Sabina J. Halupka-Rešetar[1]
University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Philosophy
Biljana B. Radić-Bojanić
University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Philosophy

POLYSEMY OF THE LEXEMES *HOME* IN ENGLISH AND *DOM* IN SERBIAN[2]

Drawing on Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Johnson 1987, Lakoff 1987) and Conceptual Metonymy Theory (Radden and Kövecses 1999, Radden 2000, Barcelona 2000) the paper presents a contrastive analysis of the lexemes *home* in English and *dom* in Serbian. The analysis of the material taken from monolingual dictionaries of English and Serbian (*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, *Macmillan English Dictionary*, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* and *Rečnik srpskoga jezika*) shows numerous similarities between the metaphoric and metonymic extensions of meaning of the given lexemes that may be attributed to the common European cultural frame which English and Serbian appear to share. Specifically, two corresponding metonymic extensions and one metaphorical extension have been found in both languages. Some minor crosslinguistic differences have also been noted in the ways in which metaphors operate in English, but a more detailed corpus analysis of the whole lexical field of *house/kuća* is required in order to support the conclusions reached in this paper.

Keywords: polysemy, conceptual metaphor, conceptual metonymy, English, Serbian, contrastive analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

A very large number of lexical items in any natural langue are ambiguous. Lexical ambiguity may stem from either homonymy or polysemy. While in the former case the different readings of the words are not related, in the latter case there has to be a semantic connection between the senses. In such cases we say that a word is polysemous, i.e. that it manifests polysemy (Cruse 2011: 115). The degree to which the different readings of a lexeme are related forms a continuous scale. Thus, of the distinct senses of a single lexical item one is more central than, or prior to, others (Sweetser 1986: 528), which are derived from it directly or indirectly via transfer of meaning. Although transferred meaning represents a peripheral component of lexical meaning, research has shown that more frequent words tend to be the most polysemous (Crossley, Salsbury and McNamara 2010: 576).

---

1 halupka.resetar@ff.uns.ac.rs

As part of a larger research project the aim of which is to establish the polysemous structure of the elements within the lexical fields *house* in English and *kuća* in Serbian, this paper offers a contrastive analysis of the lexemes *home* in English and *dom* in Serbian. Based on the analysis of the meaning extensions of these two lexemes, the paper intends to ascertain interlinguistic and intercultural similarities and differences existing between the ways in which *home* and *dom* are conceptualized in these two languages (cf. Radić-Bojanić and Halupka-Rešetar 2014a; Radić-Bojanić and Halupka-Rešetar 2014b).

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 outlines the theoretical framework of Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Conceptual Metonymy Theory, while Section 3 presents the research methodology. The results of the research are presented in Section 4, followed by Section 5, which summarizes the main findings of the research.

2. CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR AND METONYMY

Metaphors and metonymies have traditionally been regarded as figures of speech, ornamental devices primarily (or exclusively) pertaining to the field of literature, specifically rhetoric or stylistics. However, it is clear that figurative expressions like *She is such a sweetheart* or *the head of the department* are found in everyday language and are used quite aptly even by children, suggesting that figurative language is a linguistic phenomenon. What is more, metaphor and metonymy have been proven to be much more than just a way of expressing ideas by means of language: they are a way of thinking about things and conceptualizing extralinguistic reality.

In *Metaphors we live by*, the first major breakthrough in cognitive linguistic research, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) showed that metaphors are widely used in everyday language. A detailed examination of large amounts of data gave support to the idea that everyday language is filled with metaphors language users often fail to notice. This led the authors (and many other linguists since, e.g. Johnson 1987, Kövecses 2002, Ungerer and Schmid 2013, to name but a few) to define metaphor as one of the basic cognitive instruments which "is organized according to cross-domain mappings or correspondences between conceptual domains" (Evans and Green 2006: 286). To illustrate this, people often see time as an asset and hence conceptualize it as money, as in the following examples from English (1-3) and Serbian (4-6):

(1)   Stop *wasting my time!*

(2)   I can't afford to *spend a lot of time* standing here talking.

(3)   For many of us, *saving time* in the morning means sleeping in a little longer.

(4)   Marko je *protraćio tri sata* na igranje igrice.

(5)   Ne *troše* svi *slobodno vreme* na iste stvari.

(6)   Dobrom organizacijom se može *uštedeti mnogo vremena*.

All of the above examples show how the target domain (the domain being described, in this case time) is structured in terms of the source domain (the domain in terms of which the target is described, in this case money) (Evans and Green 2006: 295). In other words, the source domain tends to be more concrete and experientially closer to the speaker, while the target domain is more abstract and hence more difficult to conceptualize, so through metaphors speakers map the structure of the source domain onto the features of the target domain, as in the crosslinguistically common metaphorical mappings LOVE IS WAR, LOVE IS A JOURNEY, LIFE IS A JOURNEY, UP IS GOOD/DOWN IS BAD, PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS and so on. (For many conventional mappings see Lakoff & Johnson 1980, The Master Metaphor List,[3] Kövecses 2002, Lakoff & Turner 1989, Evans & Green 2006, etc.)

Another conceptual mechanism, which is considered to be even more basic than metaphor by many cognitive linguists (e.g. Radden & Kövecses 1999, Radden 2000, Barcelona 2000) is metonymy. This transfer of meaning rests on an asymmetrical mapping of the vehicle onto another conceptual entity, the target, whereby both the vehicle and the target entity belong to the same idealized cognitive domain (cf. Kövecses & Radden 1998: 39). As with metaphor, there are many conventionalized metonymies, such as PART FOR WHOLE, PLACE FOR INSTITUTION, EFFECT FOR CAUSE, RESULT FOR ACTION, AGENT FOR ACTION, etc. The following examples illustrate the metonymy PLACE FOR INSTITUTION in English (7-8) and Serbian (9-10):

(7)   *Downing street* refuses comment.

(8)   *Paris* and *Washington* are having a spat. (Evans & Green 2006: 313)

(9)   *Kremlj* se u svojoj politici prema Siriji smatra ojačanim.

(10) *Beograd* i *Priština* imaju sastanak 9. februara.

The last example shows a rather common phenomenon in cognitive linguistic analysis, namely that of several metaphors and/or metonymies, which form a chain (Kövecses 2002: 157). In this particular case *Beograd* and *Priština* stand for Serbia and Kosovo, respectively, as instances of the metonymy PART FOR WHOLE, but at the same time they also stand for the governments and their representatives via the metonymies WHOLE FOR PART and PLACE FOR INSTITUTION. This occurrence is not unusual: metonymy has been found to motivate many metaphorical transfers of meaning (Barcelona 2000, Radden 2000). Similar examples are also found in the corpus analyzed in this paper, as we show in Section 4.

3.   RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The analysis of metaphorical and metonymic transfers of meaning of the lexemes *home* in English and *dom* in Serbian is based on the material excerpted from monolingual dictionaries of English and Serbian (*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* 2009, *Macmillan English Dictionary* 2007,

---

3 http://araw.mede.uic.edu/~alansz/metaphor/METAPHORLIST.pdf

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 2011, *Rečnik srpskoga jezika* 2007). It is important to note that students' dictionaries of English such as the ones used in this research most often include examples which illustrate the use of given lexemes in a certain context, whereas monolingual dictionaries of Serbian offer very few examples of authentic language use. In order to compensate for the lack of such relevant information, the paper also relies on electronic corpora of English and Serbian (the *British National Corpus* (BNC) and the *Corpus of the Contemporary Serbian Language* (CCSL)) as sources of additional examples which illustrate various meanings of the lexemes under scrutiny.

It must be emphasized that the paper does not assume a quantitative approach to the material as it only intends to describe the metaphors and metonymies that comprise the polysemous structure of these lexemes, while the information regarding the frequency of usage found in the English monolingual dictionaries relates only to the frequency of the head word (lexeme), not the frequency of individual meanings associated with it. Thus, of the three students' dictionaries of English used in this research, two mention the frequencies of head words: according to the *Macmillan English Dictionary* the lexeme *home* is among the 2,500 most basic words in English, while the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* notes that *home* is one of the 1000 most frequent words in both spoken and written language. On the other hand, neither the Serbian monolingual dictionary nor the CCSL include such information so these two resources will be used solely as sources of representative examples for metaphorical and metonymic transfers of meaning.

The very procedure of metaphor and metonymy identification employed in the paper is based on a somewhat modified procedure developed by the Pragglejaz Group (2007), who in their work focused only on the identification and explication of metaphors. In brief, the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) includes the following steps (Pragglejaz 2007: 3): (1) read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning; (2) determine the lexical units in the text–discourse; for each lexical unit in the text (3a) establish its meaning in context, taking into account what comes before and after the lexical unit; (3b) determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context, i.e. whether it tends to be more concrete, related to bodily action, more precise and historically older; (3c) if the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it and if it does, (4) mark the lexical unit as metaphorical.

The analysis in this paper is based on lexemes, their meanings (including both metaphorical and metonymic transfers of meaning) and examples excerpted from dictionary entries and electronic corpora of English and Serbian. The procedure employed here was developed in two previous papers (Radić-Bojanić & Halupka-Rešetar 2014a, Radić-Bojanić & Halupka-Rešetar 2014b) and is somewhat different from the Pragglejaz procedure. It comprises the following steps: (1) establish the basic meaning of the lexeme; (2) establish the relationship of all other meanings of the lexeme in the dictionary entry

with the basic meaning; (3) establish the basis of each transfer of meaning; (4) list examples from the dictionary entry that exemplify the transfer of meaning; (5) if there are no examples in the dictionary entry, find examples in the corpus.

The latter, modified procedure was applied to the dictionary entries *home* and *dom*. In what follows we offer the contrastive analysis of the meanings of these lexemes and their metaphorical and metonymic extensions. The aim of the analysis is to establish interlinguistic and intercultural similarities and differences between the meaning extensions of the lexemes *home* in English and *dom* in Serbian.

4. RESEARCH RESULTS

Before presenting the results of the analysis we give an overview of existing research into the polysemantic structure of the lexemes *kuća* ('house') and *dom* ('home') in Serbian and we note that we are unaware of any similar analyses having been conducted for *house* and *home* in English.

Marković (1991) performed a contrastive semantic analysis of lexemes which denote the house and its parts in Serbo-Croatian, English and Russian and found few differences between the meaning extensions of these lexemes in Serbian and English. Using various sources, Ristić and Lazić-Konjik (2012) gave an extensive cognitive and ethnolinguistic comparison of the lexemes *dom* 'home' and *kuća* 'house' in Serbian. The most recent lexical and semantic analysis of the synonymous pair *kuća – dom* in Serbian is found in Đurović (2013), who puts special focus on those contexts in which the two lexemes are not completely interchangeable.

The analysis of metaphorical transfers of meaning of the lexemes *home* in English and *dom* in Serbian has revealed that there are five metaphorical mappings in English and only one in Serbian. The transfer which can be observed in both languages is the metaphor INSTITUTION IS HOME, which closely corresponds to the metaphor INSTITUTION IS A HOUSE (Radić-Bojanić & Halupka-Rešetar 2014a):

(11) A former hotel worker will spend Christmas alone in a tent after his retirement *home* was bulldozed by Spanish planners. (BNC)[4]

(12) They didn't want to put their mother in a *home*. (MED)

(13) Gertrude Hauser, superintendent of the dogs' *home*, is accustomed to such examples of man's inhumanities to dumb creatures. (BNC)

(14) Od imovine tog društva najvrednija je poslovna zgrada od 690 kvadratnih metara, takozvani 'Vatrogasni *dom*'. (CCSL)

(15) *Dom* zdravlja je dostavio odštetni zahtev za nadoknadu štete koju je dr

---

4 The sources for the examples used in the paper are coded in the following way: *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* as LDOCE, *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* as MED, O*xford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* as OALD, *British National Corpus* as BNC, *Rečnik srpskoga jezika* (Dictionary of Serbian Language) as RSJ, and *Corpus of the Contemporary Serbian Language* as CCSL.

> Bratislav Stojković naneo ovoj zdravstvenoj ustanovi u vreme dok je bio na njenom čelu. (CCSL)

(16) … pošto je ostalo da se samo Senat, gornji *dom* rumunskog Parlamenta, izjasni o tome da li će taj paragraf biti promenjen ili ne. (CCSL)

Examples (11) and (14) illustrate the use of *home/dom* as referring to the building which houses an institution: in (11) it is the building that is torn down and in (14) the example focuses on the value of the building which houses a fire department. In (12) and (15) the metaphorical meaning of *home/ dom* is further extended by a metonymic transfer to stand for the institution (CONTAINER FOR CONTENT, see the analysis below), so in (12) the mother is placed in an instition where old people live, whereas in (15) *dom* stands for the health clinic in the institutional sense. Finally, examples (13) and (16) exhibit interlinguistic and intercultural differences: in British English dogs' and cats' homes are buildings and institutions where animals which have no owner are looked after. In Serbian, on the other hand, such a meaning of the lexeme *dom* is not recorded in dictionaries, although the electronic corpus does record one example of *dom za pse* ('dogs' home') (17). This, we suppose, is the result of the influence of English, since the word commonly used to refer to this concept is *azil (za životinje)*:

(17) Propisi kažu da na svakih 250 000 stanovnika treba da nikne *dom* za pse. (CCSL)

The other interlinguistic and intercultural difference observed in relation to the above examples concerns the fact that *dom* in Serbian is used to refer to a group of people who make the laws of a country (16), which in English is not realized with the lexeme *home* but with its synonym, *house* (e.g. the House of Commons/Lords/Representatives, etc.).

Furthermore, the English *home* exhibits a much wider network of metaphorical extensions, given that examples of four other metaphorical extensions have also been found. The first one, where *home* is used to refer to the place where a sports club is based and plays most of its games (18-19), relies on the metaphor SPORTS CLUB IS HOME:

(18) Is the match on Saturday at *home* or away? (LDOCE)

(19) Birmingham Bullets are at *home* to Kingston. (OALD)

In Serbian, this metaphor is realized through metaphorical expressions involving either the adjectival form of the lexeme *dom* (i.e. *domaći*) or else the synonymous lexeme *kuća* 'house', as in (20-21):

(20) *Domaći* teren je, s jedne strane, opterećujući, a s druge lepo je takmičiti se i postizati vrhunske rezultate pred svojim navijačima, prijateljima i članovima porodice. (CCSL)

(21) Naravno da je moguće pobediti u Beogradu, ali mislim da je Srbija favorit jer je to jak tim i igra kod *kuće*.

Secondly, based on the transfer PLACE OF ORIGIN IS HOME, the lexeme *home* may also signify the place where something first started or was first made, which is not found in Serbian:

(22) Scotland is the *home* of golf. (MED)

Furthermore, by the extension A PLEASANT PLACE IS HOME, we find this lexeme referring to places where one feels comfortable and relaxed, as in the following example:

(23) We like to make our customers feel at *home*.

As for the metaphorical expressions in Serbian which refer to a pleasant place, we have found two instances, one of which is the expression *Dome, slatki dome*, which we believe is a direct translation of 'Home, sweet home' in English. The other instance of the metaphorical conceptualization of a pleasant place in Serbian is realized much more often via the metaphor PLEASANT PLACE IS A HOUSE, as described in Radić-Bojanić and Halupka-Rešetar (2014a).

The last metaphorical transfer of *home* is based on the mapping HABITAT IS HOME, where the lexeme *home* is used of the place where an animal or plant usually lives, originates from or where it is found:

(24) This region is the *home* of many species of wild flower. (OALD)

As the above examples illustrate, the lexeme *home* boasts a larger number of metaphorical extensions of meaning than its Serbian equivalent, *dom*. However, even though the *Dictionary of Serbian Language* does not record the frequency of entries, the above finding does not imply that the lexeme *home* is more frequent than the lexeme *dom*, given that some of the meaning extensions of *home* in English correspond to extensions of the lexemes *kuća* ('house') or *domaći* ('home' adj.) in Serbian (cf. examples (20-21)).

In the domain of metonymic extensions of meaning, we find the same situation in both languages under consideration. Two metonymies are at work, CONTAINER FOR CONTENT and PART FOR WHOLE. Within the metonymic transfer CONTAINER FOR CONTENT, *home* in English stands for one's family only (25), while in Serbian, in addition to this (26), it may also denote the royal family or dynasty (27):

(25) He had always wanted a real *home* with a wife and children. (OALD)

(26) I idi, pa mu se raduj kad se rodi. Od ovolicno, (pokazuje rukom) od 'mrvu mrvku' hrani ga, čuvaj, gledaj, da, kad se umire, ima ko oči da ti zaklopi, sveću zapali, da ti se *dom*, ognjište ne ugasi… (CCSL)

(27) Po članu 57 Ustava „u kraljevski *dom* ulazili su i kraljev brat knez Arsen sa svojim potomstvom i kraljev sin kraljević Đorđe". (CCSL)

It is evident from examples (25-26) that *home/dom* in both cases represents a family: in (25) he wanted a family with a wife and children, all of whom live in a home together, whereas in (26) the speaker is warning the hearer that his family (his descendants) might disappear altogether. In other words, both examples demonstrate how the content of the home is replaced by the container, the home itself. An additional transfer of meaning, similar to

the one found in both languages in the analysis of the lexemes *house* and *kuća* (Radić-Bojanić & Halupka-Rešetar 2014a) narrows down the meaning of the family as the content of a home only to the royal family or dynasty (27).

Lastly, the metomymic transfer PART FOR WHOLE has been found to operate in both languages, extending the meaning of both *home* in English (28-29) and *dom* in Serbian (30-31) to the town, district, country, etc. where one comes from or where one lives and belongs to. The following examples illustrate this:

(28) She was born in Italy, but she's made Charleston her *home*. (LDOCE)

(29) Jamaica is *home* to over two million people. (OALD)

(30) … da ima utisak […] da odavde naprosto ne treba odlaziti, da je ovo svet za njega, njegov jedini *dom*, mesto koje je oduvek sanjao i na kom je oduvek i trebalo da bude. (CCSL)

(31) … sebe doživljavam kao Evropljanina, govorim pet evropskih jezika i sve zemlje Evrope mogu biti moj *dom*. (CCSL)

Hence, in all of the four examples above *home* and *dom* present a shortcut for larger wholes in which they are conventionally found: in example (28) *home* stands for the entire town where the home is, while in (29) *home* stands for the entire country. Similarly, *dom* in example (30) describes a whole area or even a country where the person lives, while *dom* in (31) is very similar to *home* in (29) in that it signifies a whole country.

5.   CONCLUSION

In this paper we analyzed the meaning extensions of the lexemes *home* in English and *dom* in Serbian from the cognitive linguistic perspective in order to establish the similarities and differences in their polysemantic structure. The results of the analysis reveal numerous similarities (the metonymies CONTAINER FOR CONTENT and PART FOR WHOLE, and the metaphor INSTITUTION IS HOME) and several differences. Namely, some metaphorical extensions of the lexeme *home* in English are not realized as meaning extensions of *dom* in Serbian but rather as extensions of the synonymous lexeme *kuća* (e.g. SPORTS CLUB IS HOME). Furthermore, there are other metaphors in English (PLACE OF ORIGIN IS HOME, A PLEASANT PLACE IS HOME, HABITAT IS HOME) which do not have any equivalents in Serbian. This can be explained by intercultural differences that are reflected in language.

REFERENCES

Barcelona 2000: A. Barcelona, On the plausibility of claiming a metonymic motivation for conceptual metaphor, in: A. Barcelona (ed), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 31-58.

Crossley, Salsbury, McNamara 2010: S. Crossley, T. Salsbury, D. McNamara, The Development of Polysemy and Frequency Use in English Second Language Speakers, *Language Learning*, 60/3, 573-605.

Cruse 2011: D. A. Cruse, *Meaning in language: an introduction to semantics and pragmatics* (3rd ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Đurović 2013: S. Đurović, Sinonimski par *kuća: dom* u srpskom jeziku, *Srpski jezik*, XVIII, 329-338.

Evans, Green 2006: V. Evans, M. Green, *Cognitive linguistics: an introduction*, London: Routledge.

Johnson 1987: M. Johnson, *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of reason and imagination*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kövecses 2002: Z. Kövecses, *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Radden 1998: Z. Kövecses, G. Radden, Metonymy: developing a cognitive linguistic view, *Cognitive Linguistics*, 9/7, 37-77.

Lakoff 1987: G. Lakoff, *Women, fire, and dangerous things*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, Johnson 1980: G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, Turner 1989: G. Lakoff, M. Turner, *More than cool reason*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marković 1991: R. Marković, Grananje značenja reči koje označavaju kuću i njene delove, *Naš jezik*, 29/1-2, 55-76.

Pragglejaz Group 2007: Pragglejaz Group, MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse, *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22/1, 1-39.

Radden 2000: G. Radden, How metonymic are metaphors?, in: A. Barcelona (ed), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 93-105.

Radden, Kövecses 1999: G. Radden, Z. Kövecses, Towards a theory of metonymy, in: K.-U. Panther & G. Radden (eds), *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 17-59.

Radić-Bojanić, Halupka-Rešetar 2014a: B. Radić-Bojanić, S. Halupka-Rešetar, Polisemija leksema *house* u engleskom i *kuća* u srpskom jeziku, u: M. Kovačević (ur.), *Višeznačnost u jeziku*, knjiga I, Kragujevac: FILUM, 333-344.

Radić-Bojanić, Halupka-Rešetar 2014b: B. Radić-Bojanić, S. Halupka-Rešetar, Višeznačnost leksema *door* i *window* u engleskom i *vrata* i *prozor* u srpskom jeziku, u: I. Živančević Sekeruš i N. Majstorović (ur.), *Susret kultura*, Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 347-358.

Ristić, Lazić-Konjik 2012: S. Ristić, I. Lazić-Konjik, *Dom* u srpskom jeziku. Rad izložen na VI EUROJOS konferenciji *Koncepty: DOM, EUROPA, WOLNOŚĆ, PRACA, HONOR w aksjosferze Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, 21-23.11.2012. ‹http://rastko.rs/rastko/delo/14705›. 10.2.2014.

Sweetser 1986: E. E. Sweetser, Polysemy vs. Abstraction: Mutually Exclusive or Complementary?, *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 528-538.

Ungerer, Schmid 2013: F. Ungerer, H-J. Schmid, *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics* (2nd ed.), London: Routledge.

DICTIONARIES

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English 2009, 5th edition, Harlow: Pearson Education. ‹http://www.ldoceonline.com›. 15.12.2014.

Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners 2007, 2nd edition, Macmillan Education, Oxford. ‹http://www.macmillandictionaries.com/about/med/›. 15.12.2014.

Nikolić 2007: M. Nikolić (ur.), *Rečnik srpskoga jezika*, Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 2011, 8th edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press. ‹http://oald8.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com›. 15.12.2014.

CORPORA

British National Corpus, ‹http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/using/index.xml?ID=simple›. 15.12.2014.

Korpus savremenog srpskog jezika, ‹http://www.korpus.matf.bg.ac.rs/prezentacija/korpus.html›. 15.12.2014.

Sabina J. Halupka-Rešetar
Biljana B. Radić-Bojanić

POLISEMIJA LEKSEMA *HOME* U ENGLESKOM I *DOM* U SRPSKOM JEZIKU

Rezime

Oslanjajući se na teoriju pojmovne metafore i teoriju pojmovne metonimije, u radu se kontrastivno analiziraju značenja leksema *home* u engleskom i *dom* u srpskom jeziku. Cilj rada je da se ustanove sličnosti i razlike između metaforičkih i metonimijskih proširenja značenja ovih leksema, što će istovremeno dati uvid u međujezičke i međukulturne razlike ova dva jezika. Analiza se zasniva na materijalu crpljenom iz jednojezičnih rečnika engleskog i srpskog jezika, kao i na korpusu savremenog engleskog jezika i savremenog srpskog jezika. Rezultati ukazuju na mnoge sličnosti kao što su metonimije SADRŽATELJ ZA SADRŽAJ i DEO ZA CELINU, te metafora INSTITUCIJA JE DOM, koje su otkrivene u oba jezika, ali i na nekolike razlike između značenja leksema *home* i *dom*, kao što su ona zasnovana na metaforama MESTO ODAKLE NEKO POTIČE JE DOM, PRIJATNO MESTO JE DOM i STANIŠTE JE DOM. Naposletku, mogu se uočiti i određena značenja koja su u engleskom jeziku realizovana kroz metaforičke izraze koji sadrže leksemu *home*, dok su ista ta značenja u srpskom jeziku realizovana u metaforičkim izrazima sa leksemom *kuća* (metafora SPORTSKI KLUB JE DOM).

Ključne reči: polisemija, pojmovna metafora, pojmovna metonimija, engleski jezik, srpski jezik, kontrastivna analiza