal correspondent in Serbian language. The results are presented in Table 1:

¹⁴ The English language, naturally, has verbs with the meaning of *raspravljati* and *polemisati*, but these are not part of the corpus in this paper as they do not fall within the 1000 most frequently used English verbs.

the English verb	formal correspondents in Serbian language
<i>speak</i>	<i>govoriti</i>
<i>say</i>	<i>kazati, govoriti, reći</i>
<i>tell</i>	<i>reći, kazati</i>
<i>articulate</i>	<i>artikulisati, izgovoriti</i>
<i>cry</i>	<i>vikati, izvikivati</i>
<i>scream</i>	<i>vrисnuti, kriknuti</i>
<i>announce</i>	<i>objaviti, obznaniti, oglasiti, saopštiti</i>
<i>answer</i>	<i>odgovoriti</i>
<i>inform</i>	<i>informisati, izvestiti, obavestiti, saopštiti, uputiti</i>
<i>lie</i>	<i>lagati</i>
<i>mention</i>	<i>pomenuti</i>
<i>accuse</i>	<i>okriviti, optužiti</i>
<i>apologize</i>	<i>izviniti se</i>
<i>complain</i>	<i>žaliti se, zameriti, tužiti se, jadati se</i>
<i>thank</i>	<i>zahvaliti se</i>
<i>threaten</i>	<i>pretiti</i>
<i>ask</i>	<i>pitati</i>
<i>question</i>	<i>pitati, ispitivati, istraživati, saslušavati</i>
<i>greet</i>	<i>pozdraviti</i>
<i>advise</i>	<i>savetovati</i>
<i>order</i>	<i>narediti, komandovati, zapovediti</i>
<i>pray</i>	<i>moliti se</i>
<i>suggest</i>	<i>predložiti</i>
<i>warn</i>	<i>upozoriti, opomenuti</i>
<i>ban</i>	<i>zabraniti</i>
<i>promise</i>	<i>obećati, zavetovati se</i>
<i>talk</i>	<i>razgovarati</i>
<i>discuss</i>	<i>diskutovati, raspravljati, polemisati</i>
<i>shout</i>	<i>vikati, izvikivati</i>

Table 1. English verbs and their formal correspondents in Serbian language

Table 1 shows that most of the English verbs have more than one formal correspondent in Serbian language. Some of the Serbian verbs correspond to several different English verbs, which is particularly the case with semantically neutral verbs: *kazati*, *reći* and *govoriti*. All the three Serbian verbs may refer to *say*, *speak* and *tell*, and this is conditioned by register, grammar or lexis. The verb *articulate* has two correspondents in Serbian, *artikulisati* and *izgovoriti*, where the former verb is marked as formal, and the latter as neutral in its register. An example of a grammatically conditioned use of the Serbian verbs *kazati* and *reći* (which are both correspondents of the English verb *say*) is when *kazati* is used as a perfective form of *reći*. On the other hand, some verbs do not have all the components as the English verbs, which is the case with formal

correspondents of the verb *inform*. None of its Serbian correspondents has the component [OFFICIALLY OR FORMALLY], [ZVANIČNO ILI FORMALNO]. Some other Serbian verbs, on the other hand, have a component more when compared to the English verb: for example, the verb *zavetovati se* has the component [SVEČANO], whereas the English verb *promise* does not have it.

There are also two pairs of English verbs, *ask* and *question* and *inform* and *announce*, which exhibit a different problem: these two pairs of English verbs have different meaning components, but the same correspondent in Serbian – with *ask* and *question*, the Serbian correspondent is *pitati*, while with *inform* and *announce* it is *saopštiti*. *Ask* and *question* have the same meaning components, but the difference lies in their register: *ask* is used in informal, *question* in formal register. Their Serbian correspondent *pitati* is neutral in register, but corresponds to both the verbs, as it has the matching meaning components.

Moreover, there are three English verbs in the corpus that not only have formal correspondents in Serbian, but have translation equivalents, too (Table 2).

English verb	Translation equivalent in Serbian language
<i>articulate</i>	<i>razgovetno/jasno/razumljivo izgovoriti/izraziti</i>
<i>inform</i>	<i>zvanično informisati, izvestiti, obavestiti, saopštiti, uputiti</i>
<i>lie</i>	<i>govoriti laži, govoriti neistinu</i>

Table 2. English verbs and their translation equivalents in Serbian language

In these cases, Serbian verbs are either modified by the adverb of manner (*razgovetno, jasno, razumljivo, zvanično*), or the equivalent represents the combination of a verb and a noun (*govoriti laži-govoriti neistinu*). This phenomenon, when the verb has both its formal correspondent and translation equivalent, is conditioned by the fact that the existing formal correspondents in some cases do not transfer the meaning of the English verb precisely enough. That is why it becomes necessary to look for a solution that corresponds better to the meaning components of the English verb, and that is a translation equivalent.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The emphasis in this paper has been on the lexical field of verbs of speaking in English and in Serbian. The verb superordinated to this lexical field is *speak*, because its meaning components are part of all the analyzed verbs, but the verbs differ among themselves in that they have additional meaning components that further specify their meaning. Decomposing meaning of the verbs in the corpus by the method of componential analysis was the basis for comparing the verbs in the two languages. This process was crucial, as decomposing the meaning of English verbs provided the basis for their comparison with verbs in Serbian. The analysis showed that in Serbian language there are formal correspondents for all the verbs in the corpus.

The analysis also showed that there is a problem of divergence: for more than half of the English verbs there is more than one formal correspondent in Serbian. The verb *inform*, for example, has five formal correspondents in Serbian: *informisati-izvestiti-obavestiti-saopštiti-uputiti*. This problem can be solved depending on the register in which the verb is used, its grammatical or lexical features. Convergence is another problem, yet, not as striking as divergence: two of the pairs of the English verbs (*ask* and *question*, and *inform* and *announce*) have the same formal correspondent in Serbian. Three English verbs (*articulate-inform-lie*), although having their formal Serbian equivalents, also have their translation equivalents, primarily because in some cases a formal correspondent in Serbian does not fully match the meaning of an English verb.

In general, it seems that the reason for a large number of correspondents in Serbian is the fact that verbs in Serbian are not defined precisely enough. Namely, *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnoga jezika* defines verbs mostly by their synonyms, which then leads to their imprecise specification, and does not provide detailed meaning components of Serbian verbs. That is why a more thorough analysis should be done, analyzing collocation range and restrictions of verbs of speaking in Serbian. It should show the context in which native speakers of Serbian use them, and would lead to a detailed and linguistically more precise picture concerning verbs, as the meaning of lexemes would be defined thoroughly.

This paper, therefore, tries to present the way in which a lexical field of a language should be analyzed, and then contrasted to the corresponding lexical field of another language. Such analysis is applicable to the vocabulary of any language, and, along with the aforementioned analysis of collocation range, would contribute to a more precise definition of words in both monolingual and bilingual dictionaries.

References

- Austin 1961: J.L. Austin, *Philosophical Papers*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cruse 1987: D.A. Cruse, *Lexical Semantics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Đorđević 1987: R. Đorđević, *Uvod u kontrastiranje jezika*, Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
- Ivir 1981: V. Ivir, "Formal Correspondence vs. Translation Equivalence Revisited", in: Even-Zohar and Toury, G. (eds.), *Theory of Translation and Intercultural Relations*, University of Tel Aviv (= Poetics Today): 51–59.
- Ivić 1970: M. Ivić, „O upotrebi glagolskih vremena u zavisnoj rečenici: prezent u rečenici s veznikom da”, *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku*, XIII: 43–54.
- Klajn ⁴1997: I.Klajn, *Rečnik jezičkih nedoumica*, Čigoja štampa, Beograd.
- Lehrer 1985: A.Lehrer, "Semantic Fields and Semantic Change", in: Fisiak, J. (ed.), *Historical Semantics. Historical Word-Formation*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 283–296.

- Lipka 1980: L. Lipka, "Methodology and Representation in the Study of Lexical Fields", in: Kastovsky, D. (ed.), *Perspektiven der lexikalischen Semantik*, Bonn: Bouvier Verlag Herbert Grundmann, 93–114.
- Lipka ² 1992: L. Lipka, *An Outline of English Lexicology*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Lyons 1977: J. Lyons, *Semantics. Vol. 1-2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Novakov 2005: P. Novakov, *Glagolski vid i tip glagolske situacije u engleskom i srpskom jeziku*, Novi Sad: Futura publikacije.
- Prčić 2005: T. Prčić, *Engleski u srpskom*. Novi Sad: Zmaj.
- Prčić ² 2008: T. Prčić, *Semantika i pragmatika reči*, Novi Sad: Zmaj.
- Štrbac 2011: G. Štrbac, *Dopune komunikativnih glagola. Sintaksičko-semantički i leksikografski opis*, Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu.

Dictionaries

- Cambridge Dictionaries Online: <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/>. 21.4.2014. (CDO)
- Englesko-hrvatski ili srpski rječnik, sedamnaesto izdanje, ur. R. Filipović, Zagreb: Školska knjiga i grafički zavod Hrvatske, 1990.
- Koljević, Đurić Paunović (2002): S. Koljević, I. Đurić Paunović, *Englesko-srpski rečnik*, prvo izdanje, Beograd: Prosveta.
- Korpus savremenog srpskog jezika (Korpus sa izvorima 2013): <http://www.korpus.matf.bg.ac.rs/korpus/mainmenu.php/4> 26.5.2014. (KSSJ)
- Longman Language Activator. Second Edition, ed. D. Summers, Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2002. (LLA)
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 3rd edition, ed. D. Summers, Harlow: Longman, 1995. (LDOCE)
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English Online: <http://ldoceonline.com/>. 29.4.2014. (LDO)
- Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture, first edition, ed. D. Summers, Harlow: Longman, 1992. (LDOELC)
- Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary: <http://meriam-webster.com/>. 7.6.2014. (MWD)
- Oxford Dictionaries: <http://oxforddictionaries.com/>. 14.4.2014. (OD)
- Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd edition, (on CD-ROM, v. 4. 0), Oxford University Press, 2009. (OED)
- Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika. I–VI, Novi Sad: Matica srpska, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1967.

Jelena LJ. Biljetina

GLAGOLI GOVORENJA U ENGLISKOM I SRPSKOM JEZIKU

Rezime

Ovaj rad predstavlja kontrastivnu analizu leksičkog polja glagola govorenja u engleskom i srpskom jeziku sa osnovnim ciljem da se kontrastiranjem na semantičkom nivou utvrdi koje sličnosti i razlike postoje u značenjima glagola ovog leksičkog polja u dva jezika. Poređenje leksema se vrši i unutar engleskog jezika, kako bi se odredilo koja su to obeležja po kojima se glagoli govorenja međusobno razlikuju. Oba ova načina kontrastiranja doprinose utvrđivanju postojanja formalnih korespondenata ili prevodnih ekvivalenata u srpskom jeziku. Utvrđivanje značenja glagola govorenja u radu je vršeno postupkom komponente analize, odnosno razlaganjem značenja na njegove komponente, čime je stvorena mogućnost da se elementi značenja glagola u engleskom i srpskom jeziku lakše uporede.

Dobijeni rezultati pokazuju da za sve glagole u engleskom jeziku postoji formalni korespondent u srpskom, a da za neke od glagola, pored korespondenata, postoje i prevodni ekvivalenti. Tako ovaj rad može da doprinese i preciznijem prenošenju značenja ovih glagola iz jednog jezika u drugi prilikom procesa prevođenja.

Ključne reči: glagoli govorenja, leksičko polje, kontrastivna analiza, komponentna analiza, semantička obeležja.

Примљен 12. новембра 2014. године
Прихваћен 29. марта 2016. године