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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, wpadć na), stumble” – descriptive of the manner of walking (Pol. iść nierówno, potykając się) and stumble’’ – while speaking (Pol. potknąć się na słowie, jąkać/zająknąć 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, superordinate, 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. Kemps on 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENTAILMENT</th>
<th>+ TEMPORAL INCLUSION</th>
<th>- TEMPORAL INCLUSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ TROPONYMY</td>
<td>- TROPONYMY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(co-extensiveness)</td>
<td>(proper inclusion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limp – walk</td>
<td>snore – sleep</td>
<td>succeed – try</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lisp – talk</td>
<td>buy – pay</td>
<td>untie – tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BACKGROUND</td>
<td>CAUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESUPPOSITION</td>
<td>raise – rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>give – have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, descriptive 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 oppositness. 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, jumble, 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 išć, 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 Pisarski 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. domówić conclude dopowiedzieć add (up)
   b. przymówić chat up przypowiedzieć tell
   c. wymówić pronounce, utter wypowiedzieć utter, speak out
   d. zamówić book, order zapowiedzieć announce
c. play magic challenge
e. przemówić speak, lecture przepowiedzieć foresee, tell
f. podmówić rebel podpowiedzieć prompt (as in theatre)
g. odmówić refuse, discourage odpowiedzieć answer, reply
   h. wmówić persuade, convince {w + 0}\n   i. namówić persuade {na + 0}\n   j. zmówić conspire, plot {z + 0}\n   k. rozmówić to have a word with rozpowiedzieć gossip, tell
   l. umówić to make an appointment{u + 0}\n   m. podmówić malign, libel, chat {po + 0}\n   n. obmówić malign, gossip {o + 0}\n   o. omówić discuss opowiedzieć tell
   opowiedzieć się 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.

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. Nielsen 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 malomówny.
    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 I” 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) *Niemowlieta gawędzily.

(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,

\[(17) \text{DV} = \text{ANu} + \text{Mod} (+ x)\]

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:

\[(18) \text{falter} = \text{speak (ANu)} + \text{hesitantly, weakly, with broken voice (Mod)}\]
\[\text{mutter} = \text{speak (ANu)} + \text{indistinctly (Mod)}\]
\[\text{gabble} = \text{speak (ANu)} + \text{fast, indistinctly (Mod)}\]

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.
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 'illocutuonary 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\(^1\), babble, chatter\(^1\), blether (on), drivel (on), gab, gabbler, 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\(^1\) = przysięgać, obiecać, 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. ['promis]

Bl. SAY; THINK (performative)
   lb. INTENTION, VOLITION
   lc. Agent: [+HUMAN]; usually 1
       Experiencer: [+HUMAN]
       Object: action X / 'natural object' (things)
       Path: 1
       Instrument: verbal or mental action
   ld. 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
   le. Speaker evaluation: 0
   lf. [GUARANTEE¹/²; PLEDGE¹/²; SWEAR²/³/⁴; VOW¹/²; Undertake²; VOUCH FOR¹/²]
   lg. GIVE ONE’S WORD; ASSURE; VOW

B2. powiedzieć/mówić komuś, że się coś zrobi, załatwi, dać komuś
B3. przyrzec/-kać; obiecać/-ywać; dać/-wać słowo

C. VI'

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 obiecana 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. [gərən'tiː]
Bl. 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. 0
1g. [PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE¹/²; PLEDGE¹/²; VOW; UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR¹/²]

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, rękojmię na coś)
GUARANTEE⁴ (zapewniać coś (A [+ HUMAN]))
GUARANTEE⁵ (zapewniać coś (A [− HUMAN]))
Example 3

GUARANTEE¹

A. [ˈɡærəntiː]

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

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. [ˈpledʒ]

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
ld. 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. 0
1f. 0
1g. GUARANTEE⁰, OFFER
[PROMISE¹; SWEAR²/³/⁴; PLEDGE²; VOW¹/²; UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR¹/²]
B2. poważnie lub uroczyście zapewnić, że się coś od/da lub załatwi
B3. obiecać uroczyście, deklarować, przyrzec, zobowiązać/-żywać się
C. VT
D1. He once pledged his vote to me, without my asking...
Kiedyś przyrzekł mi swój głos w wyborach/oddąć 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/jakiekolwiek 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 Polish-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]

Bla. SAY [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION, VOLITION

lc. Agent: [+HUMAN]; usu. 1+(collective)
   Experiencer: [+HUMAN]
   Object: 1) [+HUMAN]; 2) action X
   Instrument: verbal

d. 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)

E. Usage: especially literary or emotive

Example 6

SWEAR² (SWORE; SWORN)

A. [swear]

Bla. SAY [PROMISE]

1b. INTENTION, VOLITION, (performative)

lc. 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

le. 0
lf. 0
lg. VOW¹

[PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE¹/²; PLEDGE¹/²; SWEAR³/⁴; VOW¹/²; UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR¹/²]

B2. uroczyście i poważnie zapewnić, że się coś zrobi
B3. przysięgać, zaklinać się
C. VT
D1. I swear I will never tell anyone.
Przysięgam, że nigdy nikomu nie powiem.
E. Usage: usually implies fith 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 zaklinać się.
swear by = być zagorzałym zwolennikiem czegoś
swear in = zaprzysięgać (prezydenta,...)

F. SWEAR¹
SWEAR³
SWEAR

Example 7

SWEAR³
A. [swea]
B1a. SAY [PROMISE]
  lb. INTENTION, VOLITION (performativic)
  lc. Agent: [+HUMAN]
      Experiencer: [+HUMAN]; 1 + (usually collective)
      Object: act of speaking/credibility
      Instrument: verbal
  ld. 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
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. SWEAR
SWEAR
SWEAR

Example 8

SWEAR (SWORE/SWORN)
A. [swea]
B1.a. SAY [PROMISE]
1.b. INTENTION, VOLITION (performatice)
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. Ø
1.f. Ø
1.g. INSIST
   [PROMISE; GUARANTEE; PLEDGE; SWEAR; UNDERTAKE; VOUCH FOR; VOW]
B2. zapewniać z powagą / z przekonaniem, że coś jest prawdą, prawdziwe
B3. dać/dawać słowo, stanowczo utrzymywać, że..., kląć 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/zapewniła, 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. [\ Anda\ Ôteɪk]

B1a. SAY, STATE [PROMISE]
  Ib. 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. ø
    1f. ø
    1g. AGREE
        [PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE¹/²; PLEDGE¹/²; SWEAR²/³/⁴; VOUCH FOR¹/²; VOW¹/²]

B2. zapewnić, że się coś zrobi, czegoś dopilnuje
B3. podąć 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 (podąć się; take on)

Example 10

VOUCH FOR¹

A. [ˈvavʃ[i]rə]

B1a. SAY [PROMISE]
  Ib. INTENTION (performative)
1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]
   Experiencer: [+HUMAN]; usu. 1+
   Object: [+ABSTRACT] (X); usu. facts
   Path: 1
   Instrument: verbal

d. 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

e. 0

f. 0

g. PROVE; GUARANTEE2
   [PROMISE1; PLEDGE1/2; SWEAR2/3/4; UNDERTAKE2; VOUCH FOR2; VOW1/2]

B2. oświadczać, że jest się przekonanym 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. ['vautʃfo]
B1.a. SAY [PROMISE]
   1b. INTENTION (performativc)
   1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]
      Experiencer: [+HUMAN]; usu. 1+
      Object: [+ABSTRACT] (X); [+HUMAN (Y)]
      Instrument: verbal

d. 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

e. 0

f. 0

g. SPEAK FOR; GUARANTEE2; RECOMMEND
   [PROMISE1; GUARANTEE1; PLEDGE1/2; SWEAR2/3/4; UNDERTAKE2; VOUCH FOR1; VOW1/2]

B2. oświadczając, 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. ['vau]
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. 0
   1f. 0
   1g. SWEAR2
       [PROMISE1; GUARANTEE1/2; PLEDGE1/2; SWEAR3/4; UNDERTAKEN2; VOUCH FOR1/2; 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 przysiągł/poprzysiągł zabić kochanka 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. ['vau]
Bla. 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. 0  
   1f. 0  
   1g. TO MAKE A VOW  
       [PROMISE¹; GUARANTEE¹/²; PLEDGE¹/²; SWEAR²/³/⁴; UNDERTAKE²; VOUCH FOR¹/²; VOW¹]  
C. VT  
D1. Priests vow their lives to the service of the church.  
       Kapłani ślubują/ oddają swoje życie na służbę Kościółowi.  
E. Usage: religious or quasi-religious connotations  
F. VOW¹

Example 14

STAMMER
A. ['stæma]  
Bla. 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. 0  
   1f. 0  
   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. [ˈstaːtə]
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, halting
       Effect: impaired communication
       (involuntary repetition of sounds)
   1e. Ø or negative
   1f. Ø
   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 stummered 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. [ˈstʌmbl]
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. STUMBLE$^1$ (potknąć się, wpaść na)
   STUMBLE$^2$ (iść nierówno, potykając się)

Example 17

FALTER$^2$

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

   ‘Co się stało?’ – ‘To...’ Bixby zahalował się.

F. FALTER$^1$ (waver, hesitate)
   FALTER$^3$ (move, pause)
Example 18

MUMBLE¹
A. ['mʌmb³]  
Bl. SAY TALK (MISPRONOUNCE)  
1b. MANNER (descriptive)  
1c. Agent: [+HUMAN]  
   Instrument: verbal  
1d. Manner: indistinct  
   Effect: reduced communicative value  
   Time: continuous  
1e. usu. negative  
1f. 0  
1g. MUTTER  
B2. mówić cicho i niewyraźnie, jak gdyby przeżuwając słowa  
B3. przeżuwac (słowa), mamrotać  
C. V (away)  

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

Example 19

MUTTER  
A. ['mʌtə]  
Bl. 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. 0  
1g. MUMBLE; GRUMBLE  
B2. mówić niewyraźnie i bardzo cicho, narzekając na coś lub zwracając się do siebie  
B3. mamrotać, mruczeć  
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 (mruczeć/pomrukiwać pod nosem) na premiera.

Example 20

PATTER²
A. ['pæta]
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' = slang
   3. '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. ['splAta]
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. 0
1f. 0
1g. 0

B2. mówić lub powiedzieć szybko, często z zakłopotaniem, krztusząc się
B3. wy/krzusić (słowa)

C. V (out)

D.1. ‘But... but...’ she spluttered.
‘Ale... ale...’ (wy)krzusiła.

2. He was spluttering with rage.
Z wściekłości krzusił słowa.

E. Usage: esp. in a hurry

F. SPLUTTER² (onomatopoeic; of a sound)

Example 22

BABBLE¹

A. ['bæbəl]

B1a. TALK SAY

1b. MANNER (descriptive)

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN], [+ADULT], usu. 1
   Object: (excessive)
   Path: 1+
   Instrument: verbal

Id. Manner: informal foolish, incoherent
   Time: durative

1e. usu. negative
1f. 0
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)

D1. 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. BABELLE^2 (Agent: [+HUMAN]; [-ADULT]; of babies)
BABELLE^3 (Agent: [-HUMAN]; onomatopoeic)
BABELLE^4 OUT (= blab)

Example 23

BLAB

A. ['blæb]

Bl. 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. 0

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

CHAT^1

A. ['tʃæt]

Bl. SAY TALK

1b. MANNER

1c. Agent: [+HUMAN], usu1+ (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. 0  
1f. 0  

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 gawędziłem/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. [tʃætə]  
Bl. SAY TALK  
1b. MANNER  
1c. Agent: [+ HUMAN], usu. 1  
   Experiencer: usu. passive  
   Object: trivial, unimportant  
   Path: 1+  
   Instrument: verbal  
Id. Base: ‘insufficient’, aimless action  
   Manner: informal, foolish  
   Time: continuous, rapid  
1e. 0 or negative  
1f. 0  
1g. BABBLE; JABBER (rapidness, 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

BLEATHER (ON)

A. ['bleθə]

Bla. 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. 0
1g. JABBER
B2. mówić długo, głupio i beztreściwie
B3. pleś (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
      1 'blethering idiot' – ktoś kto ciągle mówi bez sensu

Example 27

DRIVEL (ON)

A. ['drɪv̩ə]

Bla. 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. 0
1g. RABBIT (ON)
B2. mówić długo, beztreściwie lub nudnie
B3. truć, paplać, gadać
D. She spent an hour drivelling on about her health.
   Przez całą godzinę truła o swoim zdrowiu.

Example 28

GAB
A. [gæb]
B1a. SAY TALK
   1b. MANNER (descriptive)
   lc. Agent: [+HUMAN]
       Object: unimportant (usu. trivial)
       Instrument: verbal
   ld. Base: idle talk
       Manner: informal, foolish
       Time: durative, continuous
   le. usu. negative
   If. Ø
   lg. 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 elokwenti, logicznie i z przekonaniem

Example 29

GABBLE
A. ['gæbl]
B1a. SAY TALK
   1b. MANNER (descriptive)
   lc. Agent: [+HUMAN], 1
       Path: 1
       Instrument: verbal
   lc. Base: incoherence
       Manner: informal, indistinct
       Effect: reduced communicative value
       Time: rapid
le. usu. negative
lf. Ø
lg. BABBLE, PATTER
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 wyrzuścił 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
   Ib. MANNER (descriptive)
   Ic. Agent: [+HUMAN]
       Path: 1
       Instrument: verbal
   Id. Cause: (situation), e.g. fear or shock; madness
       Base: incoherence
       Manner: informal, foolish
       Effect: lack of communication
       Time: rapid
   Ie. negative (usu. ‘foolish’ but not ‘bad’)
   If. Ø
lg. 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. ['dʒæbə]
Bla. SAY TALK
1b. MANNER (descriptive)
lc. Agent: [+HUMAN]
   Instrument: verbal
1d. Cause: (situation), excitement
   Base: incoherence
   Manner: informal, indistinct
   Effect: lack of communication
   Time: rapid
le. usu. negative
lf. Ø
lg. 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 zrozumiem 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. ['prætə]
Bla. 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
le. negative (if Agent is '+adult')
lf. Ø
CHATTER (aimlessness), BABBLE (incoherence)

B2. mówić dużo i beztrześciwie, używając prostego lub prymitywnego języka; (o dziecku/of a child) mówić niewprawnie i bez celu

B3. paplać, młec 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. [ˈræbit]

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. 0

1g. DRIVEL ON

B2. mówić bez przerwy, w sposób nudny, rozwlekle

B3. truć, paplać, ględzić, gadać

C. PHRASAL V (about)

D. He keeps rabbitting on about his health. On ciągle truje o swoim zdrowiu.

E. Usage: usu. British English

Example 34

WAFFLE (ON)

A. [ˈwafl̩]

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, beztresciwie lub głupio
   B3. truć, paplać, pleść, gadać, głędzić
   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
   ‘They like to have a bit of a natter.’
   ‘Lubią sobie pogawędzić/pogadać.’
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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 tezaurusie polsko-angielskim (BIT), przygotowywanym w Instytucie Anglistyki Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. Przedstawiona analiza nie jest uważana za ostateczną.