NOSITI versus TO CARRY and TO WEAR

Ivo Krile
Faculty of Philosophy, Zagreb

The author discusses the grammatical properties of the SC verb *nositi* and some of its E translation equivalents. Stress is laid on two possibilities of formal representation: on the one hand, the semantic distinction is performed, in the first place, by means of syntactic arrangements which yield the two basic meanings of the SC verb *nositi;* on the other hand, the semantic distinction is made by the occurrence of two lexemes in English (*to carry* and *to wear*) i. e. by means of morphological performance which is not the case in Serbo-Croatian. The author assumes that the difference between the two ways of formal representation shown in the two languages is due to the fact that by means of morphological representation in English the extralinguistic notion of possession becomes much more conspicuous. No doubt, only the consideration of this extra-linguistic problem may show us a way to the solution of the grammatical question posed in this paper. It goes without saying that semantic distinctions made by morphological performance in language can be regarded as more expressive means than those made by syntactic.

0.0. Lexemes, as we know them, can be easily identified and separated from other lexemes owing simply to their formal unrepeatability. Meanings of lexemes, on the other hand, occur in numberless syntactic arrangements, they may be said to depend on word order and other formal constraints but they are easily identifiable only if one knows their sense and/or their denotation. Accordingly, the so-called surface structure says only how the sentence is to be *spoken* while the so-called underlying representation says how it is to be

understood.[1] Thus, generally speaking, the semantic structure of language, in contrast to the syntactic, appears to show much more complexity and intricacy in large part by being less accessible to observation.

Fortunately, speakers can handle meanings of lexemes by just knowing their senses without even being familiar with their denotations. Namely, the denotation of a lexeme contains the complete inventory of semantic features and their relations occurring in a meaning. Therefore, it is logical to assume that the sense of a lexeme is, in most cases, epistemologically prior to its denotation.[2] In other words, this process is in a way proportionate to the degree of a speaker's experience and his knowledge of the world. Certainly, in many instances, one's knowledge of extralinguistic facts will inevitably depend on possibilities of scientific research. Such activities may be said to reflect standards of civilization; they are no less indicative of general social progress in which the development and use of language also finds its place.

Semantic analysis, as we might have already noticed, deals with both sense relations within the meaning of a lexeme and sense relations between meanings of different meanings. However this type of analysis need not cover the domain of so-called referential meanings. Conceptual meanings, as we might call them, are used as referential when one is in position to say what they stand for in the actual, i.e. extralinguistic world.

0.1. The phenomenon of meaning has for centuries been discussed in a variety of ways by scholars of different scientific orientation. Nevertheless, only two approaches appear to be crucial. Within the first approach the focus is upon conceptual constructs without any attention paid to the process of reference. Within the second, analysis is based chiefly on distributions of meanings and not on verbal behaviour.

0.2. The technique of so-called *componential analysis* has, in recent years, often been assigned the role of one of the most efficient approaches to meaning. In fact, componential analysis is primarily concerned with consideration of referen-

---

[1] Lynn H. Waterhouse on *Psychology and Language* by Herbert and Eve Clark, *Language*, vol. 55, No 2, June 1979, p. 437.
[2] John Lyons, *Semantics I*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, Reprinted 1978, pp. 206—213.

tial potentiality of lexical units, such as entities, events, abstracts etc. Further, it also deals with the ways in which speakers behave in response to the use of such units. The so-called intensionalist view involves procedures based on the semantic relations of contrast and comparison while the so--called extensionalist view involves procedures based on the semantic relations of opposition and substitution.[3] Sometimes it is very difficult to grasp so many different semantic notions as e.g. of superordination, subordination, correspondence, similarity, contiguity etc., particularly when our own experience of life tells us that the actual world cannot be easily reflected in sharply defined and neat conceptual features. Linguists may console themselves with the knowledge that approaches to aspects of behaviour other than linguistic are likewise in want of scientific criteria. After all, whatever the difficulties, it is astonishing that so many labyrinths and mosaics of human experience can be so efficiently turned into a system of auditive or visual or alike signals by means of which language may serve as a means of communication.

1.0. We have mentioned that some lexemes can yield more than one meaning. Such lexemes may be said to have several denotations, i.e. complete semantic inventories, corresponding to a single form. This is the case with the Serbo-Croatian verb *nositi*, whose semantic potential appears rather rich especially when contrasted with its translation equivalents in Englisn or some other European languages.

In our first approach to the grammatical structure of the SC verb *nositi*, we shall exclude its occurrences in idiomatic expressions and deal with only two translation equivalents of this verb in English. Any other possibilities will remain beyond the scope of this paper.

1.1. The first step in componential analysis requires the separation of concrete from abstract meanings. The following step may be taken to classify so-called figurative expressions which, as abstract meanings, are not to be understood in the way we understand and treat idiomatic phrases.

2.0. Concrete meanings, as we know, are concerned with realities or actual instances. Accordingly, as will be evident from the componential analysis below, the semantic structure

---

[3] Eugene Nida, *Componential Analysis of Meaning*, Mouton Publishers, Second Printing 1979, p. 23.

of the SC verb *nositi* will involve body movements (movements of vehicles or the like), conveying loads from one place to another etc.

2.1. The following may be understood as the denotation of one of the meanings of the SC verb *nositi:*

NOSITI$_{con1}$ *Nositi*$_{con1}$ denotes a physical action which may be analysed as a process with its own internal relations of order. In other words, *nositi*$_{con1}$ predicates of a subject

1 which has charged itself, or has been charged, with a load;

2 which has the ability to hold up the weight of the load;

3 which is moving from one place to another.

We can see that the three phases of the event analysed above are conceived as inseparable components in the proposed denotation of *nositi*$_{con1}$. However, only the first two phases may be understood as two reciprocal actions prior to the third which denotes just directional motion. The paraphrase of *nositi*$_{con1}$ might also be presented as *take + hold up + move*.

(1) Dječak je nosio kutiju.

2.1.1. *Nositi*$_{con2}$ can also be analysed as a physical process which has internal relations of order. However, its denotation shows a clear contrast to the meaning of *nositi*$_{con1}$.

NOSITI$_{con2}$ *Nositi*$_{con2}$ predicates of a subject which has put on, or has been put on, a covering, equipment or ornament. The effects of gravitational force are not so much expressed as in the case of *nositi*$_{con1}$. However, it must be noted that objects that must necessarily occur in the denotation of *nositi*$_{con2}$ are always used each for a specific purpose and, accordingly, they are inevitably assigned a specific place on the human body.

One might also propose a paraphrase for *nositi*$_{con2}$ with the following three diagnostic components: *to put on + to hold up + to move*. As we can see, directional motion is an optional occurrence in the denotation of *nositi*$_{con2}$.

(2) Djevojka j˄ nosila lijepu haljinu.

2.1.2. $Nositi_{con3}$ also refers to physical, or rather physiological, processes.

NOSITI$_{con3}$ $Nositi_{con3}$ predicates of human beings who let a beard (moustaches, whiskers, nails or the like) grow. The denotation of $nositi_{con3}$ consequently involves the notion of so-called (in)alienable possession which may be said to relate in the first place to parts of the body.

(3) Vojnicima nije bilo dopušteno nositi dugu kosu.

2.2.0. Abstract meanings, essentially, are concerned with either mental processes or emotional states.

NOSITI$_{abs}$ $Nositi_{abs}$ cannot be said to refer to physically perceptible actions, processes or states. As a matter of fact, it is sometimes enough for just one part of a sentence to be an abstract notion making the whole sentence refer to an abstract idea,

(4) Nosila je težak teret u srcu.

It is quite clear that one must reach the last part of this sentence, i.e. the adjunct *u srcu* "in her mind", to understand that the meaning of this sentence has nothing to do with any kind of physical representation.

2.2.1. Sometimes it is questionable whether an expression is simply figurative or must be accepted as a true idiomatic phrase.

(5) Nosio je sve pred sobom (= surmounted difficulties)

(6) Dobro je nosio godine do ove jeseni.

3.0. Within the scope of this paper, as may be seen from its title, we are not dealing with the SC verb *nositi* and its translation equivalence in English. Our contrastive analysis has been confined to the verb *nositi* and only two of its E translation equivalents: *to carry* and *to wear*. In evidence of a similar formal distinction between Serbo-Croatian and English or conversely, we may quote examples such as *pozajmiti (posuditi): borrow/led; uncle: stric/ujak* etc.

The verbs *carry* and *wear*, as E translation equivalents of the SC verb *nositi*, will be observed in our componential analysis with the same grammatical criteria that have been used for the verb *nositi*.

13

3.1. Meanings referring to actions, processes or states which involve physically perceptible representation once again appear in the same order:

CARRY$_{con}$ The denotation of *carry*$_{con}$ may be considered as identical to the denotation of *nositi*$_{con1}$ exposed in **2.1.**

(7) The boy carried a box.[4]

3.1.1.   The denotation of *to wear*$_{con1}$ can be regarded as
WEAR$_{con1}$ identical to the denotation of *nositi*$_{con2}$ exposed in **2.1.1.**

(8) The girl wore a nice dress.

Unlike Serbo-Croatian, the following examples make quite clear the formal distinction made in English by means of the two verbs *to carry* and *to wear: I wore one* (i.e. *helmet*) *when we went up to the posts, and carried an English gas-mask;*[5] *Some wore their steel helmets but most of them carried them slung from the packs.*[6] And here is an example in which *to put on* entails *to wear* which has been shown in the denotation of *nositi*$_{con1}$ "to wear$_{con1}$": *All the officers put on their helmets and sprawled on the ground.*[7]

We may also say that the SC verb *imati*, "to have", is in most cases interchangeable with *nositi*$_{con2}$, "to wear$_{con1}$", especially when it occurs with adjuncts referring to parts of the body, as e.g. *on one's head, on one's finger* etc.

3.1.2.   The denotation of *to wear*$_{con2}$ may be considered
WEAR$_{con2}$ as identical to that of *nositi*$_{con3}$ exposed in **2.1.2.**

(9) Soldiers were not allowed to wear long hair.

We have pointed out in (8) that *to wear* may occur with clothing, equipment, or ornament and that it may also occur with natural coverings of the human body, as in (9). However, although the sentence objects in (8) and (9) are entities, i.e. nouns, which belong to different semantic fields, they may cooccur, as e.g. in: *She was wearing a white dress and long hair.*

---

[4] In *Atlas bears the world on his shoulders* the verb *to carry* is not used since Atlas is not supposed to be moving directionally.
[5] E. Hemingway, *A Farewell to Arms*, Penguin Books 1961, p. 26.
[6] E. Hemingway, *ibidem*, p. 29.
[7] E. Hemingway, *ibidem*, p. 29.

14

There is no cooccurrence of sentence objects if one of them denotes a kind of facial expression, as in: *She was wearing a white dress and a smile on her face.*[8] This example, however, cannot be taken into account in our contrastive analysis since in Serbo-Croatian one would say *imati smiješak* and not *nositi smiješak.*

3.2.0. Meanings referring to abstract notions may cooccur with those referring to concrete notions. An illustration of how the former may affect the latter, semantically, has been given in the SC sentence (5). However, from the semantic point of view, this sentence is slightly different than its translation in (10). Namely, in English *burden,* "teret", refers to an abstract rather than a concrete notion. In other words, the adjunct *u srcu,* "in her mind", is the only part of the SC sentence which may be said to refer to an abstract notion.

(10) She carried a heavy burden in her mind.

3.2.1. To be sure, many figurative expressions have already obtained the status of true idiomatic phrases. As a matter of fact, they have been so widely used over the centuries that, as such fixed forms, they have found a permanent place in dictionaries. The meaning of an idiomatic phrase, as we know, is formed by the contribution of all its parts. Their interdependence is expressed more vigorously than in an nonidiomatic construction.

CARRY$_{id}$ The meaning of *to carry*$_{id}$ cannot be paraphrased apart from the rest of the meanings in the idiomatic phrase:

(11) He carried all before him.

WEAR$_{id}$ In the same way as *to carry*$_{id}$, the meaning of *to wear*$_{id}$ is governed by and strictly dependent on the meanings of all the other lexemes in the phrase:

(12) He wore his years well till this autumn.

3.3.0. It is clear that most idiomatic phrases in which *to carry* or *to wear* occur cannot be taken into consideration in this paper since they do not appear as translation equivalents of the SC verb *nositi.* Here are several examples:

---

[8] J. Palmer, *Semantics,* Cambridge University Press, 1976.

15

to carry authority	imati autoritet
to carry coals to Newcastle	sipati pijesak u more
to carry one's point	provesti svoju volju
ambition carries one far	ambicije odvedu čovjeka daleko
to wear one's heart on one's sleeve	otvoreno pokazivati osjećaje
to wear the breeches	zapovijedati u kući
to wear the gown	biti pravnik

These examples give enough evidence of formal non-correspondence which is most likely to occur between two languages. They may also be understood as clear signs of freedom with great possibilities existing in the realm of so-called figurative or metaphoric expression.

4.0.0. Finally, one is inevitably faced with the question why the SC verb *nositi* has two formal correspondents (it may have more but not in the sense we have been treating it in this paper) in the E translation equivalence. In other words, the problem lies in the fact that where Serbo-Croatian finds syntactical representations, in English the same can only be resolved morphologically.

Thus, the occurrence of *to carry* and *to wear*, as two E translation equivalents of the single SC verb *nositi*, illustrate the serious semantic need for such a morphological solution. The formal distinction between the two notions, i.e. that of *to carry* and *to wear*, may be seen in the difference between the denotations of the two notions. *To carry* means *to support the weight of a thing and move it from one place to another. To wear*, in contrast to it, means *to have on the body*. Thus, the verb *to wear* is brought into connection with the well--known grammatical phenomenon which concerns the category of so-called *(in)alienable possession*.[9] It is obvious that *possession* has two subcategories and that each of them, in its own way, affects the grammatical structure of a language. To be sure, *inalienable possession* represents a domain grammatically more restricted than that of *alienable*. The former, as we know, in the main, refers to parts of the body.

---

[9] Ch. J. Fillmore, "The Case for Case" in *Universals in Linguistic Theory* ed. by Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968, p. 62.

As was evident in our previous mentioning of the two verbs, in the denotation of *to carry* there is no insistence on how a thing, which is carried, relates to the body, or rather, to some parts of it. Essentially, in the case of *to wear*, there always exists a crucial link between subject and object in the sentence. What connects them most closely is the semantic relationship between the sentence subject and a thing which, owing to the specificity of its use, is assigned a specific place on the body. One can also see a great difference in the behaviour of sentence subjects: subjects with *to carry* are *agents* while those with *to wear* cannot be considered as subjects performing actions.[10]

Naturally, languages use a variety of means to express references to *alienable* and/or *inalienable* possession:

— verbs, such as *to have, to own, to possess* etc. which in most instances appear with subjects denoting possessors, owners, proprietors or the like;[11]

— *possessive adjectives* (my, your. his etc.) which may occur with almost all parts of the sentence: subjects, objects, adjuncts etc.;

— *non-omissible determiners* which occur with parts of the body;[12]

— etc., etc.

Obviously, the extralinguistic notion of possession finds manifold representations in language. The morphological distinction made by the occurrence of *to carry* and *to wear* in English may, accordingly, be treated as an instance of the linguistic response to the extralinguistic phenomenon of possession. Possibly, one of the most evident examples is the metaphoric notion in *the house wore a neglected look* which is analogous to *the girl wore a troubled look*. The metaphoric notion in this example is formed by way of personification which in based on the linguistic expression of the relationships between an animate (in the function of sentence subject) and a part of his body (in the function of sentence object). This has been exemplified at the end of **3.1.2.**

---

[10] Ch. J. Fillmore, *ibidem*, p. 24.

[11] One can also take into consideration verbs with meanings complementary to the verb *to have* etc. such as *to lose, to waste* etc.

[12] Milka Ivić, "Non-Omissible Determiners in Slavic Languages", *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress (1962) of Linguists*, pp. 476—479.

M. Radovanović, "Opštelingvistički aspekt kategorije 'obavezni determinator' u sintaksi" *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* XV/1, pp. 211—240.

It would also be interesting to examine the interchangeability of *to wear* and *to have*. An illustration of their grammatical properties would contribute considerably to the clarification of the relationship between the linguistic and the extralinguistic notion of possession. Further, this same question observed in a contrastive analysis between English and Serbo-Croatian would, no doubt, be a matter of considerable linguistic interest.

NOSITI SPRAM *TO CARRY* I *TO WEAR*

Autor raspravlja o gramatičkim svojstvima hrvatskog ili srpskog glagola *nositi* te o nekim njegovim prijevodnim ekvivalentima u engleskom. Naglasak je stavljen na dvije mogućnosti formalizacije: s jedne strane, značenjska se razlika ostvaruje prije svega sintaktičkim sredstvima te se tako javljaju dva osnovna značenja hrvatskog ili srpskog glagola *nositi;* s druge strane, semantička se distinkcija ostvaruje pojavom dvaju leksema u engleskom (*to carry* i *to wear*) tj. pomoću morfološke razlike, što nije slučaj u hrvatskom ili srpskom. Autor pretpostavlja da je razlika između dvaju načina formalizacije, koja se javlja u dva spomenuta jezika, uvjetovana činjenicom da u engleskom izvanjezični pojam vlasništva, ostvaren morfološkom razlikom, u neku ruku postaje naglašeniji. Razmatranjem baš tog izvanjezičnog problema može se stići na domak rješenja gramatičkog pitanja postavljenog u ovom članku. Nije potrebno naglašavati da se značenjska razlika ostvarena morfološkim putem može u jeziku smatrati izražajnijom od razlike ostvarene sintaktičkim sredstvima.