

Iwona Witczak-Plisiecka

SELECTED SEMANTIC ISSUES CONCERNING VERBS OF SPEAKING

1. INTRODUCTION

The present paper discusses the notions concerning lexical meaning. The topics include various methods of the formalisation of lexical meaning, lexical and sense relations within the domain of the verbs of speaking. It also aims to present some aspects of the recent semantic theories relevant to the explanation of the meaning of verbal concepts and has been based on a preliminary research done with reference to a current lexicographic project, a Bilingual English-Polish Thesaurus [BIT] (an on-line data base), which is being prepared in the Institute of English Studies, University of Łódź.

Naturally, there are many approaches to the problem of the explanation of the meaning of lexemes and they differ greatly within various linguistic theories, e.g. the truth-conditional approach, cognitive semantics, the behaviourist approach, etc. Various theories concerning the basic philosophical questions of symbol use, e.g. the reference theory of meaning, the use theory, the image theory, etc., have been discussed extensively in the specifically linguistic literature [cf. Lyons 1968: 400f.; 1977: 95f.; Leech 1981; Fodor 1977: 9f; Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet 1990; Jackendoff 1990].

Following de Saussure's [1916 (1959)] dichotomy, the meaning of any item of vocabulary is usually described in terms of signification and mediating concepts, which can be traced back to the traditional Aristotelian distinction between 'matter' and 'form'. It is the concept or 'sense' that lexical semantics attempts to explain. For the purposes of a semantic dictionary, it is *lexemes* – abstract underlying elements, and not words with

their multiplicity of forms, which are under investigation. This seems to meet the needs of representing the mental lexicon as it appears that lexemes are convenient idealisations and correspond to items contained in the structure of the lexicon [cf. Cruse 1986]. It seems important to present both 'internal', i.e. conceptual elements of meaning and the 'external', network organisation of the lexicon.

Even having accepted that there is no reason to suppose that different grammatical categories should demonstrate different mental representations [cf. Jackendoff 1983], it goes without saying that verbs are the category constituting 'pivotal elements' – the core of a sentence. They suggest a scene/frame of an event [cf. Fillmore 1971a/b, 1977a/b] and show great semantic sensitivity to context. In Polish verbs seem to resist formalisation still more because of their richness of affixation processes.

In the analysis of verbal concepts which is to be adopted for lexicographic purposes, it may prove worthwhile to compile findings of various linguistic theories to provide as complete an interpretation of the meaning of the analysed senses as possible.

2. LEXICAL AND SENSE RELATIONS WITHIN THE FIELD OF THE VERBS OF SPEAKING

Within the structuralist tradition the vocabulary of a language is recognised as a system or a network of interdependent elements. It is apparent that lexemes enter many varied relations with one another. In the relational, in a sense 'external' structure of the lexicon, lexemes are treated as separate entities, the entries in the mental lexicon. Representations of this structure attempts to discover and present or model their configurations. Relational analysis correlates to some extent with componential analysis, and some relations can be approached as features as well. In the following sections selected sense and lexical relations will be presented.

2.1. Polysemy and Homonymy

A major problem posed by the notions of polysemy and homonymy is to distinguish between several senses of the same lexical item and different lexical items which show the same form. A word is defined as **polysemous** when it has several meanings, while semantically unrelated lexemes which have the same form are called **homonyms**.

The problem of the recognition of polysemy and homonymy does not manifest itself so dramatically if the field approach is adopted for the analysis, within which we tend to treat lexemes as different words, therefore avoiding the problem of the identification of the relation that holds between them, which does not of course answer theoretical problems.

Verbs in English are generally recognised as being more polysemous than nouns and other categories. The same seems to apply to Polish verbs. It has been claimed that verbs in English have on average 2.11 senses, whereas the average English noun has 1.74 senses [Fellbaum 1990: 43]. It also appears that verbs in general show greater mutability of meaning which changes depending on the context. Furthermore, a number of verbs can be depleted, i.e. their meaning can only be determined in particular contexts. In such cases nearly all relevant information which concerns the meaning is carried by the context. The most frequently used verbs, those which belong to the core vocabulary (e.g. *be*, *have*, *run*, *set*, etc.) show a great variety of meaning. To exemplify, for the purposes of the present analysis, three senses have been identified for *stumble*, i.e. *stumble'* – while walking (Pol. potknąć się, wpaść na), *stumble''* – descriptive of the manner of walking (Pol. iść nierówno, potykając się) and *stumble'''* – while speaking (Pol. potknąć się na słowie, jąkać/zająknać się).

2.2. Hyponymy

In brief, hyponymy is the relation of inclusion or entailment between a more specific (subordinate) and a more general (superordinate) lexeme. It demonstrates a unilateral transitive implication and is best seen between nouns, where its relatively simple structure can be rendered in a frame 'An X is (a kind of) Y'. In logic this relation can be described as the unilateral implication, i.e. A B (B implies A), where B is higher in the taxonomy than A, but it is not the case that B A. The higher term in the taxonomy is usually called a **headword**, **cover word**, **supcrordinate**, **hyperonym** or **archilexeme**. Hyponymy involves the notion of **entailment** which is dealt with in the further sections. Although it seems to be relatively simple between nouns and in taxonomies of natural kinds, hyponymy relation is by no means simple between verbs. The use of a frame to demonstrate entailment between nouns does not seem appropriate when applied to verbs, e.g. '*stammering is talking*' or '*mumbling is talking*' seem to be at least awkward [cf. Fellbaum 1990]. Research into verbal hyponymy has shown that this structure involves various kinds of semantic elaborations across different dimensions of meaning, the lexicalisation itself often being

language-specific. For example, Talmy (1985) in his analysis of the verbs of motion, presents them as a conflation of 'move' and features of 'manner' and 'cause'.

With regard to the verbs of speaking, It seems more convenient to approach them in terms of **troponymy** [cf. Fellbaum 1990] rather than traditional hyponymy. Verbs in general seem to demonstrate a rather 'bushy' structure in their hierarchies, i.e. some levels or strata of semantic conceptualisation are lexicalised much more richly than others. Moreover, some levels lack a hyperonym or any 'prime' lexeme [cf. Cruse 1986 for verbs of movement] and seem to be linked rather by a prime concept or a salient feature.

One basic word has been identified as most general for the English verbs of speaking, i.e. *say*. It appears that above the level of *say* there are no hyponyms or hyperonyms. The verb has also been claimed to exemplify a semantic primitive [cf. Wierzbicka 1972; 1987] and probably a **lexical universal** [Verschueren 1987]. With respect to Polish, *mówić* and *powiedzieć* seem to be the most general.

2.3. Troponymy and Entailment

Entailment is a unilateral implication, close to the notion of hyponymy. In fact the concept of entailment can also explain the relation of synonymy – a bilateral implication, and antonymy, being the converse of entailment [cf. Kempson 1977]. Entailment has been shown to be especially suitable for the analysis of verbs and correspond to a considerable extent to the part – whole relation of **meronymy** found between nouns [Fellbaum 1990]. However, with respect to verbs, the part-whole relations seem to be based on the temporal inclusion or the lack of such an inclusion. Further aspects of meaning analysed within the framework of entailment involve **troponymy**, **presupposition**, and the **causal** relation. All these kinds of entailment are related in Tab. 1 below [adopted from Fellbaum 1990: 57].

The name troponymy has been coined on the basis of the Greek term *tropos* which denotes 'manner' or 'fashion'. Thus, troponymy, the manner relation, can be seen as a special kind of entailment parallel to **meronymy**, i.e. a part-whole relation. Troponymy is to be understood as a relation between pairs which are always temporally co-extensive and whose members are related to each other by entailment. The term 'manner' is understood in a broad sense so as to cover variety of semantic dimensions which may themselves differ across given conceptual fields of verbs. In the field of the verbs of speaking it may evolve such elements as 'intention' or 'motivation', e.g. *confess*, *promise* or literally 'manner', e.g. *lisp*, *mutter*. In addition,

within the field of communication and especially in the field of the verbs of speaking, many lexemes can be classified as hyponyms, or rather troponyms, of basic speech act verbs. Thus, we can talk about a 'THANK' group or 'PROMISE' group where the verbs *to promise* and *to thank* indicate the focal conceptual area of the field. However, we can hardly find a hyperonym different from some general term supplemented with an adverb or adjective of manner for verbs related to e.g. 'INDISTINCT' speech or 'INFORMAL', 'IDLE' speech.

Table 1

Four kinds of entailment relations among verbs

ENTAILMENT			
+ TEMPORAL INCLUSION		- TEMPORAL INCLUSION	
+ TROPONYMY (co-extensiveness)	- TROPONYMY (proper inclusion)	BACKGROUND PRESUPPOSITION	CAUSE
limp - walk lisp - talk	snore - sleep buy - pay	succeed - try untie - tie	raise - rise give - have

It is worth noting that the causal relation in general can be encoded at different levels of semantic structure of a language. It can be lexicalised, as in the examples above, but it can also be realised in periphrastic expressions involving elements such as '*cause to/make/let/have/get to*', etc., or can be inherent in lexemes, i.e. can be present as an internal conceptual element of a lexeme's meaning, e.g. *promise* seems to entail the element of '*cause to believe that...*'. Verbs of speaking seldom reflect the causal relation by morphological derivation. Instead, a great number of the verbs in question are inherently causative, which can be reflected in their componential analysis. The causative element of their meaning is often an elaboration of notions such as 'intention' or 'volition' (cf. *promise* above). This, however, relates to the componential analysis rather than the relational one.

2.4. Synonymy

Synonymous relations are relations of the 'sameness' of meaning. They can be seen as special cases of bilateral or symmetrical hyponymy or bilateral implication. Although there is no total synonymy within the lexicon, it is useful to analyse near synonyms.

With respect to verbs, it has been suggested that English is especially rich in synonyms for historical reasons [Palmer 1981; Fellbaum 1990]. A number of English verbal concepts are represented by both Anglo-Saxon and Greco-Latinate (or French) words, e.g.:

- (1) end – terminate
hide – conceal

In general, Greco-Latinate words are more formal. Furthermore, most often only one member of such synonymous pairs tends to be appropriate in a given context. Some of synonymous expressions, dyscriptive synonyms, seem to reveal their internal structure. In the example (2)

- (2) a. *mumble* = 'talk indistinctly'
b. *gibber* = 'talk foolishly'

the verbs *mumble* and *gibber* in their synonymous expressions show that they are manner elaborations of a more basic verb. In much the same manner, deadjectival verbs seem to encapsulate some internal property such as a change-of-state concept, e.g. (3):

- (3) *widen* = 'make/become wide'

To some extent, synonymy within the verbs of speaking depends on the level of analysis, i.e. on the subjective decision as to how precise and detailed the analysis is to be. In general, verbs as in (4) below can be claimed synonymous:

- (4) a. *to tell* = to reveal
b. *to request* = to demand
c. *to speak* = to talk
d. *to order* = to command

However, a context can often be found in which the pairs as above could stand in opposition, or one element of a pair could stand in opposition, or one element of a pair could be presented as a **hyperonym** of the other.

Within the field of the verbs of speaking it appears that synonymous structures differ across various semantic sub-fields. For example, descriptive or 'manner-of-speech' verbs do not produce as many lexemes perceived as synonymous as e.g. 'speech act verbs'.

2.5. Antonymy

The relation of antonymy generally refers to all instances of semantic oppositeness. There are three most frequently enumerated types of antonymous relations. These are: (1) complementary pairs, (2) gradable antonyms, and (3) relational opposites.

Within the domain of the verbs of speaking various types of antonymy can be found. In Polish most of the verbs in the domain could be contradicted by a 'non-action' verb *milczeć* ('to be silent') which is not lexicalised in English. In addition, the English *say*, widely recognised as the most general and basic lexeme in the field, may in some context be contrasted with others lexemes from the field, e.g. *sing*, *ask*, *deny*, etc. In each case the contrast is based on the conceptual differences along various dimensions of the meaning of *say*, e.g. *He didn't say that, he asked*. The same phenomenon can be observed in Polish.

On a deeper level of analysis, pairs such as *persuade* and *dissuade* can be found, although some of the verbs of speaking seem to lack a close opposite lexeme, e.g. *promise*.

There are a number of relational opposites, e.g. *ask* and *reply* or *answer*, which seem to presuppose one another within a temporal relation [cf. Palmer 1981: 99]. Some speech act verbs in general suggest a more complex pattern, e.g. *accept* and *refuse* both involve *offer*, but also various other dimensions.

Some antonymous lexemes show morphological markers, e.g. *approve* vs. *disapprove*, *persuade* vs. *dissuade*.

A number of antonymous pairs have the same superordinate category or a hyperonym, being usually co-troponyms, i.e. elaborations of manner, of some higher in the hierarchy term. They often seem to share some entailed elements as well, e.g. both *persuade* and *dissuade* appear to entail concepts such as 'say' and 'try'.

2.6. Other Types of Lexical and Semantic Relations

Lexical and sense relations discussed above demonstrate familiar relations which are widely recognised among users of a language and often present in reference materials and semantic literature. However, it is possible to identify other lexical and semantic relations which do not apply as widely throughout the lexicon and appear to be less explicit.

2.6.1. Phonestasia

Phonestasia belongs to unconventional lexical and sense relations which reflect both similarities in form and meaning of lexical items. Although relations such as phonestasia are seldom indicated in the structure of

reference materials, i.e. in a dictionary or a thesaurus, they seem to be important both for theoretical and practical purposes. When approached within a theoretical framework, they apparently reveal information about the components of the lexeme's meaning. In the practical approach, they seem not only to add to our knowledge of the lexeme's properties, but also help the memorisation of concepts, both of their formal and semantic elements. This becomes especially important in contrastive analysis or in the process of acquiring a foreign language.

There are various sets of phonostatic words in English [cf. Allen 1986: 248f.]. Among others, there is a group related to 'light effects', e.g. *glitter*, *glimmer*, *glisten* etc., which shows similarities in the initial parts of the group's lexemes. Also, the final element *-itter*, as in *chitter*, *glitter*, etc., provides information about implied 'bittiness', untidiness, or imperfection of the action described by the verb. Similarly, within the domain of the verbs of speaking, items such as *chatter*, *clatter*, *natter*, *patter*, seem to provide the information about iterativeness of the action referred to. Other phonostatic properties relevant for the analysis of the verbs of speaking are exemplified by the lexemes which signify dull, heavy or untidy, here also indistinct, action, e.g. *mumble*, *stumble*, *grumble*. The final element of these lexemes is also present in words belonging to other semantic domains which, however, share their 'heaviness' component of meaning, e.g. *bumble*, *fumble*, *humble*, *rumble*, etc.

In conclusion, no formal way of presenting phonostasia as a formal relation has as yet been suggested. Nonetheless, the relation being partly formal and partly based on the meaning properties of the lexemes in question seems to add to our knowledge of natural language and its structure. As such, it is relevant both to lexicography and (contrastive) lexical semantics. It is apparent from the limited analysis of selected verbs of speaking that there are correlations between phonostatic properties and meaning. Phonostatic words share aspects of both their phonetic and written form and some parts of their inherent properties as can be seen in their componential analysis.

2.6.2. Morphological Relations or 'Morphostasia'

There are sets of verbs in Polish which seem to be on the interface of compounds and morphological derivations. These verbs could be seen as combinations of a prefix and a single general verb, usually the most neutral or one of the most neutral in its semantic domain. Because both prefixes and general basic lexemes of the type of *ić*, *jechać* ('go'), *patrzeć* ('look'),

widzieć ('see'), *robić* ('do') are meaningful elements, such verbs could be analysed within both semantic and morpho-syntactic classifications (for the movement verbs analysed in relation to aspect, see P i s a r s k i 1990).

A domain can be constructed on the basis of different verbs of speaking which show a complex structure of two elements, i.e. a basic, core, general term related to 'speech', e.g. *mówić*, *powiedzieć* (two counterparts of the English *say* and *tell*) and a prefix. In fact, in many cases it is possible to deduce the meaning of the lexeme, or at least a part of it, from both its constituent elements which are meaningful morphological units. The meanings of such Polish verbs most often have both one-word and 'a core verb + preposition' counterparts in English, e.g.

(5) *opowiedzieć* – narrate, tell (*about*)

It appears that the verbs of speaking in Polish can take most, if not all, existing verbal prefixes, thus constituting a vast field of 'speech' verbs which contain a core presumably universal related concept, cf. (6) below. The combinations of a prefix and the symbol {0} indicate lexical gaps.

(6) a.	<i>domówić</i>	conclude add up	<i>dopowiedzieć</i>	add (up)
b.	<i>przymówić</i>	chat up clamour for...	<i>przypowiedzieć</i>	tell (arch.) announce
c.	<i>wymówić</i>	pronounce, utter scold...	<i>wypowiedzieć</i>	utter, speak out challenge
d.	<i>zamówić</i>	book, order play magic	<i>zapowiedzieć</i>	announce forecast
e.	<i>przemówić</i>	speak, lecture give a talk	<i>przepowiedzieć</i>	foresee, tell (future)
f.	<i>podmówić</i>	rebel	<i>podpowiedzieć</i>	prompt (as in theatre)
g.	<i>odmówić</i>	refuse, discourage patter	<i>odpowiedzieć</i>	answer, reply refer, react
h.	<i>wmówić</i>	persuade, convince	{w + 0}	
i.	<i>namówić</i>	persuade	{na + 0}	
j.	<i>zmówić</i>	conspire, plot tell (a prayer)	{z + 0}	
k.	<i>rozmówić</i>	to have a word with	<i>rozpowiedzieć</i>	gossip, tell (around)
l.	<i>umówić</i>	to make an appointment to make an agreement	{u + 0}	
m.	<i>podmówić</i>	malign, libel, chat	{po + 0}	
n.	<i>obmówić</i>	malign, gossip	{o + 0}	
o.	<i>omówić</i>	discuss	<i>opowiedzieć</i>	tell
			<i>opowiedzieć się</i>	introduce oneself

The examples as above do not demonstrate a uniform pattern. Some of the Polish prefixes are free morphemes, e.g. *na* (Eng. 'on' as in 'on the table'), *pod* ('under', 'below') *do* ('towards', 'to', 'up to'), *przy* ('near', 'around') etc. Others, e.g. *roz-*, *ob-*, *wy-*, are bound morphemes which cannot appear on their own. They are highly polysemous and show great sensitivity to context. Therefore, we cannot expect any complete semantic correspondence between lexemes constructed with the use of the same prefix. Some compounds, if they are to be approached as compounds at all, show more fossilised structures and opaqueness in their meanings. However, the explanation of the meaning of the prefixes may prove valuable both for the theoretical and practical purposes. A lot of Polish lexemes, e.g. those with *do-*, demonstrate transparency of meaning although they belong to different semantic domains, cf. *domówić* ('do' + *say/tell*), *dojechać* ('do' + *go*), etc. Others prefixes also provide insights into the meanings of related verbs.

It has been suggested that image-schemata could provide appropriate means for such a description. A sample of graphic representations is presented in (7) below:

- (7) a. *do-* →
 b. *przy-* → |
 c. *wy-* ↔

It is possible to find sets of verbs in English which appear to share the features which we found in Polish, e.g. *degrade*, *regrade*, *upgrade*, *downgrade* etc. However, Polish sets seem to produce a more regular pattern throughout the lexicon than the apparently less fossilised, more transparent and less common, English sets. It is arguable whether such relations being on the interface of form and meaning, can and should be formalised or employed in reference materials. Still, they allow for gaining access to further facets of a lexeme's meaning and use. As such are relevant for the analysis.

3. THE FORMALISATION OF LEXICAL MEANING

3.1. Componential analysis and semantic primes

Among various attempts to formalise meaning, **componential analysis** seems to be one of the most popular and controversial. The advantages and disadvantages of the approach has been well aired in the literature [cf.

Katz 1972; Jackendoff 1972, 1983; Kempson 1977; Leech 1981; Lyons 1977; Nilsen 1975; Bierwisch 1970].

In short, in relation to verb it seems more efficient to interpret meaning in terms of **prototypical** and **expected**, or in Cruse's [1980] words 'canonical' vs. 'non-canonical' features rather than necessary and sufficient ones. It is now apparent that features ascribed to lexemes, in other words the components of their meaning, do not demonstrate equal values. Some of the features are more crucial and necessary than others and some concepts may be vague. The idea correlates with psychological findings involving 'gestalt' perception of basic objects [cf. Lakoff 1977; Jackendoff 1983] and the notion of 'family resemblance' present in the prototype approach suggested by Eleanor Rosch [1973, 1975, 1977] and her followers.

For some verbs, decomposition in terms of a **definitional method** into **semantic primes** has been suggested. The most known and also controversial example has been provided by McCawley's analysis of *kill* into 'CAUSE TO BECOME NOT ALIVE'. It goes without saying that any decomposition is necessarily dependent on the subjective judgements of its author as to the atomicity of concepts. An interesting, although controversial, example of the analysis of the lexicon into a hierarchical and relational structure reduced to a few hypothetically basic elements, and guided by the dynamic 'cause-effect' process, has been presented by Burger [1984] in his "*Wordtree*".

An alternative model of semantic representation of meaning related to componential analysis has been suggested by Anna Wierzbicka [1972, 1980, 1987] in the form of *lingua mentalis* or **reductive paraphrase**. Representations are based on a minimal set of 15 'semantic primitives' or 'primes', i.e. elementary conceptual building blocks. This set includes lexemes such as *I, you, to, something, this, want* etc. Within this approach more complex concepts are portrayed in terms of a more complex set of simple sentences as in the example below, quoted after Wierzbicka [1987: 205]:

- (8) PROMISE: I know that you want me to do A
 I know that you think I may not do it
 I want to do it because you want me to do it
 I say: I will do it
 I want us to think that if I don't do it, people will not believe anything that I say I will do
 I say this, in this way, because I want to cause you to be able to think that
 I have to do it.

In order to avoid circularity and artificiality in definitions a number of cognitive linguists argue for not using a natural language to represent

lexical meaning. Within this approach non-propositional schematic representations are suggested to 'illustrate' rather than 'describe' meaning. Examples of image schematic representations for verbal prefixes in Polish have been presented in section 2.6.2.

2.2. Semantic roles

The theory of semantic roles seems to be especially efficient in the explanation of the meaning of verbal concepts. Semantic roles are also known as **participant roles** or **thematic relations** within **frame and case theory**. They are said to represent 'deep cases' which are ascribed to arguments in a sentence and, within the traditional approach, were to be universal [cf. Fillmore 1968]. However, in the alternative modern approach, as represented by Dowty and Ladusaw [cf. Ladusaw 1988; Dowty 1991] semantic roles are seen as combinations of certain entailments. It has also been suggested that roles are not discrete categories at all, but are better seen in terms of a prototype or a 'family resemblance' approach as introduced by Rosch [1975] and other cognitive linguists and psychologists. The best way out of the problem and the one efficient for the practical purposes is to identify a limited set of semantic roles and features, most relevant for the description of verbal senses, and construct lexicographic analysis based on such a set. In that way the definitions would be both informative enough for the user and, hopefully, preserve their theoretical values.

It has been shown that most of the COMMUNICATION verbs in English, such as explain or tell [cf. Nilsen 1975: 104], show the frame as in (9) below.

(9) *tell* [_Agent, Experiencer, Object, Instrument]

which can be realized in sentences such as (10a), below, which has been given further feature specification in (10c):

(10) a. John told Mary to do the dishes.

b. Agent Experiencer Object [Instrument]

c. Source Goal [+ Abstract] vocal tract

In such cases Object usually relates to the content of what has been communicated. This frame shows clear correlations with Polish frames for equivalent verbs, e. g. as in (11) where Experiencer is treated as an optional element and the frame itself depends on the particular sense in which the verb is used (here: '*say something*')

(11) *powiedzieć/mówić* [_A (E) O I]

(= *tell, say*)

Similar correspondence is present in the case of one-argument univalent verbs, such as the expression '*to be loquacious*' or '*to be talkative*', as in (12) below, the group of which includes all the instrumental sounds as well [cf. Nilsen 1975: 104].

- (12) a. John is talkative/loquacious
b. [_O]

The parallel Polish sentence and frame would be as in (13):

- (13) a. Jan jest małomówny.
b. 'John is 'not-talkative'

Having accepted that, we may proceed and try to give more information about the verbs than the frames provide. Thus, we can either supplement the case labels with the information involving semantic features (such as Human, Abstract, Concrete etc., as discussed above) or with other types of information inherent in lexical items. For the COMMUNICATION verbs, and especially the verbs of speaking, information about presupposition carried by verbs and illocutionary force corresponding to what has been made explicit by the use of the verb in question seem to be the most relevant notions.

Thus, for each verb of speaking Agent is to be specified as [+HUMAN] with some additional information which concerns the role's other properties. For example, for *promise*, Agent is also "usually 1" which means that the role characteristically associated with the verbal sense is always 'human' and usually singular as opposed to e.g. the Agent of *pledge* which is most commonly collective. Agent always contains the feature [+HUMAN] and denotes a member of the class of *homo loquens*. All the verbs of speaking do not allow a subject/Agent who would be related to human beings but either permanently or occasionally unable to speak [cf. also Kozarzewska 1991 on Polish data]. Thus a sentence as in (14)

- (14) *The babies discussed and chattered.

is at least awkward, while in Polish a symmetrical sentence:

- (15) *Niemowlęta gawędziły.
(babies chattered)
The babies chattered.

or other as in (16):

- (16) *Niemy rozprawiał.
(the dumb discussed/argued)
The dumb argued...

are not acceptable.

2.3. Speech Act Verbs

The notion of 'illocutionary force', taken from the theory of speech acts, seems to be crucial to the explanation of the meaning of a large sub-group of the vocabulary of both Polish and English.

Speech act verbs, e.g. *ask, promise, deny, sentence*, are crucial in how people perceive and organise human interaction. The acts of speech are both performed and referred to. Although classifications of speech acts and speech act verbs [cf. Austin 1962; Searle 1969, 1976, 1979] are not equivalent, they are often convenient labels for the semantic sub-field within the field of the verbs of speaking. There are also correlations between the complement construction of the embedded clause and the kind of illocutionary act denoted by the verbs of speaking [cf. Lehrer 1989]. For example, *that*-clauses in English are associated with knowledge and assertions, *to* correlates with directives, and *for-to* constructions are found with weak directives (e.g. *plead*). In contrast, verbs denoting manner of speaking, means of communicating, etc., embed several or all complement types. There seem to be further regularities. For example, a sub-class of assertives that disallow *that*-complements are verbs of judgements, e.g. *acclaim, admonish, credit*. These verbs seem to presuppose or imply a fact or event and assert a judgement. Further evidence for the correlation of syntax and semantics, therefore semantic classification, is provided by the use of *whether*-constructions. Such constructions seem to be allowed only if the meaning of the verb itself has the component of an alternative or some sort of choice [cf. Lehrer 1989: 8]. It seems that speech act classifications correlate with semantics and syntax of verbs via semantic components shared by both related speech acts category and verbs. Considering the correlation of *to*-constructions with directives, one could explain it on the basis of the association of *to* with 'wanting', given that a directive is realized by an expression in which the Agent or the speaker 'wants' the Experiencer/addressee to perform some action. The point seems to be reinforced by the syntactic behaviour of a small sub-set of directives which express 'negative' concepts and do not allow *to*-constructions, e.g. *forbid, prohibit, dissuade, cancel*. Such correlations as discussed above could be most naturally approached within the framework of valency-analysis, in other words: in relation to a potential that a word possesses for combining with other words both syntactically and semantically. This problem involves the domain of semantic roles, discussed in the first part of the present chapter.

Thus, the information about the type of speech acts naturally associated with the verb in question, or in other words, the verb's illocutionary potential, can provide hints about this verb syntactic behaviour.

Within the speech act verbs, i.e. verbs related to speech acts, we can distinguish **implicit** and **explicit** performatives, the former not normally being uttered while performing the act (e.g. *boast*).

In addition, other notions normally associated with pragmatics and discourse analysis may provide insights into the nature of speech acts and speech act verbs. It has been suggested that any speech communication situation involves two aspects: (1) implicit and **presuppositional** and (2) explicit and illocutionary [cf. Fillmore 1971b]. The implicit presuppositional aspect would concern all conditions which must be satisfied in order for a particular illocutionary act to be effectively performed in saying (potential) sentences. Presupposition understood in such a way appears to be most relevant for the description of speech act verbs and denoting the scenarios they imply.

2.4. Descriptive Properties of Lexical Items

Other types of information inherent in verbs can be approached within the framework of **descriptivity**. A large sub-class of verbs in general has been identified as descriptive [cf. Snell-Hornby 1983]. Such verbs appear to possess built-in inferences concerning, e.g. manner of the action they relate or refer to, or some emotional content that could be described as Speaker's/Narrator's attitude. In her analysis, Mary Snell-Hornby suggested that a descriptive verb (DV) may be provisionally rendered in the formula as in (17) below,

(17) DV = ANu + Mod (+ x)

where ANu stands for the act-nucleus or a semantic core (usually a verb), Mod for the modifying adverbial element – modificant, and x is understood as an optional element without evaluative properties and not expressible in terms of adjectives or manner adverbs. Thus, there is one more distinction, that between **nuclear** (capable of being act-nucleus) and **non-nuclear** (more specific) verbs.

Within the domain of the verbs of speaking the approach can be exemplified as in (18) below:

(18) *falter* = speak (ANu) + hesitantly, weakly, with broken voice (Mod)

mutter = speak (ANu) + indistinctly (Mod)

gabble = speak (ANu) + fast, indistinctly (Mod)

The definitions as above which reveal manner-elaboration in verbs show obvious correlations with everyday synonymous expressions, e.g. *mumble* = 'talk indistinctly'. Descriptivity in verbs can also be rendered in terms of semantic roles and features.

3. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, it is believed that meaning can be, at least partially, explained. The aim of the paper is to present results of a tentative analysis of selected verbal concepts in English and Polish. The analysis generates insights both into the structure of semantic fields and into the similarities and differences in the lexicalisation structure between both language systems. It also allows for the identification of the closest counterparts in the languages and the points of differentiation. Furthermore, it allows for the identification of the most relevant ways of describing the senses. It is apparent, and may be common knowledge, that verbs belonging to different semantic domains show different structure in their semantic content. It appears that various semantic fields may require different types of description if the analysis is to be precise. Different approaches highlight different aspects of the semantics of lexemes. For example, stative descriptivity or nuclear verbs could, it appears, be successfully presented within the framework of formalised componential analysis. In contrast, dynamic descriptivity and non-nuclear descriptive verbs, as well as speech act verbs, seem to require a more elaborate, possibly less formalised method of definition. Furthermore, some features are perceived as more important than others as should be marked as salient.

The limited two areas of verbal concepts under investigation have demonstrated considerable differences in their componential analysis. The PROMISE group, mostly comprising verbs which can be referred to as 'performative' or 'illocutionary force' verbs, illustrates the whole frame of an action related to their use, which results in much richer circumstantial properties. On the other hand, verbal concepts related to *babble* or *stutter* can be best termed as 'descriptive' of the manner and built on the base of some general or superordinate term. Thus, such typological differences have proved to have interesting implications for the analysis of the verbs in question (cf. Appendix).

Tentative verbal entries are presented in the Appendix. In general, information provided in these entries should be seen as tentative: as a basis for further analysis and modification. A comprehensive set of relevant, sufficient and uniform semantic representations awaits the analysis of a far larger data base. The lexemes analysed so far fall roughly into two main groups. One of the groups comprises lexemes related to 'promise'. These lexemes, presented as the examples 1 to 13, relate to speech acts. They include: *promise*¹, *guarantee*¹, *guarantee*², *pledge*¹, *pledge*², *swear*², *swear*³, *swear*⁴, *undertake*², *vouch for*¹, *vouch for*², *vow*¹, *vow*². Verbs which could be referred to as 'descriptive' are presented as the examples 14 to 35. These

include: *stammer*, *stutter*, *stumble*³, *falter*², *mumble*¹, *mutter*, *patter*², *splutter*¹, *babble*¹, *blab*, *chat*¹, *chatter*¹, *blether (on)*, *drivel (on)*, *gab*, *gabble*, *gibber*, *jabber*, *prattle (on)*, *rabbit on*, *waffle (on)* and *natter*.

In relation to the 'PROMISE' group, the conceptual area of these lexemes is also present in Polish and most of the English lexemes have close counterparts in Polish, cf. *promise*¹ = *przrzec*, *obietać*, *guarantee*² = *gwarantować*, *guarantee*³ = *rekomendować*, *vow*¹ = *ślubować*, etc. Because of the close mutual relationship of the verbs within the domain, apart from their closest synonyms, other terms from the field are listed in square brackets to provide links to related terms. In addition, 'promise' is given as a headword and placed in square brackets to indicate that it is understood as a conventional label for the field. All verbs from the 'PROMISE' group are rich in their circumstantial properties. They seem to denote the whole scenario or scene of a related event. They involve the notion of presupposition in the sense that they seem to incorporate information concerning elements such as 'cause' of the described action, potential 'effect', 'manner' or (purported) 'intention' of the speaker. They often offer clues to the base component of the act. For example, it appears that all the lexemes from the 'PROMISE' group share the element of 'Agent's personal credibility as a guarantee' which in this study has been referred to as the 'Base' in section B.1.d. of the entry which describes circumstantial properties. The emphasis on 'making other people believe that...', which is apparently incorporated in the lexemes in question, is also recognised as 'salient' in terms of INTENTION and VOLITION. The 'PROMISE' group of lexemes differ with respect to elements such as 'manner' (e.g. formal vs. non-formal) or additional 'presuppositional' information. For example, some of the lexemes have 'sacred or semi-sacred connotations' or 'religious or quasi-religious connotations' (cf. *swear*², *vow*¹, *vow*²). Thus, the analysis presented so far demonstrates some kind of mixture of relevant means for the description of semantic properties of the verbs in question.

In general, verbs related to speech acts seem to require the method of definition (cf. 'cause someone to believe that...') while descriptive verbs are best rendered by a combination of a general term related to speech (*say*, *tell*, *talk*, *speak*) and features which specify, e.g. 'manner' of speaking (cf. examples 14-35). Most of the descriptive verbs presented in the Appendix involve 'manner' features such as: 'indistinct' (*stammer*, *stutter*, *mumble*, *mutter*), 'informal' (*blab*, *babble*, *chatter*) or features describing time-related properties, e.g. 'fast' (*patter*, *splutter*, *babble*) or 'continuous', i.e. denoting excessive flow of usually empty talk (*prattle (on)*, *rabbit on*). This conceptual element is often marked by the presence of the English preposition *on* which accompanies the verb. Another element which is often incorporated

in descriptive verbs is 'speaker's evaluation'. The verbs range from neutral terms (e.g. *chat*) to emphatic ones which often encapsulate negative evaluation on the part of the speaker (cf. *blether (on)*, *drivel (on)*, *jabber* etc.).

In relation to Polish, it appears that the 'PROMISE' group, as mentioned above, produces a neater pattern in their Polish counterparts. In contrast, descriptive verbs do not show a simple pattern of one-to-one or even one-to-many correspondence. There is a conceptual correspondence between fields in both languages.

In summary, the analysis presented here is a tentative one and will be subject to further changes. It is an exercise, not couched within a single theoretical framework, meant to illuminate the areas of interest, importance and difficulty, and to contribute to further and more complete research.

To conclude, it should be admitted that any formalisation must necessarily be conventional and cannot reflect the dynamicity which is inherent in meaning. It is understood that any semantic representation we propose cannot be complete and thoroughly satisfactory. Furthermore, it must always be the result of some kind of idealisation. Nevertheless, they can provide theoretical insights into the nature and working of natural language and prove valuable for practical purposes.

APPENDIX

I. The entries structure

Headword:

A: Phonetic transcription

B: Semantics

1. Conceptual analysis

- a) Superordinate category (elaborated as a separate headword or treated as a prime)
 - b) salient property
 - c) participants of a act: Agent, Experiencer, Object...
 - d) circumstantial properties: Cause, Base, Manner...
 - e) speaker evaluation
 - f) subordinate categories (elaborated as separate headwords)
 - g) synonyms (elaborated as separate headwords)
2. Polish definition
 3. Polish equivalents
 4. Antonyms (elaborated as separate headwords according to the number of definite dimensions used)

- C: Syntax – verb patterns
- D: English examples with Polish equivalents
- E: Special remarks
 1. Usage (style, register, etc.)
 2. Remarks counteracting Polish interference, based on contrastive analysis
- F: Conceptual extension of headword'; headword''; headword'''... (elaborated as separate headwords where necessary).

Example 1

PROMISE¹

A. [ˈprɒmɪs]

B1a. SAY; THINK (performative)

1b. INTENTION, VOLITION

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]; usually 1

Experiencer: [+HUMAN]

Object: action X / 'natural object' (things)

Path: 1

Instrument: verbal or mental action

1d. Cause: explicit or implied request or expectation

Base: Agent's personal credibility as a guarantee

Effect: prediction of the future act; or self-imposed obligation: A guarantee/cause X happen

1e. Speaker evaluation: ∅

1f. [GUARANTEE^{1/2}; PLEDGE^{1/2}; SWEAR^{2/3/4}; VOW^{1/2}; UNDER-TAKE²; VOUCH FOR^{1/2}]

1g. GIVE ONE'S WORD; ASSURE; VOW

B2. powiedzieć/mówić komuś, że się coś zrobi, załatwi, da komuś

B3. przyrzec/-kać; obiec-ać/-ywać; dać/-wać słowo

C. VT

D1. I'll be back at one o'clock, I promise.

Będę z powrotem o pierwszej, obiecuję.

2. I promised your father that you should never know he had been in prison.

Przyrzekłem twemu ojcu, że nigdy nie dowiesz się o jego pobycie w więzieniu.

3. You should always keep your promises.

Zawsze powinieneś dotrzymywać swoich obietnic/danego słowa.

4. Ben promised me a new car on my birthday.

Ben obiecał mi nowy samochód na urodziny.

5. Dick was promised a job in Alaska.

Dickowi obiecano pracę na Alasce.

E. Special remarks:

'to keep a promise' = dotrzymać/-ywać obietnicy

I promise you(=I warn you), the work won't be easy.

'promise someone the moon/the earth' = obiecywać złote góry

Promised Land = Ziemia Obiecana

F. PROMISE² (=zapowiadać, rokować nadzieje)

Example 2

GUARANTEE²

A. [gærən'ti:]

B1a. SAY [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Experiencer: [+HUMAN]; usually collective

Object: action X

Instrument: verbal

1d. Cause: Experiencer's uncertainty

Base: personal credibility as a guarantee

Intention: cause people believe X happen

1e. Speaker evaluation:

1f. ∅

1g. [PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE^{1/2}; PLEDGE^{1/2}; VOW; UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR^{1/2}]

B2. zapewnić, że coś się zrobi lub załatwi komuś, że coś na pewno się wydarzy

B3. gwarantować, obiecywać

C. VT

D1. They have guaranteed delivery within three days.

Zagwarantowano/-li dostawę w ciągu trzech dni.

2. I'm not guaranteeing that this will work.

Nie obiecuję/nie mogę dać gwarancji, że to się uda.

E1. 'I'll guarantee that you'll enjoy the play. (=I'm sure)

2. 'something is guaranteed' = is certain

3. often with non-human agent (personification), e.g.; 'The Constitution (the law) guarantees...'

F. GUARANTEE¹ (ręczyć za kogoś)

GUARANTEE³ (dawać gwarancję, rejkójmię na coś)

GUARANTEE⁴ (zapewniać coś (A[+HUMAN]))

GUARANTEE⁵ (zapewniać coś (A[-HUMAN]))

Example 3

GUARANTEE¹

A. [gærən'ti:]

B1a. SAY [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Experiencer: [+HUMAN]; usually collective

Object: 1)[+HUMAN] 'X' 2)[+ABSTRACT] 'Y'

1d. Cause: Experiencer's uncertainty

Base: personal credibility as a guarantee

Intention: cause Experiencer to believe X/Y is good/ true

1e. ∅

1f. ∅

1g. VOUCH FOR²; RECOMMEND[PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE²; SWEAR^{2/3/4}; PLEDGE^{1/2}; VOW^{1/2};
UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR^{1/2}]

B2. zapewniać, że ktoś (coś) jest godny szacunku, odpowiedzialny, godny zaufania

B3. ręczyć za kogoś, rekomendować, polecać

C. VT

D1. ...an Englishman who had been guaranteed to him over the phone by one of his friends.

...jakiś Anglik, którego polecił mu przez telefon jeden z jego przyjaciół.

E.

F. GUARANTEE² (gwarantować, obiecywać)GUARANTEE³ (dawać gwarancje, rękojmię na coś)GUARANTEE⁴ (zapewniać coś (A[+HUMAN]))GUARANTEE⁵ (zapewniać coś (A[-HUMAN]))

Example 4

PLEDGE¹

A. ['pledʒ]

B1a. SAY, GIVE [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION, VOLITION

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN], usu. 1+(collective)

Experiencer: [+HUMAN], usu. 1+(collective)

Object: actionX, usu. 'good'

Path: 1

Instrument: verbal

- 1d. Cause: advancing a 'good' cause
 Base: Agent's personal credibility as a guarantee
 Manner: formal
 Effect: prediction of the future act;
 Agent's self-imposed obligation
 Agent's obligation to cause X happen
 Intention: to obligate A to perform X / cause X happen
 Place: social, usu. public
- 1e. ∅
- 1f. ∅
- 1g. GUARANTEE², OFFER
 [PROMISE¹; SWEAR^{2/3/4}; PLEDGE²; VOW^{1/2}; UNDERTAKE²;
 VOUCH FOR^{1/2}]
- B2. poważnie lub uroczyście zapewnić, że się coś od/da lub załatwi
- B3. obiecać uroczyście, deklarować, przyrzec, zobowiązać/-zywać się
- C. VT
- D1. He once pledged his vote to me, without my asking...
 Kiedyś przyrzekł mi swój głos w wyborach/oddać na mnie swój głos,
 bez prośby z mojej strony.
2. A lot of people have pledged a lot of money this evening.
 Dzisiejszego wieczoru wiele osób zadeklarowało/obiecało dużo pieniędzy.
3. They have pledged that any details given to them will remain confidential.
 Zapewnili nas (z całą powagą), że wszelkie/jakiegokolwiek szczegóły
 przekazane im pozostaną poufne.
- E. Usage: 1. esp. literary or emotive
 2. as opposed to *promise* – difficulties envisaged
 3. as opposed to *vow* – more private act
- F. 'to *pledge one's word*' = to make a solemn promise, at the risk of
 loosing one's honour, implying that if one does not fulfil it s/he will
 not expect people to believe him/her ever again, e.g.
 'I *pledged my word of (honour) that I would never again get into debt.*'
 'to *take the pledge*' = zobowiązywać się, ślubować wstrzemięźliwość
 (*pledge* is often translated as a counterpart for *ślubować* in Po-
 lish-English bilingual dictionaries. However, *ślubować* is more like
vow referring to 'solemn promise')
- F PLEDGE² (zobowiązywać się lub kogoś)
 PLEDGE³ (wznosić toast)
 PLEDGE⁴ (zastawić coś, dać pod zastaw)

Example 5

PLEDGE²

A. [pledʒ]

B1a. SAY [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION, VOLITION

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]; usu. 1 + (collective)

Experiencer: [+HUMAN]

Object: 1) [+HUMAN]; 2) action X

Instrument: verbal

1d. Cause: advancing a 'good' cause

Base: Agent's personal credibility as a guarantee

Manner: usu. formal

Effect: prediction of a future act

Intention: Agent's self-imposed obligation to fulfil X

Place: usu. public (social act)

1e. ∅

1f. ∅

1g. DEDICATE

[PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE^{1/2}; PLEDGE¹; VOW^{1/2}; UNDERTAKE²;
VOUCH FOR^{1/2}]

B2. zobowiązać siebie lub kogoś do zrobienia czegoś lub poparcia jakiegoś działania, osoby, grupy ludzi lub idei

B3. zobowiązać się pod słowem honoru, ślubować, oddać się (idei, celowi)

C. VT

D1. I was pledged to secrecy.

Złożyłem ślub zachowania tajemnicy.

2. They pledged themselves never to tell the secret.

Ślubowali / zaprzysiężyli się, że nigdy nie wyjawią sekretu.

E. Usage: especially literary or emotive

F. PLEDGE¹PLEDGE³PLEDGE⁴

Example 6

SWEAR² (SWORE; SWORN)

A. [swɛə]

B1a. SAY [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION, VOLITION, (performative)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Experiencer: [+HUMAN]

Object: action X / facts

Instrument: verbal

1d. Cause: Experiencer's explicit or implicit reluctance to believe A

Base: personal credibility as a guarantee sacred connotations

Effect: prediction of a future act

Agent's self-imposed obligation to cause X happen

Intention: to cause people to believe 'Agent cause X happen'

Manner: formal

1e. ∅

1f. ∅

1g. VOW¹

[PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE^{1/2}; PLEDGE^{1/2}; SWEAR^{3/4}; VOW^{1/2};
UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR^{1/2}]

B2. uroczycie i powaznie zapewnic, ze sie cos zrobi

B3. przysiegac, zaklinac sie

C. VT

D1. I swear I will never tell anyone.

Przysiegam, ze nigdy nikomu nie powiem.

E. Usage: usually implies fifth in the inherent, semi-religious or semi-magical power of speech; it is implied that if the speaker does not keep the promise, then something 'bad' will happen to him in future as in the case of Polish *zaklinac sie*.

swear by = być zagorzałym zwolennikiem czegoś

swear in = zaprzysiegac (prezydenta,...)

F. SWEAR¹

SWEAR³

SWEAR

Example 7

SWEAR³

A. [sweə]

B1a. SAY [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION, VOLITION (performative)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Experiencer: [+HUMAN]; 1+(usually collective)

Object: act of speaking/credibility

Instrument: verbal

1d. Base: personal credibility as a guarantee

Manner: formal

Place: formal, esp. at the court of law

Intention: Agent's self-imposed obligation to be truthful

- 1e. \emptyset
 1f. \emptyset
 1g. VOW
 [PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE^{1/2}; PLEDGE^{1/2}; SWEAR^{2/4}; UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR^{1/2}; VOW^{1/2}]
 B2. uroczyście lub poważnie zapewnić, że mówi się prawdę
 B3. przysiąc, przysięgać, zaprzysiąc
 C. V
 D1. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?
 Czy przysięgasz mówić prawdę, całą prawdę i tylko prawdę?
 2. Before giving evidence you have to swear on the Bible.
 Przed złożeniem zeznań musisz (musi pan/pani / trzeba) przysiąc na Biblię.
 F. SWEAR¹
 SWEAR²
 SWEAR⁴

Example 8

SWEAR⁴ (SWORE/SWORN)

A. [sweə]

B1.a. SAY [PROMISE]

1.b. INTENTION, VOLITION (performative)

1.c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Experiencer: [+HUMAN]

Object: [+ABSTRACT] (X)

Instrument: verbal

1.d. Base: personal credibility as a guarantee

Manner: formal

Intention: cause Experiencer to believe X is true

1.e. \emptyset 1.f. \emptyset

1.g. INSIST

[PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE^{1/2}; PLEDGE^{1/2}; SWEAR^{2/3}; UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR^{1/2}; VOW^{1/2}]

B2. zapewniać z powagą / z przekonaniem, że coś jest prawdą, prawdziwe

B3. dać/dawać słowo, stanowczo utrzymywać, że..., kłąć się na...

C. V

D1. I'm not prepared to swear to it, but I thought I saw him in Exeter once.

Nie mogę dać słowa, ale wydaje mi się, że widziałem go kiedyś w Exeter.

2. She did not know a thing, she swore...

Przysięgała/zapewniała, że nie miała o niczym pojęcia.

3. I swear on my children's heads that it is true.
Klnę się na głowy moich dzieci, że to prawda.

E. Usage:

to swear blind (informal) = to emphasise one's certainty that something is true or really did happen, e.g.: *I would have sworn blind it was water* (Jestem pewien, że to (była) woda...)

F. SWEAR¹

SWEAR²

SWEAR³

Example 9

UNDERTAKE

A. [ˌʌndə'teɪk]

B1a. SAY, STATE [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Experiencer: [+HUMAN], often 1+

Object: action X

1d. Base: Agent's personal credibility as a guarantee

Intention: cause Experiencer believe Agent cause X happen

1e. ∅

1f. ∅

1g. AGREE

[PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE^{1/2}; PLEDGE^{1/2}; SWEAR^{2/3/4}; VOUCH FOR^{1/2}; VOW^{1/2}]

B2. zapewnić, że się coś zrobi, czegoś dopilnuje

B3. podjąć się, obiecać, zgodzić się

C. V

D1. I undertake to preserve strictly neutral position.

Zapewniam/ obiecuję, że zachowam zdecydowanie neutralne stanowisko.

2. Most share holders have undertaken to accept the offer.

(Zdecydowana) większość udziałowców obiecała/zgodziła się przyjąć ofertę.

F. UNDERTAKE¹ (podjąć się; take on)

Example 10

VOUCH FOR¹

A. ['vaʊtʃfə]

B1a. SAY [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION (performative)

- 1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]
 Experiencer: [+HUMAN]; usu. 1+
 Object: [+ABSTRACT] (X); usu. facts
 Path: 1
 Instrument: verbal
- 1d. Cause: explicit or implicit doubt about X
 Base: personal credibility as a guarantee
 Manner: usu. formal
 Intention: cause Experiencer to believe X is true good
- 1e. \emptyset
- 1f. \emptyset
- 1g. PROVE; GUARANTEE²
 [PROMISE¹; PLEDGE^{1/2}; SWEAR^{2/3/4}; UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR²; VOW^{1/2}]
- B2. oświadczać, że jest się przekonany o prawdziwości lub prawidłowości czegoś.
- B3. ręczyć za, zapewniać o czymś (wierzyć w coś)
- C. PHRASAL VERB
- D1. I can vouch for the accuracy of my information.
 Mogę ręczyć za dokładność moich informacji.
- F. VOUCH FOR²

Example 11

VOUCH FOR²

A. ['vaʊtʃə]

B1.a. SAY [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION (performative)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Experiencer: [+HUMAN]; usu. 1+

Object: [+ABSTRACT] (X); [+HUMAN] (Y)]

Instrument: verbal

1d. Cause: explicit or implicit doubts about X / Y

Base: personal credibility as a guarantee

Intention: cause Experiencer to believe X is true of Y

Manner: usu. formal

1e. \emptyset

1f. \emptyset

1g. SPEAK FOR; GUARANTEE²; RECOMMEND

[PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE¹; PLEDGE^{1/2}; SWEAR^{2/3/4}; UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR¹; VOW^{1/2}]

B2. oświadczać, że wierzy się w czyjeś poprawne zachowanie, bierze na siebie za nie odpowiedzialność

- B3. ręczyć za kogoś, wstawiać się za kimś
 C. PHRASAL VERB
 D1. He said you'd vouch for him.
 Powiedział, że za niego poręczysz, wstawisz się za nim.
 2. I can vouch for him; he will work.
 Mogę ręczyć/ ręczę za niego; będzie dobrze pracował.
 F. VOUCH FOR1

Example 12

VOW¹

A. [ˈvɔv]

B1a. SAY, THINK [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION, VOLITION (performative)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]; usu. 1

Experiencer: [+HUMAN]; often Agent = Experiencer

Object: usu. action X

Instrument: verbal or mental

1d. Cause: often to prevent future unwillingness to fulfil X

Base: sacred connotations

Manner: formal

Intention: Agent's self-imposed obligation to fulfil X

1e. ∅

1f. ∅

1g. SWEAR²

[PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE^{1/2}; PLEDGE^{1/2}; SWEAR^{3/4}; UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR^{1/2}; VOW²]

B2. zobowiązywać się uroczyście do zrobienia czegoś

B3. ślubować, uroczyście przyrzekać, składać/złożyć przysięgę

C. V

D1. He vowed to kill his wife's lover.

Uroczyście przysięgł/poprzysięgł zabić kochankę swojej żony.

2. He had vowed never to let it happen again.

Ślubował, że nigdy nie dopuści, aby się to powtórzyło.

E. Usage:

1. more solemn than *swear*

2. *vows* (pl.) = śluby (e.g. małżeńskie, czystości etc.)

3. usu. quasi-religious connotations

4. *to make a vow* (a resolution) = vow

e.g. 'He made a vow to give up smoking.'

Zdecydował/ przyrzekł sobie, że rzuci palenie.

F. VOW²

Example 13

VOW²

A. ['vav]

B1a. SAY, THINK [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION, VOLITION (performative)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]; 1

Experiencer: [+HUMAN]; Agent = Experiencer or E = collective

Object: 1) action X; 2) physical object

Instrument: verbal or mental

1d. Base: sacred connotations

Manner: formal

Intention: Agent's self-imposed obligation to fulfil X

Place: usu. formal

1e. ∅

1f. ∅

1g. TO MAKE A VOW

[PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE^{1/2}; PLEDGE^{1/2}; SWEAR^{2/3/4}; UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR^{1/2}; VOW¹]

C. VT

D1. Priests vow their lives to the service of the church.

Kapłani ślubują/ oddają swoje życie na służbę Kościołowi.

E. Usage: religious or quasi-religious connotations

F. VOW1

Example 14

STAMMER

A. ['stæmə]

B1a. SAY TALK SPEAK

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Instrument: verbal

1d. Cause: often confusion, excitement

Base: insufficient action of the speech organs

Manner: indistinct, haltering

Effect: impaired communication

1e. ∅

1f. ∅

1g. STUTTER

B2. mówić z przerwami, zatrzymując się, z tendencją do powtarzania początkowych spółgłosek, wyrazów lub sylab

- B3. jąkać się, zająkiwać się, wyjąkiwać, zacinać (się)
 C. V
 D1. 'I c-c-can't do it' he stuttered.
 'N-n-nie mogę tego zrobić' – wyjąkał.
 E. Usage:
 1. cf. *stutter:stammer* – usu. suggests a temporary reaction
stutter – usu. suggests a habit

Example 15

STUTTER

- A. ['stʌtə]
 B1a. SAY SPEAK TALK
 1b. MANNER (descriptive)
 1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]
 Instrument: verbal
 1d. Cause: nervous tension (chronic or temporary)
 Base: (emphasis on the mode of speaking)
 insufficient action of the speech organs
 Manner: indistinct, haltering
 Effect: impaired communication
 (involuntary repetition of sounds)
 1e. ∅ or negative
 1f. ∅
 1g. STAMMER
 B2. mówić lub wypowiadać się z pauzami, z tendencją do powtarzania dźwięków, szczególnie pierwszych spółgłosek
 B3. jąkać się, zająkiwać się
 C. V (out)
 D. He stammered out his thanks.
 (On) wyjąkał (swoje) podziękowania.
 E. cf. *stammer: stutter*: usu. suggests a habit
stammer: usu. suggests a temporary reaction

Example 16

STUMBLE³

- A. ['stʌmbʌl]
 B1a. SAY SPEAK TALK
 1b. MANNER (descriptive)
 1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]
 Instrument: verbal

- 1d. Cause: (situation), excitement (confusion)
 Base: (emphasis on the mode of speaking)
 insufficient action of the speech organs
 Manner: indistinct, haltering
 Time: accidental
- 1e. \emptyset or negative
 1f. \emptyset
 1g. \emptyset
- B2. zatrzymywać się lub pomylić mówiąc lub czytając na głos
 B3. potknąć się (na słowie), za/jąkać, za/jąkiwać się, zaciąć (się)
 C. V (at/over)
- D1. He stumbled at/over the long word.
 Mówiąc, potknął się (zająknął się) na długim słowie.
2. Somehow he stumbled through his speech and sat down with great relief.
 Przebrnął jakoś, potykając się, przez swoją (prze)mowę i usiadł z wielką ulgą.
- E. Usage: cannot be used in imperative mood
 F. STUMBLE¹ (potknąć się, wpaść na)
 STUMBLE² (iść nierówno, potykając się)

Example 17

FALTER²

A. [fɔ:ltə]

B1a. SAY SPEAK TALK

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Path: 1

Instrument: verbal

1d. Cause: (situation), uncertainty and excitement

Base: (emphasis on the mode of speaking)

Manner: indistinct

1e. \emptyset 1f. \emptyset

1g. HESITATE; STUMBLE; STAMMER

B2. mówić z przerwami lub jąkając się na skutek niepewności lub emocji

B3. za/wahać się, zatrzymać się (w mówieniu)

C. V

D. 'What happened?' – 'It's...' Bixby faltered.

'Co się stało?' – 'To...' Bixby zawahał się.

F. FALTER¹ (waver, hesitate)FALTER³ (move, pause)

Example 18

MUMBLE¹

A. [ˈmʌmbəl]

B1a. SAY TALK (MISPRONOUNCE)

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Instrument: verbal

1d. Manner: indistinct

Effect: reduced communicative value

Time: continuous

1e. usu. negative

1f. ∅

1g. MUTTER

B2. mówić cicho i niewyraźnie, jak gdyby przeżuając słowa

B3. przeżuwać (słowa), mamrotać

C. V (away)

D1. The old woman mumbled a prayer.

Stara kobieta wymamrotała modlitwę.

2. Don't mumble your words.

Nie przeciągaj (przeżuwaj) słów. (=Mów wyraźnie.)

F. MUMBLE² (eat; żuć powoli, jak gdyby bez użycia zębów)

Example 19

MUTTER

A. [ˈmʌtə]

B1a. SAY SPEAK TALK

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Path: 1

Instrument: verbal

1d. Cause: (situation), complaint or self-reference

Manner: indistinct (fast)

Time: continuous, fast

1e. usu. negative (often sarcastic and abusive)

1f. ∅

1g. MUMBLE; GRUMBLE

B2. mówić niewyraźnie i bardzo cicho, narzekając na coś lub zwracając się do siebie

B3. mamrotać, mrużyć

C. V

- D1. Denis could be heard muttering to himself about my stupidity.
Słyszano, jak Denis mamrotał (mruczał pod nosem) do siebie o mojej głupocie.
2. Some members are beginning to mutter about the P. M.
Niektórzy członkowie (parlamentu) zaczynają narzekać (mrużyć/pomrukiwać pod nosem) na premiera.

Example 20

PATTER²

A. [ˈpætə]

B1a. SAY SPEAK TALK

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Path: 1

Instrument: verbal

1d. Manner: mechanical (rapid)

Time: continuous, fast

1e. ∅

1f. ∅

1g. MUMBLE

B2. mówić lub powtarzać szybko lub mechanicznie, bezmyślnie

B3. od/klepać (pacierze), mamrotać, powtarzać rytmicznie

C. V

D. The little girl hastily pattered all her prayers and jumped into her bed.
Dziewczynka pospiesznie odklepała pacierze i wskoczyła do łóżka.

E. Usage:

1. esp. of comedians, conjurers and sales people

2. often used as a noun: '*thieves' patter*' = slang3. '*the patter of tiny feet*' in e.g. 'They'll soon be hearing' = they are expecting a baby.F. PATTER¹ (Agent: [-HUMAN]; onomatopoeic)

Example 21

SPLUTTER¹

A. [ˈsplʌtə]

B1a. SAY SPEAK TALK

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Instrument: verbal

1d. Cause: (situation), excitement or external impediment

Manner: fast, indistinct

Effect: reduced, impaired communication

Time: rapid

1e. ∅

1f. ∅

1g. ∅

B2. mówić lub powiedzieć szybko, często z zakłopotaniem, krztusząc się

B3. wy/krztusić (słowa)

C. V (out)

D.1. 'But... but...' she spluttered.

'Ale... ale...' (wy)krztusiła.

2. He was spluttering with rage.

Z wściekłości krztusił słowa.

E. Usage: esp. in a hurry

F. SPLUTTER² (onomatopoeic; of a sound)

Example 22

BABBLE¹

A. ['bæb^əl]

B1a. TALK SAY

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN], [+ADULT], usu. 1

Object: (excessive)

Path: 1+

Instrument: verbal

1d. Manner: informal foolish, incoherent

Time: durative

1e. usu. negative

1f. ∅

1g. GABBLE; JABBER; GIBBER; PRATTLE (incoherence); CHATTER (excessive)

B2. mówić szybko w sposób trudny do zrozumienia, głupio, beztreściwie

B3. paplać, wy/mamrotać, wy/gadać

C. V (on / away)

D.1. She babbled her thanks in a great hurry.

Z wielkim pośpiechem wymamrotała podziękowania.

2. I have no idea what he was babbling on about.

Nie mam pojęcia o czym on paplał.

E. Usage:

babble – esp. associated with babies

gabble – esp. associated with geese

jabber – esp. associated with monkeys

gibber – esp. associated with ghosts, apes, idiots or lunatics

F. **BABBLE**² (Agent: [+HUMAN]; [–ADULT]; of babies)

BABBLE³ (Agent: [–HUMAN]; onomatopoeic)

BABBLE⁴ OUT (=blab)

Example 23

BLAB

A. ['blæb]

B1a. SAY TALK

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Object: 'secret'

Path: 1

Instrument: verbal

1d. Manner: informal, foolish
Effect: revealing of a secret

1e. usu. negative

1f. ∅

1g. TELL A SECRET

B2. wyjawić sekret, często niezamierzenie

B3. wypaplać, wygadać

C. V (out)

D1. He's been blabbing to the Press.
(Wszystko) wygadywał (opowiadał) prasie.

2. I wonder who blabbed...
Zastanawiam się, kto (to) wypaplał...

Example 24

CHAT¹

A. ['tʃæt]

B1a. SAY TALK

1b. MANNER

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN], usu 1+ (often 2)

Object: trivial, unimportant, usu 1+
(abstract; familiar)

Path: reciprocal (symmetrical); 1+

Instrument: verbal

1d. Cause: (situation) mutual spontaneity
Base: sociability

Manner: informal, friendly relaxed

Effect: entertainment (pleasure)

Time: usu. continuous

1e. ∅

1f. ∅

1g. NATTER

B2. rozmawiać luźno i przyjaźnie (na błahe tematy), o rzeczach małej wagi

B3. po/gawędzić, po/gadać, po/rozmawiać

C. V (about/to/with) (away/on)

D1. Two women sat in the corner and chattered (away) about the weather.
Dwie kobiety siadły w kącie i gawędziły o pogodzie.

2. My sister discussed politics at the party, but I chatted about books.
Na przyjęciu moja siostra dyskutowała o polityce, lecz ja gawędzi-
łem/rozmawiałem o książkach.

E. Usage: 1. used as a noun, e.g. *to have a chat* = pogawędzić, uciąć
sobie pogawędkę

F. CHAT² UP

Example 25

CHATTER¹

A. [ˈtʃætə]

B1a. SAY TALK

1b. MANNER

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN], usu. 1

Experiencer: usu. passive

Object: trivial. unimportant

Path: 1+

Instrument: verbal

1d. Base: 'insufficient', aimless action

Manner: informal, foolish

Time: continuous, rapid

1e. ∅ or negative

1f. ∅

1g. BABBLE; JABBER (rapidity, trivial subject)

B2. mówić szybko, bez przerwy, głupio lub niepotrzebnie

B3. za/paplać, za/trajkotać, za/szczebiotać, gadać

C. V (away/on)

D1. The teacher told children to stop chattering in class.

Nauczyciel kazał dzieciom zaprzestać rozmów/gadania w klasie.

E. Usage: Polish equivalents of chatter often have more negative evaluation

F. CHATTER² (of animals and birds)

CHATTER³ (of a sound, e.g. of teeth)

Example 26

BLETHER (ON)

A. ['bleðə]

B1a. SAY TALK

1b. MANNER DURATION (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Object: unimportant, trivial (often absurd)

Path: 1+

Instrument: verbal

1d. Manner: informal, foolish

Time: durative, continuous

1e. negative

1f. ∅

1g. JABBER

B2. mówić długo, głupio i beztreściwie

B3. pleść (bzdury), gadać (bez sensu)

C. V (about)

D. What are you blethering about?

O czym ty pleciesz/gadasz? / Co za bzdury wygadujesz?

E. Usage:

1. Am. English: blather

2. esp. Scot. English

3. 'blethering idiot' – ktoś kto ciągle mówi bez sensu

Example 27

DRIVEL (ON)

A. ['driv^ə]

B1a. SAY TALK

1b. MANNER, DURATION (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN], 1

Object: unimportant (usu. absurd), excessive

Path: 1

Instrument: verbal

1d. Manner: informal, foolish

Time: durative, continuous

1e. negative

1f. ∅

1g. RABBIT (ON)

B2. mówić długo, beztreściwie lub nudnie

B3. truć, paplać, gadać

- C. V (on)
 D. She spent an hour drivelling on about her health.
 Przez całą godzinę trwała o swoim zdrowiu.

Example 28

GAB

A. [gæb]

B1a. SAY TALK

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Object: unimportant (usu. trivial)

Instrument: verbal

1d. Base: idle talk

Manner: informal, foolish

Time: durative, continuous

1e. usu. negative

1f. ∅

1g. CHATTER, NATTER

B2. mówić dużo, beztreściwie lub niepotrzebnie

B3. paplać, gadać, gawędzić

C. V (about)

D. What were you two men gabbling about?

O czym to sobie gadacie?

E. Usage:

'to have the gift of the gab' = posiadać łatwość wymowy, wyrażać się elokwentnie, logicznie i z przekonaniem

Example 29

GABBLE

A. [gæb^l]

B1a. SAY TALK

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN], 1

Path: 1

Instrument: verbal

1c. Base: incoherence

Manner: informal, indistinct

Effect: reduced communicative value

Time: rapid

- 1e. usu. negative
- 1f. ∅
- 1g. BABBLE, PATTERN
- B2. mówić lub powiedzieć szybko, w sposób trudny do zrozumienia
- B3. za/trajkotać, paplać, gadać, od/klepać, za/bełkotać
- C. V (away/on) (out)
- D1. The announcer gabbled (out) some incomprehensible message.
Speaker wyrzucił z siebie jakiś niezrozumiały komunikat.
- 2. What on earth are you gabbling about?
O czym ty gadasz? (Co chcesz powiedzieć?)
- E1. associated with geese; etymologically onomatopoeic.

Example 30

GIBBER

A. ['dʒɪbə]

B1a. SAY TALK

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Path: 1

Instrument: verbal

1d. Cause: (situation), e.g. fear or shock; madness

Base: incoherence

Manner: informal, foolish

Effect: lack of communication

Time: rapid

1e. negative (usu. 'foolish' but not 'bad')

1f. ∅

1g. BABBLE

B2. mówić bardzo szybko, szczególnie na skutek strachu lub będąc w szoku

B3. trajkotać, wyrzucać z siebie słowa

C. V

D. What on earth are you gibbering about? Pull yourself together and speak calmly.

O czym ty mówisz (trajkoczesz)? Zbierz się w sobie i mów spokojnie.

E. Usage:

1. used as a noun: *gibberish* = words or ideas that do not make any sense, e.g. 'to say something with a lot of gibberish'

2. associated with ghost, apes, idiots or lunatics

Example 31

JABBER

A. [ˈdʒæbə]

B1a. SAY TALK

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Instrument: verbal

1d. Cause: (situation), excitement

Base: incoherence

Manner: informal, indistinct

Effect: lack of communication

Time: rapid

1e. usu. negative

1f. ∅

1g. YAK

B2. mówić bardzo szybko i z ożywieniem

B3. trajkotać, gadać

C. V

D1. I can't understand you if you keep jebbering (away) like that.

Nie rozumiem cię, jeśli będziesz nadal tak trajkotał.

2. He jabbered (out) a confused apology.

Wyrzucił z siebie niezrozumiałe/zagmatwane przeprosiny.

E. Usage:

1. a jabber of excited voices = gwar ożywionych głosów

2. often associated with monkeys.

Example 32

PRATTLE (ON)

A. [ˈprætʃ]

B1a. SAY TALK

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN], usu. 1

Object: unimportant (trivial, artless)

Path: 1+

Instrument: verbal

1d. Base: incoherence

Manner: informal, foolish

Time: continuous, rapid

1e. negative (if Agent is '+adult')

1f. ∅

- 1g. CHATTER (aimlessness), BABBLE (incoherence)
 B2. mówić dużo i beztreściwie, używając prostego lub prymitywnego języka;
 (o dziecku/of a child) mówić niewprawnie i bez celu
 B3. paplać, mleć językiem, pleść głupstwa, bajdurzyć
 C. V (about) (on)
 D. The children prattled on about their Christmas presents.
 Dzieci paplały o swoich gwiazdkowych prezentach.

Example 33

RABBIT ON

- A. [ˈræbɪt]
 B1a. SAY TALK
 1b. MANNER DURATION (descriptive)
 1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]
 Object: unimportant (absurd)
 Path: 1
 Instrument: verbal
 1d. Base: excessive talk
 Cause: (situation) e.g. complaints
 Manner: informal, foolish
 Time: durative, continuous
 1e. negative
 1f. ∅
 1g. DRIVEL ON
 B2. mówić bez przerwy, w sposób nudny, rozwlekle
 B3. truć, paplać, głądzić, gadać
 C. PHRASAL V (about)
 D. He keeps rabbiting on about his health.
 On ciągle truje o swoim zdrowiu.
 E. Usage: usu. British English

Example 34

WAFFLE (ON)

- A. [ˈwɒfl̩]
 B1a. SAY TALK
 1b. MANNER DURATION (descriptive)
 1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]
 Object: unimportant (trivial), excessive, empty talk
 Path: 1+
 Instrument: verbal or written text

- 1d. Base: ('insufficient') incoherence
 Manner: informal, foolish
 Effect: impaired communication
 Time: durative, continuous
- 1e. negative
- 1f. ∅
- 1g. RABBIT (ON), DRIVEL
- B2. mówić lub pisać dużo, beztreściwie lub głupio
- B3. truć, paplać, pleść, gadać, głądzić
- C. V
- D. He's still waffling about economic recovery.
 On ciągle truje o uzdrowieniu gospodarki.
- E. Usage:
 1. used as a noun, e.g. '*It was a lot of waffle*' (=empty talk) (= 'Nie było w tym wcale treści.')

Example 35

NATTER

A. [nætə]

B1a. SAY TALK

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]

Object: unimportant, aimless talk

Path: usu. 1+

Instrument: verbal

1d. Cause: (situation), mutual spontaneity

Base: sociability

Manner: informal, friendly, relaxed

Time: durative

1e. ∅

1f. ∅

1g. CHAT1

B2. mówić lub rozmawiać luźno i przyjaźnie, długo, często o rzeczach małej wagi

B3. po/gawędzić, po/gadać, paplać

C. V (away/on)

D1. They kept nattering (on) about silly things.

Cały czas paplali o głupotach.

2. We just want to natter together about old times.

Chcemy po prostu pogawędzić (sobie)/pogadać o dawnych czasach.

E. Usage:

1. British English: informal

2. used as a noun, e.g. 'They like to have a bit of a natter.'
'Lubią sobie pogawędzić/pogadać.'

REFERENCES

- Allen, K. (1986) *Linguistic Meaning*. 2 vols. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bach, E. and R. T. Harms (eds) (1968) *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bierwisch, E. H. (1971) "On classifying semantic features". In Steinberg and Jakobovits, 410-435.
- Burger, H. G. (1984) *The Wordtree. A Transitive Cladistic for Solving Physical & Social Problems*. Merriam.
- Chierchia, G. and S. McConnell-Ginet (1990) *Meaning and Grammar: an Introduction to Semantics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Cole, R. W. (ed.) (1977) *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press.
- Cruse, D. A. (1986) *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dillon, G. L. (1977) *Introduction to Contemporary Linguistic Semantics*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice - Hall Inc.
- Dixon, R. M. W. (1971) "A method of semantic description". In Steinberg and Jakobovits, 436-471.
- Doroszewski, W. (ed.) (1980) *Słownik poprawnej polszczyzny*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Dowty, D. R. (1991) "Thematic proto-roles and argument selection", *Language* 67: 547-619.
- Fellbaum, C. (1990) "English verbs as Semantic Net". In *Five Papers on Word-Net*. CLS, Princ. Univ. CLS. Report 43, 43-64.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1968) "The Case for Case". In Bach and Harms, 1-88.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1971a) "Types of lexical information". In Steinberg and Jakobovits, 370-392.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1971b) "Verbs of judging: an exercise in semantic description". In Fillmore and Langendoen, 273-289.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1977a) "Topics in lexical semantics". In Cole, 76-138.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1977b) "Scenes - and - frames semantics". In A. Zampolli (ed.) *Linguistic Structures processing*. Amsterdam: North Holland, 55-81.
- Fillmore, C. J. and D. T. Langendoen (eds) (1971) *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Firth, J. R. (1957) *Papers in Linguistics, 1934 - 1955*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Fisiak, J. (ed.) (1990) *English Dictionary for Speakers of Polish*. Poznań: Kantor Wydawniczy SAWW.
- Fodor, J. D. (1977) *Semantics: Theories of Meaning in Generative Grammar*. Harvard University Press.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1983) *Semantics and Cognition*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1990) *Semantic Structures*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Katz, J. J. (1972) *Semantic Theory*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Kempson, R. M. (1977) *Semantic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kozarzewska, E. (1991) "Właściwości walencyjne czasowników mówienia w języku polskim". In D. Rytel-Kuc (ed.): *Walencja czasownika a problemy leksykografii dwujęzycznej*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 137-157.
- Ladusaw, W. A. and D. R. Dowty (1988) "Towards a nongrammatical account of thematic roles". In Wilkins, 61-73.
- Lakoff, G. (1977) "Linguistic gestalts", *CLS* 13, 236-287.
- Langendoen, D. T. (1971) "Presupposition and assertion in the semantic analysis of nouns and verbs in English". In Steinberg and Jakobovits, 341-344.
- Leech, G. (1981) *Semantics*. Second edition. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Leech, G. (1987) *Meaning and the English Verb*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehrer, A. (1972) "Universals in a culture - bound domain". In L. Heilmann: *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Linguists*. Bologna - Florence Aug. 28 - Sept. 2. Bologna: Societa editrice il Mulino Bologna., 769-775.
- Lehrer, A. (1974) *Semantic Fields and Lexical Structure*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Lehrer, A. (1989) (MS): "Checklist for verbs of speaking", to appear in *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 39: 1-19.
- Lyons, J. (1968) *An Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nilsen, D. L. F. and A. P. Nilsen (1975) *Semantic Theory. A linguistic perspective*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Palmer, F. R. (1981) *Semantics*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pisarski, A. (1990) "On the aspect of Polish verbs of movement and the corresponding English constructions". In J. Fisiak (ed.): *Further Insights into Contrastive Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin, 433-440.
- Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases* (1984) rev. ed. S. M. Lloyd. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Rosch, E. H. (1973) "Natural Categories", *Cognitive Psychology* 4: 328-350.
- Rosh, E. H. (1975) "Cognitive Representations of Semantic Categories", *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 104: 192-233.
- Rosch, E. H. (1977) "Classification of Real - World Objects: Origins and Representations in Cognition". In P. N. Johnson-Laird and P. C. Wason (eds): *Thinking: Readings in Cognitive Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 212-222.
- de Saussure, F. (1916) [1959]: *Cours de Linguistique Generale; Course in General Linguistics*, transl. by W. Baskin, New York: Philosophical Library.
- Searle, J. R. (1969) *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1976) "A classification of illocutionary acts", *Language in Society* 5: 1-23.
- Searle, J. R. (1979) *Expression and Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sebeok, T. A. (ed.), (1966 and 1974) *Current Trends in Linguistics*, vol. 3 and 12. The Hague: Mouton.
- Sinclair, J. (ed.), (1987) *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary*. London and Glasgow: Collins.
- Słownik języka polskiego* (1979), 3 vols., Warszawa: PWN.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1983) *Verb - descriptivity in German and English. A contrastive study in semantic fields*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Stanisławski, J. (ed.) (1982) *Wielki słownik angielsko-polski*. Warszawa: PW "Wiedza Powszechna".

- Steinberg, D. D. and L. A. Jakobovits (eds) (1971) *Semantics. An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Talmy, L. (1985) "Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms". In T. Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. 3: *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57-149.
- Verschueren, J. (1985) *What People Say They Do with Words*. Norwood, N. J. : Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Verschueren, J. (1987) "Metapragmatics and Universals of Linguistic Action". In Verschueren (ed.): 125-140.
- Verschueren, J. (ed.), (1987) *Linguistic Action: Some Empirical - Conceptual Studies*. Norwood, N. J. : Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1972) *Semantic Primitives*. Frankfurt: Athenäum.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1980) *Lingua Mentalis*. Sydney: Academic Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1985) *Lexicography and Conceptual Analysis*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1987) *English Speech Act Verbs. A semantic dictionary*. Sydney: Academic Press.

Iwona Witczak-Plisiecka

WYBRANE ZAGADNIENIA DOTYCZĄCE CZASOWNIKÓW MÓWIENIA

W artykule omówiono wybrane problemy dotyczące opisu semantycznego czasowników mówienia w języku angielskim i polskim.

Celem artykułu jest ukazanie możliwości ewentualnego zastosowania współczesnych teorii semantycznych do opisu znaczenia leksykalnego ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem analizy konceptualnej. Omówione zagadnienia koncentrują się na metodach formalizacji znaczenia leksemów oraz ich wzajemnych relacji.

Końcowa część artykułu zawiera przykładowe robocze hasła słownikowe, stworzone do dalszego zastosowania w komputerowym teaurusie polsko-angielskim (BIT), przygotowywanym w Instytucie Anglistyki Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. Przedstawiona analiza nie jest uważana za ostateczną.