Ida Raffaelli
Barbara Kerovec
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Zagreb
iraffael@ffzg.hr, bkerovec@ffzg.hr

The concept of 'taste' in formation of Croatian and Turkish lexicon: A contrastive analysis[1]

The paper explores the importance of the concept of 'taste' in the formation of the Croatian and the Turkish lexicon. The main goals of the paper are 1) to investigate differences and similarities in conceptual mappings based on the concept of 'taste' in two typologically different and genetically unrelated languages by analyzing the vocabulary based on the root *kus* in Croatian and the vocabulary based on the root *tat* in Turkish and 2) to see to what extent the formation of taste vocabulary differs with respect to lexicalization patterns in the two languages.

—————

1. Introduction

It is well known that in all languages lexemes of sensory perception – which are primarily related to the five sensory modalities (sight, hearing, touch, smell and taste) – extend their meanings into abstract domains such as cognitive activities, emotions, aesthetic or moral judgments, social relations, etc. (c.f. Viberg 1984; Sweetser 1990; Evans & Wilkins 2000, Ibarretxe–Antuñano 2008). In Cognitive Linguistics (CL), extension of meaning from a concrete to an abstract domain is explained via *conceptual metaphor* (c.f. Lakoff & Johnson 1980; Kövecses 1986; Lakoff 1987; Johnson 1987, Kövecses 2002). Conceptual metaphors involve understanding experiences from one conceptual domain in terms of experiences from another domain. Since our earliest and primary experience of the world is achieved through sensory perception, perceptual experience often appears to be the basis for understanding other, more abstract phenomena. Therefore, it can be stated that conceptual meta-

---

1   This article is based on the preliminary research presented at the NetWordS Final Conference on Word Knowledge and Word Usage: Representations and Processes in the Mental Lexicon, Pisa 30th March – 1st April 2015 entitled *'Taste' and its conceptual extensions: the example of Croatian root "kus/kuš" and Turkish root "tat"*. The extended abstract is available at http://ceur–ws.org/Vol–1347/.

phors are usually perceptually based, which could be the reason why there are some cross–linguistic regularities in the way we use metaphors in linguistic expressions, especially when metaphors involving perception vocabulary are concerned.[2] However, some of the studies done so far have shown that, besides regularities, there are also some cross–linguistic differences in the way lexemes and lexical structures of perception vocabulary extend their meanings into abstract domains, in spite of the fact that sense modalities are biologically common to all humans. Differences have been observed with regard to different language families and cultures.[3]

This paper deals with one of the five basic sensory concepts – the concept of 'taste' – and its importance in the formation of the lexicon in two typologically different and genetically unrelated languages – Croatian and Turkish. As to our knowledge, within the research of perception vocabulary lexical structures related to the concept of 'taste' have been among the least investigated areas, not only with respect to conceptual mappings, but also with respect to different parts of speech and their correlation in building the lexicon.[4] Furthermore, there are not many studies that focus on comparing the ways taste vocabularies[5] of typologically and genetically different languages are structured. Therefore, a comparative and contrastive analysis of two typologically and genetically unrelated languages could point to regularities and specificities in lexicalization processes operative in the formation of vocabularies related to the concept of 'taste'.

In the following chapters our goal is to: (i) give a brief etymological overview that will provide an insight into conceptual relations (lexicalized by the vocabularies based on the roots *kus* and *tat*) that are common to both or specific to one of the investigated languages; (ii) provide an overview of the analysis of the 'taste' domain in other linguistic approaches; (iii) present some basic

---

2   For example, in IE languages the widespread regularity of the metaphor KNOWING IS SEEING has been pointed out (Sweetser 1990). This metaphor is reflected in the use of lexemes referring to visual perception for expressing concepts related to thinking and understanding. Its existence is explained by the fact that the modality of sight is crucial in collecting information from the outside world.

     The existence of regularities across different languages in employing the same metaphors led some linguists to the hypothesis that the mapping between conceptual domains corresponds to neural mappings in the brain (e.g. Feldman and Narayanan 2004).

3   For example, Evans & Wilkins (2000) have discovered that in Australian languages verbs that extend their meanings to domains of understanding and thinking relate primarily to hearing, and not to sight as in IE languages. The cultures these languages belong to are cultures with an oral tradition, so conceptualizing the cognitive domain of knowledge in terms of the perceptual domain of hearing can be interpreted as a reflection of "the unchallenged role of spoken transmission in acquiring knowledge" (Evans & Wilkins 2000: 585). Cross–cultural variations in conceptual mappings have also been investigated in the context of conceptual metaphors. See Žic Fuchs (1991) and Kövecses (2005).

4   Ibarretxe–Antuñano (2008) points out that the perceptual modalities that have attracted the attention of most linguists are the modalities of sight and hearing. Upon examination of the relevant linguistic literature on sensory perception, it must be pointed out that out of the three remaining modalities taste seems to be the one that is least explored.

5   The term *taste vocabulary* refers to a structure of lexemes that are related to each other via the same root – *kus* and *tat* in Croatian and Turkish, respectively.

theoretical and methodological tenets of the analysis, and (iv) give an analysis of the Croatian vocabulary related to the root *kus* and the Turkish vocabulary related to the root *tat*. We will end the paper with some concluding remarks.

2. The Croatian root *kus* and the Turkish root *tat* in the etymological and linguistic context

Conceptual mappings between the domain of taste and other domains are best investigated in Indo–European languages. In a large number of them, 'taste' serves as a source domain mostly in the conceptualization of some human internal processes like 'to try', 'to experience' or 'to aesthetically judge' (Sweetser 1990; Viberg 1984).[6] This type of conceptual mapping can be observed especially with respect to the IE root **ĝeus–* (Pokorny 1959, s.v.), whose reflexes frequently and regularly have the meanings 'to try', 'to explore', 'to taste', 'to enjoy'.[7] These meanings are lexicalized, for example, in French *goûter*, German *kosten*, Dutch *keuren* 'to taste', English *choose*[8], Proto Slavic and Old Slavic **kusiti,* Croatian *kušati* (*kuſsati,* 16th C.) 'to taste' etc.[9] Evans & Wilkins (2000) show that, similar to the IE languages, in many Australian languages the meanings 'to try' and 'to taste' are denoted by the same verb, or that a verb meaning 'to try' or 'to test' in the context of food and eating will be interpreted as the meaning 'to taste'.

Sweetser (1990) points out that in the IE languages the domain of 'taste' is often mapped onto the domain of 'personal preference', i.e. likes and dislikes in the mental world.[10] She gives an explanation of why the concept of 'taste' serves as a basis for conceptualizing this particular abstract domain: "Taste is a sense which is (…) proverbially subjective in its variability across people (…) Personal likes and dislikes in other domains – clothing, music, friends – are equally variable and equally subjective, and are thus well represented in terms of the vocabulary of physical taste." (Sweetser 1990: 44).

---

6   Conceptual mapping of the concept of 'taste' onto abstract concepts can be subsumed under the more schematic conceptual metaphor MIND AS BODY, which Sweetser (1990) considers to be the overarching conceptual metaphor for all conceptual mappings between human sensory system and various mental and internal processes.

7   The meaning 'to enjoy' is the least lexicalized meaning in IE languages. However, it is found in Sanskrit *juṣáte*, Latin *gustare* and French *goûter,* German *kosten,* and the opposite meaning 'disgust' is found in French *dégoûter* and English *disgust.*

8   English word *taste* is related to the Vulgar Latin *tastare* 'to touch' (from Classical Latin *taxare/tangere*).

9   Sweetser (1990) notes that the direction of semantic development in IE languages is not clear: the IE root could have meant 'try' rather than 'taste'. Raffaelli (2015) points out the existence of regular and frequent relation between concepts 'try' and 'taste' that are both lexicalized in the IE languages with the root **ĝeus–*. Although both directions of conceptual extensions are possible, the concept 'try' is more frequently lexicalized than the concept 'taste'. Moreover, they are differently lexicalized in different IE branches (Germanic languages more frequently lexicalize the concept 'try'), thus some generalizations about what is the source domain and what is the target domain are hard to provide.

10   "Lat. *gustis* and Fr. *goût*, like Eng. *taste* may indicate a 'taste' in clothing or art as well as in food" (Sweetser 1990: 37).

Viberg (1984) provides a very extensive and in–depth analysis of perception verbs in many of the world's languages. However, it must be mentioned that Viberg deals primarily with the hierarchy of sense modalities and not the possible semantic extensions of perception vocabulary. He notes (1984: 157–158) very generally that the main abstract domain 'taste' extends to is the domain of 'experience'.

Perhaps the reason why taste vocabulary is one of the least explored areas among the five sense modalities lies in the fact that linguistically (and possibly also experientially) taste seems to be at the bottom of the hierarchy of sense modalities, as shown by Viberg (1984). This means that many languages do not have simple verbs for encoding taste, but instead they use compound verbs, noun–verb constructions, or verbs related primarily to experiences from other sense modalities (like sight, hearing and touch). If compound verbs or noun–verb constructions are used, they usually consist of a noun denoting the taste modality and 1) a verb from another sense modality (e.g. '**feel** the taste', '*osjetiti* okus') or 2) a verb with a rather general meaning (e.g. '**take** the taste'). Furthermore, verbs which have prototypical meanings connected to taste never extend their meanings to other sense modalities, i.e. they are never used to encode experiences related to sight, hearing or touch, while the opposite trend is very common in many languages. Accordingly, sight, hearing and touch are placed higher in the hierarchy (sight holding the top position), while taste (together with smell) is positioned at the very bottom.[11]

We must point out that the concept of 'taste' in Turkish, or the Turkic languages in general, has been less investigated with regard to etymology than the IE languages. For the purpose of the present analysis *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre–Thirteenth–Century Turkish* (1972) was used. Several words related to the root *tat* were considered: the verbs *tat–* and *tatı:–*, the noun *ta:tığ*, and the adjective *tatığlığ*. The dictionary data show that old Turkic words related to the root *tat* had the concept 'pleasant' as one of the most salient facets of their meaning structure, referring to concrete as well as to abstract domains. For example, for the noun *ta:tığ* the concrete meaning 'taste, flavor' is listed, hence this meaning often has the implication of a pleasant taste. Abstract meanings of these words refer to pleasant experience, i.e. pleasant feelings and enjoyment in different domains of human activities: e.g. *tatıdı tiriğlik* 'life was sweet' (lit. 'life tasted (sweet)'), *tatığ erdi barça yiğitlik işim* 'when I was young all my work was pleasant', *biliġ tatığ* 'the sweet taste of wisdom'.

According to the dictionary data, the adjective *tatığlığ*[12], an old variant of today's adjective *tatlı* 'sweet', was used to refer not only to 'sweet', but also to pleasant taste in general (e.g. *tatlağlağ aş içgü* 'savoury food and drink', *tatlı:ğ aşı:ğ* 'delicious food'), as opposed to *ta:tsız* 'tasteless'. The meaning of 'tasty' has been suppressed by the meaning 'sweet', as evidenced by the fact that the adjective *tatlı*, the modern variant of *tatığlığ*, has only the meaning 'sweet'. Our assumption is that this change of meaning could have occurred due to the

---

11   For a detailed analysis see Viberg (1984).
12   Other variants across the Turkic languages were *tatlığ, tatlı, tatlu, tatağlağ, tatlı:ğ*, etc.

fact that out of our four basic tastes (sweet, salty, bitter and sour), sweet taste can be considered as the most pleasant one. Since the concept 'pleasant' was one of the most prominent concepts related to words based on the root *tat*, it could have triggered the change of meaning from 'tasty' to 'sweet'.

This brief etymological overview shows that there exist differences in the basic conceptual mappings between the two languages. In the IE languages and thus, in Croatian, the domains of 'taste', 'experience' and 'try', are closely related, i.e. regularly and frequently lexicalized by the same root, whereas in Turkish these are 'taste' and 'pleasantness'.

3. Goals, theoretical framework and methodology

The etymological data for both languages and language families (especially for the IE languages) provide a basic insight into conceptual extensions related to the root **ĝeus–* (more specifically *kus*) and *tat*. Therefore, the main goal of the paper is to show how typologically different languages capture conceptual and semantic diversities and similarities in the vocabulary related to the Croatian and Turkish roots *kus* and *tat*.

Some more specific goals can be pointed out as well:
1) to provide a more detailed analysis of the regularities and specificities in conceptual mappings based on the concept of 'taste' in two typologically different and genetically unrelated languages. Taking into account the data from the IE languages, our goal is to see to what extent Turkish differs from (or is similar to) Croatian with respect to lexicalization and conceptualization of the taste modality.
2) to present structures of taste vocabulary and to see what are the fine–grained semantic differences lexicalized by lexical units of taste vocabulary in the two languages.
3) to see to what extent the formation of taste vocabulary is influenced by typological features, e.g. differences in lexicalization patterns of the two languages. While collecting data for the research, we have identified a great number of Croatian lexemes derived from the root *kus,* primarily by the process of prefixation. The aim of this research is to define the way prefixation – which does not exist in Turkish – can influence the extension of the morphosemantic field of the root *kus*. In other words, the goal is to investigate how this word–formation process is related to the lexicalization of experiences from different domains via the same root (mappings from the domain of taste to other experiential domains), and what the differences and similarities are with Turkish as an agglutinative language, in which suffixation is a dominant word–formation process.

Since comparing and contrasting typologically and genetically different languages provides novel perspectives in the study of language structures, we believe that the analysis of morphosemantic fields in Turkish and Croatian can contribute to a better understanding of grammatical and semantic processes

that operate in the lexicalization and the organization of lexical structures in both languages.

The theoretical framework we find suitable to describe and explain similarities and differences in lexicalization processes is the model of morphosemantic fields (Guiraud, 1967). The model has been further developed by Raffaelli and Kerovec (2008, 2015) and Raffaelli (2012, 2013, 2015). It regards the lexicon as morphologically and semantically related. The key feature of the morphosemantic field is that each derived form is related to an *etymon* (the etymologically basic lexeme, root or base lexeme) in a different way. Thus, in the case of the Croatian root *kus* and the Turkish root *tat*, all the words formed on the basis of the respective roots create a morphosemantic field, i.e. a system of lexemes that are related morphologically and semantically. Moreover, each lexeme (unmotivated such as *okus, ukus* 'taste' or *kušati* 'to taste' or motivated such as *ukusan* 'tasty', *neukusan* 'tasteless', 'disgusting' and *bezukusan* 'tasteless') represents a lexicalization pattern, i.e. the way a language has captured a certain meaning. It means that each lexeme as a linguistic form conveys a certain aspect of conceptual structures or knowledge of the world that, related to a linguistic form, has become a linguistic meaning.

3.1. Lexicalization patterns used in the formation of taste vocabulary

The term *lexicalization pattern,* as used in this paper, is closely related to Talmy's notion of lexicalization patterns.[13] There are, however, some differences between our approach and Talmy's. The main difference is that we define lexicalization patterns within the same morphosemantic field, i.e. lexemes that stem from the same etymon or root and are, thus, morphologically and semantically related. Similar to Talmy, we believe that the analysis of lexicalization patterns consists of defining diverse lexical forms that capture the way the world is conceptualized. Thus, it is necessary to define types of lexicalization patterns that lexicalize certain concepts or conceptual mappings within a certain language or among languages. Since the model of lexicalization patterns is closely related to the model of morphosemantic fields, it is possible to recognize conceptual and semantic extensions captured by the same or different lexicalization patterns, which is not the case in Talmy's model. Since we define lexicalization patterns in relation to morphosemantic fields, unmotivated as well as motivated (morphologically and syntactically) lexical units have to be described. Moreover, the model of lexicalization patterns as developed in this paper shares an important feature with Talmy's model: the notion of typological relevance. Some lexicalization patterns can be language specific, some can be regular and frequent among languages, mostly within a certain language family. For example, a concept that is, in addition to 'taste', regularly lexical-

---

13   Talmy (1985: 57) defines lexicalization patterns as a relation between meaning and surface expressions, and investigates which semantic elements are expressed by which surface elements. Semantic elements of different types can be expressed by the same type of surface element, as well as the same type by several different ones. A range of typological patterns and universal principles can be found by such an approach.

ized in the IE vocabulary related to the IE root *ĝeus– or other etymons (e.g. Latin *taxare* for the English lexeme *taste*) is 'a system of aesthetic criteria'. In some IE languages, i.e. the French *goût* or English *taste*, the two concepts can be lexicalized via a single lexeme. However, at the same time these languages have a separate noun that lexicalizes the quality of a thing perceived by the modality of taste: English *savour* and *flavour*, and French *saveur* 'savour'. Croatian differs from English and French in two ways: 1) it lexicalizes the two concepts via two different lexemes *okus* 'taste' and *ukus* 'system of aesthetical criteria', but in contrast to English and French, they are both derived from the same root *kus*; 2) *ukus* can lexicalize 'taste' and 'savour' or 'flavour' as well (although more rarely), which makes it a parasynonym to the noun *okus* (see chapter 4.1.). On the other hand, in Turkish, neither of those two lexicalization patterns is present. Lexical units formed from the root *tat* in Turkish do not lexicalize the concept 'system of aesthetical criteria'. This concept is lexicalized via lexemes formed from the Arabic root/noun *zevk* 'enjoyment', 'pleasure', 'taste' (in the sense of aesthetical criteria). This situation across languages can be graphically presented as follows:

	'food'	'system of aesthetical criteria'
ENGLISH	*Taste*	
	Savour, Flavour	
FRENCH	*Goût*	
	Saveur	
CROATIAN	**Ukus**	
	Okus	
TURKISH	*Tat*	*Zevk*

Table 1: Lexemes related to domains of 'food' and 'system of aesthetical criteria'

The investigation of lexicalization patterns also includes an analysis of different word–formation processes and other grammatical (e.g. syntactic) processes that are regularly used in the formation of the lexicon. This means that lexicalization patterns that will be defined for taste vocabulary in Croatian and Turkish exhibit some of the word–formation patterns that are productive and frequently used in the formation of the two lexicons in general.

For example, the noun *iskušenje* 'temptation' is a motivated noun, formed from the verb *iskušati* 'try out'. The verb *iskušati* is also a motivated lexeme derived from the verb *kušati* 'taste'.[14] The examples thus show that two motivated lexemes have been formed via productive word–formation patterns. The verb *iskušati* has been formed via prefixation with the prefix *iz(s)–* used also in *izvući* 'to pull out', *izmisliti* 'to invent', 'to make up', *isploviti* 'to sail

---

14 Note that this cluster of the morphosemantic field already exists in the Old Slavic in the same meanings: *iskušati* and *iskušenje*. (Damjanović, 2004)

out' and many others. The noun *iskušenje* shares the suffix *–enje* with other deverbal nouns such as *odobrenje* 'allowance', *uništenje* 'destruction', etc. Since each of the word–formation patterns combines the same (affixes) with different units (base lexemes), the final products, i.e. motivated lexemes, have some features in common. For example, the prefix *iz–* influences meanings of the motivated words in more or less the same way. They share a very general meaning 'to put an activity to the end'.[15] However, in combination with different base lexemes it forms a structure that represents a lexicalization pattern that captures specific relations between conceptual structures and meanings in a certain morphosemantic field.

For example, in Croatian the "middle" form *iskušati* serves as a basis for a non–finite verb form *iskuša–va–ti* which has two different meanings: 1) 'to try out', and 2) 'to tempt someone'. The latter meaning signals a conceptual and semantic extension towards a very specific abstract domain, that of 'temptation'. Moreover, it is the core meaning of the noun *iskušenje* 'temptation'. This Croatian lexeme is not related to the modality of taste or a very general concept such as 'try out'. We do not find such a lexicalization pattern which connects 'taste' and 'temptation' via the root *tat* in Turkish. The pattern is also not regularly and frequently lexicalized in other IE languages, with the exception of the Slavic branch (e.g. Russian *искушение*, Polish *pokusa,* Slovak *pokušenje*, Czech *pokušení*). Therefore, derivation (already attested for the Old Slavic *iskušati, iskušenie*), being operative in the formation of the lexemes *iskušati, iskušavati* and *iskušenje*, has enabled the extension of the 'taste' domain towards the domain of 'temptation'. Moreover, it could be stated that *iskušavati* 'to try out', 'to tempt' and *iskušenje* 'temptation' have developed metaphorically motivated meanings with respect to the unmotivated verb *kušati* 'to taste'. Thus, defining lexicalization patterns does not only mean a recognition of grammatical processes that are operative, but also concepts and meanings, i.e. conceptual and semantic extensions that can be captured in a certain morphosemantic field.

Although derivation is the most prominent grammatical process in Croatian, it is not the only one. Generally, the Croatian vocabulary is also enriched with constructions that fall in between syntax and the lexicon. Recent research of [V–P] constructions in Croatian (Katunar et al. 2012 and Katunar 2015) has shown that such constructions should be regarded as separate lexemes with highly idiomatic meanings. Some of the most illustrative examples are *držati do* 'to value' (lit. 'to keep next to') or *zagrijati se za* 'to become very interested in' (lit. 'to warm up for'). These examples demonstrate that particular prepositions are necessary complements to a verb, creating a linguistic form with separate and diverse meanings from the base verb within a construction. Therefore, such constructions should be regarded as examples of grammatical processes that are regularly applied in the formation of the Croatian lexicon.

---

15 This is one of the meanings of the prefix *iz–* listed in Babić (2002: 539–540) which will be elaborated in the chapter 4.2.2.

This means that they represent a well–established language device that captures a variety of meanings.

Therefore, the Croatian lexical inventory in general, as well as the lexicon specifically related to the root *kus,* is formed via derivation and via [V–P] constructions, particularly when it comes to verbs formed with the root *kus*. In this regard, affixes and prepositions have an equal and parallel impact in lexicalizing the meaning of a lexeme. One of the most prominent examples within taste vocabulary is the verb *okušati*, formed from the noun *okus*.[16] The meaning of the verb *okušati* is 'to try something superficially'. According to the data from the Croatian Web Corpus (HrWaC), the verb is used more frequently with the reflexive pronoun *se* and the preposition *u* 'in' as in the construction *okušati se u* 'to try out (a certain activity)'. We consider *okušati* and *okušati se u* as two separate lexical units that represent two lexicalization patterns; they are closely related, but having different semantic nuances. They exhibit differences in their syntactic realizations and, accordingly, in their meanings.

With regard to Turkish, in addition to suffixation as the most prominent grammatical process, a somewhat different construction is used. Prefixation as a derivational process is in general extremely rare in Turkish and is never used in the formation of taste vocabulary. Although Turkish has one simple verb related to 'taste' (*tatmak* 'to taste'), one of the most prominent Turkish constructions often used to lexicalize the meaning 'to taste', but also abstract meanings, is the construction [Ntat–V]. The noun *tat* 'taste' within these noun–verb constructions is related to a noun which immediately precedes it in a so–called genitive construction[17], and takes a case suffix depending on the verb that follows, for example:

*Pasta**nın** tad**ı**na baktım.*
[cake$_{GEN}$ tat$_{POSS.1SG–DAT}$ look$_{PAST}$]
I tasted the cake. (lit. 'I looked at the taste of the cake')

This type of construction represents a rather different lexicalization pattern from those found in Croatian. Its specificity is that the verb as a constituent can (semantically) vary, i.e. it can refer to different experiences and activities. The meaning 'to taste' in the example above is lexicalized by the combination of the noun *tat* and the verb of visual perception *bakmak* 'to look'. Moreover, this lexicalization pattern is regularly used for the lexicalization of

---

16 In *Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik* the verb *okušati* is related to the noun *okus*. However, in Kačić's and Vrančić's dictionaries we find the verb *okùsiti* defined as 'to taste in small quantities, superficially', which points to the basic semantic difference with respect to the verb *izkùsiti*, also attested in both dictionaires and having the meaning 'to taste or to try more thoroughly'. This points towards another possible derivational pattern – prefixation *o–kusiti* that is in accordance with the attested meanings. The reason we point to these diachronic facts is that the semantic difference between the two verbs has already been captured from their first attestations in Croatian dictionaries and is diachronically stable.

17 For a detailed explanation of the genitive construction see Čaušević (1996: 67–74, 111–113), and Göksel & Kerslake (2005: 95–99, 161–164). As can be seen from the examples, the final *t* of the noun *tat* is replaced by its voiced pair *d* when followed by a suffix which begins with a vowel.

some abstract meanings as in *hayatın tadını görmek* 'to taste/experience life' lit. 'to see the taste of life'). In addition to verbs of visual perception, different generic verbs can be used to convey the meaning of 'to taste' in Turkish. These are, for example, *almak* 'to get', 'to receive', 'to take' (*tadını almak* 'to taste', lit. 'to receive the taste of') or verbs of motion like *varmak* 'to come' (e.g. *tadına varmak* 'to taste', lit. "to come to the taste of"). Meanings of all the lexical units formed via the [Ntat–V] construction are metaphorically motivated with respect to the meanings of their constituent lexical units.[18]

Therefore, lexicalization patterns as presented in this paper comprise a coherent structure of diverse grammatical processes that are instrumental in lexicalizing different conceptual and semantic structures. This means that particular lexicalization patterns can be established for a) a specific conceptual domain (as the domain of 'taste' in our case, or 'motion event' domain in Talmy's case) and/or b) a specific morphosemantic field, i.e. lexicalization of a certain conceptual domain (e.g. 'taste') via a certain root (e.g. *kus* or *tat*). In the case of defining lexicalization patterns in the formation of lexemes structured within a single morphosemantic field, conceptual mappings or extensions from one domain to other (often more abstract) domains become visible. Hence, the analysis of lexicalization patterns can provide an insight into the way world knowledge is structured, at least some of its aspects. It reflects regular and more specific conceptualizations of the world.

3.2. Methodology

In the analysis that follows, lexical units based on the root *kus* and *tat* have been selected and each of them has been checked for meanings and contextual uses in the Croatian National Corpus (CNC), Croatian Web Corpus (HrWaC) and METU Turkish Corpus. Although statistics is not central to our analysis, some figures are given when they point to a regular and frequent usage of a certain lexeme. Croatian language is taken as a starting point in the analysis and the Turkish vocabulary is compared with respect to lexicalization patterns established for Croatian. The two taste vocabularies are systematized according to some basic conceptual domains that are lexicalized in both vocabularies. This is the reason the analysis starts with the 'taste' domain as a sensory domain, followed by the analysis of the 'experience' domain, which is further divided into several subdomains that make different aspects of the experience domain salient. These are subdomains of 'trying to achieve something', 'achieving new experience/knowledge', 'temptation' and the domain of 'experiencing pleasantness/unpleasantness'. This conceptual structure stems from the analysis of lexicalization patterns related mostly to the root

---

18 It should be noted that [Ntat–V] constructions within the morphosemantic field of the root *tat* cannot be considered as compound verbs since the noun within these constructions always appears in the oblique case (accusative or dative). This is the feature which differentiates them from compound verbs such as *yardım etmek* 'to help' (lit. 'to do help'), *cevap vermek* 'to answer' (lit. 'to give answer') or *hata yapmak* 'to make a mistake' (lit. 'to make mistake'), in which the noun appears in the so called absolute case (the case which is marked by the absence of a case suffix and is used to encode subject or direct object).

kus in Croatian. The domain of 'experiencing pleasantness/unpleasantness' is regularly lexicalized in the Turkish language. We finish the analysis with the domain of 'system of aesthetical criteria'.

4. The analysis of the morphosemantic fields related to the root *kus* and to the root *tat*

At the onset of this chapter we must point out that it is impossible to give a fully exhaustive overview of the structure of the morphosemantic fields based on the Croatian root *kus* and the Turkish root *tat* because of their complexity. However, we will highlight i) basic features of morphosemantic organization in the two languages and ii) conceptual domains lexicalized via these two fields.

4.1. Kus *and* tat *in the domain of 'taste'*

In Croatian there are two nouns within the morphosemantic field of the root *kus* which refer to the domain of 'taste'. These are *okus* 'taste, flavor' and *ukus* 'taste, flavor'. Although similar in meanings, there are some important differences between them with respect to their usage, their potential in the derivation of other lexemes as well as their meaning extensions towards domains other than food. The noun *okus* appears in HrWaC almost 70,000 times; out of 200 randomly chosen tokens, only 12 refer to domains other than taste. All other usages are related to taste as a sensory modality or to a flavor of food (*okus vanilije* 'vanilla flavor') or drink (*voda bez okusa* 'water without flavor'). The noun *ukus* is far less frequent than the noun *okus* when referring to the domain of tasting food. In HrWaC it appears 14,592 times; all of the 200 randomly chosen tokens refer exclusively to domains other than taste. Separate lexicalization of the meaning 'taste' (as a sensory modality) and 'flavor' (as a quality of something perceived by the modality of taste) is a regular lexicalization pattern in the IE language family, as in Latin *gustus : sapor* or English *taste : savour, flavor*. However, two facts should be pointed out: 1) in Croatian this semantic distinction is lexicalized by the nouns based on the root *kus*, as opposed to Latin or English; 2) this semantic distinction in Croatian is not strict and semantic overlapping between the two lexemes exists. However, the noun *ukus* is nowadays rarely used to refer to the quality of something perceived by the taste modality.

Semantic relatedness of the noun *ukus* to the domain of tasting food is formed clearer in motivated words from the noun *ukus* by the processes of prefixation and suffixation: *ukus* served as a basis for the formation of the adjective *ukus–an* 'tasty', 'with taste' (lit. taste–y), and its antonyms *ne–ukus–an* 'not tasty' (lit. non–taste–y) and *bez–ukus–an* 'tasteless' (lit. without–taste–y).[19] Although all of them can refer to the taste of food, the three adjectives differ with respect to their meaning extensions to abstract domains, as we will show

---

19 Croatian suffix *–an* is frequent in the derivation of denominal qualitative adjectives (e.g. *mir* 'peace' → *miran* 'peaceful', *bijes* 'rage, fury' → *bijesan* 'furious', *radost* 'joy' → *radostan* 'joyful', etc.). The Croatian prefix *bez–* 'without' is a privative affix, and the prefix *ne–* 'not' gives negative or opposite meaning to adjectives.

in chapter 4.3. The adjective *ukusan* has both concrete and abstract meanings, whereas its antonyms frequently lexicalize either one or the other. Thus, *bezukusan* 'tasteless' appears mostly in the meaning related to tasteless food, as in *doručak je bio potpuno bezukusan* 'the breakfast was completely tasteless', while the adjective *neukusan* is far more frequent in abstract meanings: in the CNC it appears 414 times, out of which only 5 occurrences are related to the taste of food (as in *neukusna hrana* 'tasteless food'). It is interesting to note that the noun *okus*, which appears far more often than the noun *ukus* in the domain of taste, cannot serve as the basis for the formation of any adjective related to the quality of food.[20] This is an important feature signaling that the meaning 'savour' of the noun *ukus* still exists and is lexicalized more clearly in the derived adjectives – *ukusan* and *neukusan*. The same lexicalization pattern is for example recognizable in the French adjective *savoureux* (*ce chocolat est idéal pour réaliser de savoureux gâteaux au chocolat* 'this chocolate is perfect for making a tasty chocolate cake').

In Turkish the noun referring to the domain of 'taste' morphologically corresponds to the root *tat* (e.g. *güzel tat* 'nice/pleasant taste/flavor') and it serves as the basis for deriving adjectives referring to taste. Since Turkish is an agglutinative language in which prefixation as a derivation process is extremely rare, adjectives referring to taste are formed exclusively by the process of suffixation. These adjectives are *tatsız* and *tatlı,* derived by agglutinating the privative[21] suffix *–sız* 'without' or his antonym *–lı* 'with' to the noun *tat*. Based on the fact that the suffixes *–sız* 'without' and *–lı* 'with' are usually used in derivation of antonymic adjectives,[22] one would expect that *tatsız*, similarly to Croatian *neukusan* and *bezukusan*, conveys the meaning 'without taste', 'tasteless', and *tatlı*, similarly to Croatian *ukusan*, the meaning 'with taste', 'tasteful', 'tasty'. However, only the privative *tatsız* can be compared to Croatian *neukusan* and *bezukusan*. As for *tatlı*, it refers only to one segment of the taste experience, and that is 'sweet'.[23] This adjective can be nominalized without any morphological change, and then it refers to any kind of sweet dish or dessert (e.g. *Sofrada tatlı olarak baklava vardı.* 'On the table there was baklava as a dessert'). This shows that Turkish adjectives based on the root/noun *tat* exhibit a different type of lexicalization pattern that is not characteristic for Croatian, nor for other IE languages. As we pointed out before in the etymological overview, the concept of 'pleasantness', i.e. sweetness as a type of pleasant taste, is frequently lexicalized via the root *tat* in Turkish whereas

---

20   The adjective *okusan* formed from the noun *okus* has a meaning related exclusively to the ability of taste, and is restricted to constructions such as *okusni pupoljci* 'taste buds' and *okusna osjetljivost* 'gustatory sensitivity'.

21   A *privative (or negating) suffix* marks the absence of the attribute indicated by the base or the root to which it is attached.

22   Here are some examples: *başarı* 'success' → *başarı–lı* 'successful', *başarı–sız* 'unsuccessful'; *suç* 'guilt' → *suç–lu* 'guilty', *suç–suz* 'unguilty'; *fayda* 'benefit, use' → *fayda–lı* 'useful', *fayda–sız* 'useless', etc. For other uses of these suffixes see Čaušević (1995: 437) and Göksel & Kerslake (2005: 60–62).

23   In Turkish, the Arabic *lezzet* ('taste', 'flavor'/ *lezzetli yemek* 'tasty food/dish') is used to convey the meaning 'tasty', 'tasteful', instead of *tat*.

this lexicalization pattern is not extant in Croatian. In section 4.2.4. we will show that the concept of 'pleasantness' is also important to explain semantic extensions towards more abstract domains in the Turkish language.

With regard to the Croatian and Turkish verbs within the morphosemantic fields of the roots *kus* and *tat* referring to the domain of 'taste', it has to be pointed out that in both languages there are just a few verbs with the meaning 'to taste'. In Croatian, there are only two such verbs: *kušati* 'to taste' and *okus–iti* 'to taste, perf.'. In Croatian dictionaries[24] both verbs are listed with their first meanings relating to the concrete domain of 'taste': for the verb *kušati* the meaning 'to taste' is noted, and for the verb *okusiti* the meaning 'to taste a small quantity'. The corpus data show some differences. In HrWaC the verb *kušati* appears 10,448 times and the verb *okusiti* 4,671 times. Randomly chosen 200 tokens of both verbs show the difference in the occurrence of the lexicographic first meaning. In all 200 randomly chosen usages the verb *kušati* appears in the meaning 'to taste', whereas the verb *okusiti* appears in the meaning 'to taste a small quantity' only 16 times. Some examples of these usages are *dijete nije okusilo ni komadić sladoleda* 'the child didn't taste even a piece of ice–cream', *u tim restoranima možete okusiti domaća tradicionalna jela* 'in these restaurants you can taste traditional homemade dishes'. In all of the other usages *okusiti* refers to experiencing something related to diverse abstract domains. These results show that the verb *okusiti* regularly lexicalizes abstract concepts, i.e. conveys metaphorical meanings.

Turkish, on the other hand, has only one simple verb with the meaning related to tasting food – the verb *tatmak*. All other examples are constructions that have been previously schematized as [Ntat–V] constructions. They have as their first constituent the noun *tat*, and as their second constituent one of the following verbs: *almak* 'to get/take/receive', *bakmak* 'to look', *görmek* 'to see', *duymak/hissetmek* 'to feel', *varmak* 'to come/reach', and even *tatmak* 'to taste': e. g. *Burnum tıkalı, yemeklerden hiçbirinin tadını alamadım.* 'My nose is clogged; I couldn't feel the taste of any of the dishes', *Öğrenciliğim sırasında ilk kez barbunun tadını gördüm.* 'When I was a student I tasted red mullet for the first time in my life'. As the examples show, many of the verbs which combine into this kind of construction with the noun *tat* primarily refer to other sense modalities – sight and touch respectively. In Croatian, similar combinations are possible only with the verb *osjetiti* 'to feel' (e.g. *Tuzlu su tadını **duydum** dilimin ucunda.* vs. *Na vrhu jezika **osjetio** sam okus slane vode.* 'I **felt** the taste of salty water on the tip of my tongue'). In Croatian, neither verbs of visual perception nor verbs of movement or motion such as the Turkish verb *almak* 'to take/get/receive' and *varmak* 'to come/reach' can be used to lexicalize experiences related to taste.

Among Turkish [Ntat–V] constructions there are differences in the meaning they convey with respect to the verb used in the construction. Firstly, they can be divided into two wider groups: those encoding *activity*, and those encoding *experience*. Viberg (1984:123) explains the difference between activities and

---

24   Hrvatski jezični portal (Croatian Language Portal) available at http://hjp.novi–liber.hr/.

experiences as follows: "The distinction between an activity and an experience is illustrated by pairs such as *look at* vs. *see* and *listen to* vs. *hear*. *Activity* refers to an unbounded process that is consciously controlled by a human agent, whereas *experience* refers to a state (or inchoative achievement) that is not controlled." According to these criteria, the construction *tadına bakmak* (lit. 'to look at the taste of') can be classified as an activity verb, which makes it conceptually close to the Croatian verb *kušati* 'to taste', 'to try the taste of'. All of the other constructions contain experience verbs,[25] but differ with respect to their meanings and usages. According to our search results, the construction *tadını almak* (lit. 'to take/receive the taste of') is the most frequently used; it has the meaning 'to experience the taste of something', but at the same time it can have a more general meaning of the *ability* to experience taste. *Tadını görmek* is semantically very close to *tadını almak*, but it is less frequently used and differs from the former in the feature of 'to get to *know* what the taste of something is like'. On the other hand, verb constructions which consist of the noun *okus* 'taste' and a verb encoding sensory experience other than taste are extremely rare in Croatian. The only one is the already mentioned construction *osjetiti okus* 'feel the taste'.

It has to be pointed out that the verbal constituents in all of these [Ntat–V] constructions are used in metaphorical meanings.[26] Metaphorical uses of the verbs *bakmak* 'to look at' and *görmek* 'to see' within these constructions can be easily explained. As shown in our previous research,[27] the verb *bakmak* extends its meaning to the abstract domain of checking and control, which explains the meaning 'to *check* the taste of' in the construction *tadına bakmak*. On the other hand, the verb *görmek* extends its meaning to the abstract domains of knowledge[28] and experience. This semantic feature is also recognised in the construction *tadını görmek* 'to get to *know* what the taste of something is like'. Metaphorical uses of the verbs *varmak* 'to come/reach' and *almak* 'to get/take/receive' can also be explained easily: usually we cannot experience something that is out of our reach or something at a distance, but when we reach or receive something, we get the opportunity to experience it.

One of the major differences between lexicalization patterns related to the conceptual domain of 'taste' in Croatian and Turkish is that Croatian has two nouns (*okus* and *ukus*) and two verbs (*kušati* and *okusiti*) that regularly refer to tasting food, whereas Turkish has only one noun (*tat*) and one verb (*tatmak*). Verbs that relate to sight (*görmek* 'to see' and *bakmak* 'to look at') can be used as verbal components of Turkish [Ntat–V] constructions. However, verbs of movement (*almak* 'to take/receive/get') and motion (*varmak* 'to reach/

---

25 The simple verb *tatmak* can refer to both activity and experience.
26 Only in constructions *tadını duymak* and *tadını hissetmek* the verbs *duymak* and *hissetmek* 'to feel' are not used in their metaphorical meanings. This seems natural when we consider, as Viberg (1984: 147–148) points out, "the close relation between touch and taste [which is] due to the fact that the two senses are used only when the perceived object is in contact with the body."
27 See Kerovec (2016).
28 Verbs of visual perception in IE languages show the same direction of metaphorical extension (see Sweetser 1990).

come to') do appear as well. Thus, it is not only a cross–sensory interrelation that is involved (sight–taste), but also more generally, cross–experiential relation (taste–movement, taste–motion) that is in effect in the lexicalization of 'taste' in Turkish. The other major difference is between the Croatian adjective *ukusan* 'tasty' and the Turkish adjective *tatlı* 'sweet', which cannot refer to the same kind of sensory experience as *ukusan* although they are both formed with semantically similar suffixes. Moreover, the Turkish example clearly points to a lexicalization pattern that is not only different with respect to Croatian, but to other IE languages as well.

4.2. Kus *and* tat *in the domain of 'trying/experiencing'*

As pointed out previously, the domain of experience is regularly and frequently lexicalized within the IE language family by the same root as the domain of taste. Since there are many lexical reflexes in the IE languages that have both or one of the meanings, it is difficult to define whether a meaning referring to taste was the first, and the meaning of experience is its extension or vice versa.[29] It has to be pointed out that the meaning 'to try' referring to the activity that enables acquiring the experience is the most frequently lexicalized meaning (see Pokorny, 1959).

Lexemes within the Croatian morphosemantic field of the root *kus* convey regularly and frequently the meanings 'to try' and '(to) experience'. The systematic diachronic relation between the meanings '(to) taste' on one hand, and 'to try', '(to) experience' on the other is found in many IE languages, thus pointing to an inherent conceptual link. Therefore, in the IE languages (and in Croatian) the concept of '(to) taste' can be regarded as a part of a more generalized conceptual domain 'to try'/'(to) experience' since 'taste' relates to a very specific way of experiencing something – by the sensory modality of taste in particular. One of the possible arguments for considering '(to) taste' as a motivated meaning or more specialized meaning with respect to the meaning 'to experience' also lies in the fact that in the IE languages a more generalized meaning 'to try/'to experience' is more frequently lexicalized (e.g. Germanic languages). This is the case in Croatian as well. The concept '(to) taste' is far less lexicalized with lexemes based on the root *kus*, than the concept 'to try'/ '(to) experience'. Furthermore, it is important to mention that the Croatian verb *probati* 'to try' is far more frequently used in Croatian than the verbs *kušati* and *okusiti* in the context of tasting food.

The research of lexicalization patterns conducted on the morphosemantic fields of the roots *kus* and *tat* accounts for the claim that the meanings 'to try' and 'to experience' can be seen only as overarching ones, and that lexemes conveying these meanings require a more fine grained semantic analysis. These lexemes have some specific and some common semantic features. Therefore, in the sections that follow, we will divide these lexemes into several groups according to their common and specific semantic features. It should be

---

29   See Raffaelli (2015).

pointed out that in spite of the differences and meaning specificities among the lexemes belonging to each group, they all lexicalize more general concepts of 'experiencing' and 'trying'. In the following sections we will thus consider different, but semantically interrelated subdomains of the conceptual domain of 'to try/to experience'.

4.2.1. The domain of 'trying to achieve something'

Croatian lexemes based on the root *kus* whose meanings are related to the domain of trying to achieve something are very frequently formed with the prefix *po*–. Two very frequent representatives of this group are the verb *pokušati* 'to try' and the deverbal noun *pokušaj* 'attempt'. The verb *pokušati* (*pokusiti* or *pokušati* in Old Slavic) is derived from *kušati*, and cannot refer to 'taste'. *Pokušati* as a modal verb syntactically allows only for an infinitival complement (such as *pokušati čitati* 'to try to read'), whereas other verbs mostly allow for a complement in the accusative case. However, there are some rare and very particular cases of the verb *pokušati* allowing a complement in the accusative case, as in *pokušati samoubojstvo* 'attempt a suicide', *pokušat ću sve što mogu* 'I'll try anything I can', which we consider as an elliptical syntactic construction. In Croatian the verb *učiniti, počiniti* 'to do' is missing in both constructions (*pokušat ću* učiniti *sve što mogu* 'I will try *to do* anything I can', *pokušati* počiniti *samoubojstvo* 'to try *to do* a suicide'). Because *pokušati* is a modal verb, it is the most frequent of all the verbs investigated. It appears in HrWaC 73,468 times. The noun *pokušaj* 'attempt' preserves semantic features of the verb *pokušati*, thus referring to trying to achieve a certain act or a process. The noun often allows for similar complementation as the verb – a noun in the genitive case which refers to a process or an act as in *pokušaj ubojstva* 'murder attempt' or *pokušaj izmjene* 'attempt of change'.

None of the meanings realized by the lexemes in this group can be lexicalized via lexemes based on the root *tat* in Turkish.

4.2.2. The domain of 'acquiring new experiences/knowledge'

This domain differs from the previous one in the fact that it denotes an actual achievement of an activity, and not only an attempt of an activity. A new experience or knowledge is a result that has been gained from a certain activity. It should be noted that none of the Croatian lexemes based on the root *kus* whose meanings are related to the domain of acquiring new experiences can refer to tasting food.

In Croatian two different morphosemantic clusters can be identified within this domain: 1) the morphosemantic cluster comprising lexemes prefixed with *o*–, and 2) the morphosemantic cluster with lexemes prefixed with *iz*–. One of the lexemes is the aforementioned verb *okušati*. Similarly to the verb *pokušati* described in the previous section, it is rarely followed by an argument in the accusative case, an obligatory complement of the verb *okusiti* as in *okusiti hranu* 'to taste food'. Two such rare examples are attested in the examples *građani su mogli okušati svoje sposobnosti* 'the citizens could try/test their competences'

and *okušati sreću* 'to try/test (one's) fortune'. The most frequent construction in which the verb *okušati* appears is the construction *okušati se u*, followed by the reflexive pronoun (or particle) *se* and the preposition *u*. This construction appears in HrWaC 12,637 times. This figure points to its high level of conventionalization. In some rare and specific cases the preposition *u* can be replaced by the preposition *na*. *Okušati se u* has a very particular meaning 'to try out a certain activity'. Complements regularly refer to different types of human activities as in *okušati se u nogometu/pjevanju* 'to try out football/singing'. The construction *okušati se na* is related to the *okušati se u* in the sense that its complements refer to concepts related to a certain activity. These complements are *film* 'movie', *filmsko platno* 'screen', *teren* 'sport field'. All the nouns refer to surfaces on which certain activity is performed or presented. Thus, *okušati se na terenu* 'to try (oneself) out on the sports field' means to try out a certain sport. It seems that all the analyzed lexical structures with the verb *okušati* share the same semantic feature, and that is 'testing one's abilities or possibilities'. However, the construction *okušati se u/na* conveys a very specific semantic nuance, one referring to testing the ability in a certain activity.

Note that in the Turkish language such a lexicalization pattern based on the root *tat* does not exist, i.e. there are no Turkish lexemes derived from *tat* with the same meaning. Nevertheless, some semantic similarities can be identified between the Croatian verb *okusiti* on the one hand, and the Turkish verb *tatmak* and [Ntat–V] constructions on the other. The Croatian verb *okusiti* (in contrast to *okušati*) appears in a very specific construction as in *okusiti slast/čari*, e.g. *okusio je slast ljubavi* 'he got a taste of the savours of love'. In these contexts it has the meaning 'the feeling of experiencing something', or 'experiencing what something is like', which is very similar to Turkish *anneliği tatmak* 'to taste/experience (a feeling of) motherhood'. Since this meaning is quite different from the meaning of 'testing one's abilities/possibilities', we consider it to be related to a separate subdomain which we have named *the domain of experiencing pleasantness/unpleasantness* and which will be analyzed in section 4.2.4.

The morphosemantic cluster formed with the prefix *iz–* exhibits different features with respect to the experience domain. One of the main differences between the verbs *okusiti* and *okušati* on the one hand, and *iskusiti* and *iskušati* on the other is that the first two verbs refer to experiencing something superficially or in small quantities, whereas the last two verbs refer to experiencing something thoroughly, in detail and as much as possible.[30] The verbs *iskusiti* and *iskušati* cannot refer to taste, but to experiencing a wide range of diverse human experiences like activities, emotions, relationships etc., thus complemented by semantically diverse nouns such as *iskusiti pravo prijateljstvo* 'to experience a real friendship', *iskusiti različite vrste boli* 'to experience different types of pain'. As pointed out by Babić (2002: 539–540), the prefix *iz–* has multiple meanings, and one of them is 'bring to an end', 'lead to a result', with the semantic component 'as much as possible'. The verbs *iskusiti* and *iskušati* have

---

30 The difference has already been pointed out from the diachronic perspective.

the meaning 'to experience something almost to the end', e.g. *iskušati njegove mogućnosti* 'to try out his potentials'. This example highlights the feature of pushing someone's potentials as far as it goes. In this example the verb *iskušati* is not interchangeable with *okušati*, or *pokušati*. The noun *iskustvo* 'experience' and the adjective *iskusan* 'experienced' share the same features as the verbs.

Only one of the lexemes from the Croatian cluster formed by the prefix *iz–* can be semantically comparable to Turkish lexemes derived from the root *tat*, and that is the lexeme *iskusiti*, e.g. *iskusiti različite vrste boli* 'to experience different types of pain' vs. Tur. *ayrılığın tadını görmek* "to see/experience the (pain of) a breakup". And it is again the meaning 'the feeling of experiencing something' or 'experiencing what something is like' that is salient in the examples from both languages. All other meanings which are conveyed by Croatian lexemes *iskušati* 'to try out', *iskustvo* 'experience', and *iskusan* 'experienced' cannot be encoded by any Turkish lexeme derived from the root *tat*.

English translations of most of the Croatian examples show that the meaning '(to) experience' is lexicalized by lexemes not formed from the IE root *$\hat{g}eus$–*. In the IE languages the experience domain is frequently lexicalized with other lexemes like the English and French *experience/expérience*. The Gothic *kausjan* that comes from the Proto Slavic and Old Slavic *kusiti* has the meaning 'to experience'. This is lexicalized in Croatian within the morphosemantic cluster of lexemes formed with the prefix *iz–*.

Although one could argue that there are no significant differences between the meanings of verbs *pokušati, okušati, iskušati, okušati se u/na, okusiti*, and *iskusiti* we consider them as diverse lexicalization patterns. With respect to their usages and argument structures, these lexemes differ in meanings. They all refer to experiencing something, but faceting this process from different perspectives.

4.2.3. The domain of 'temptation'

Croatian lexemes that can be categorized as belonging to this domain are the nouns *kušnja* 'temptation', 'trial' (e.g. *biti na kušnji* 'to be in temptation', *staviti na kušnju* 'to put on trial') and *iskušenje* 'temptation' (e.g. *pasti u iskušenje* 'fall into temptation', *dovesti u iskušenje* 'bring into temptation', *bolest je veliko iskušenje* 'illness is a severe trial'), and the verb *iskušavati* 'to tempt'. These lexemes convey several important semantic features which make them different from those analyzed in sections 4.2.1. and 4.2.2. Firstly, they refer to a strong internal human impulse to experience something that is not recommendable or allowed, or to cope with something that is not pleasant and easy. Secondly, the experiencer of temptation is actually not an agent performing an activity, as is the case with activities encoded by verbs such as *pokušati, okušati (se u/na)* or *iskušati*. The experiencer is rather a patient brought to the state of temptation by an agent. This can be seen from the semantics of the verbs which occur in contexts with the nouns *kušnja* and *iskušenje* as in *biti doveden u iskušenje* 'to be brought into temptation', *biti stavljen na kušnju* 'to be put on trial', *pasti u iskušenje* 'to fall into temptation', and which signal that the activity is not performed deliberately. Nevertheless, the conceptual re-

lation between 'temptation' on the one hand, and 'experiencing', 'trying' and 'testing' on the other is quite clear: a patient is pushed into a new experience by an agent who tests whether or not he will be able to resist his internal impulses or be able to cope with the new experience.

At the end of this section it has to be noted that none of the analyzed meanings related to the domain of temptation can be realized by Turkish lexemes based on the root *tat*.

4.2.4. The domain of 'experiencing pleasantness/unpleasantness'

The semantic feature that distinguishes lexemes related to this domain from previous examples has already been mentioned in section 4.2.2. and the analysis of lexemes *okusiti* and *iskusiti*. It can be described as 'subjective impression', '*feeling* of experiencing something' or 'experiencing something as pleasant or unpleasant'. Therefore, in contrast to other domains already described, it is not the meanings of 'trying to achieve something', 'acquiring new knowledge' or 'strongly desiring to experience something' that are prominent in this domain, but rather a pleasant or unpleasant feeling brought on by a new experience. The salience of the concept of 'pleasantness/unpleasantness' is in accordance with Sweetser's claim that 'taste' strongly refers to someone's general preference. As we have already pointed out, this concept is far more frequently lexicalized in Turkish than in Croatian and the IE languages in general. However, some similarities between the two languages can be found.

As previously mentioned, the Croatian noun *okus* 'taste' appears in HrWaC almost 70,000 times and among randomly chosen 200 tokens, the noun *okus* 'taste' refers to something other than food only in 12 examples. Very often in such cases the noun is used in constructions such as *gorak okus uspjeha* 'bitter taste of success' or *ostao je loš okus* 'the bad taste has remained', thus referring to a bad experience or unpleasantness. Although these constructions are frequently and regularly used, there are not many similar constructions based on the noun *okus*. Furthermore, this noun can be used to refer to pleasant experiences as well, like in *okus ljubavi* 'the taste of love', although such usages are rather poetic and rarely used. The verb *okusiti* is also used in the construction *okusio je slast ljubavi* 'he got a taste of the savours of love', thus referring to experiencing something pleasant. Nouns appearing as arguments in these syntactic structures are *slast* 'savour' and *čari* 'charm, pl.', thus signaling a kind of pleasant experience and enjoyment. It can be stated that the construction *okusiti čari/slast* means 'to enjoy the experience', thus referring to a kind of pleasant experience.[31] These constructions are rare and indicate that the Croatian language lexicalizes meanings related to the subdomain of 'pleasant/unpleasant experience' as well, not by a single lexeme (unmotivated or motivated), but by a collocation. The verb *iskusiti* has a similar meaning in similar collocations (*iskusiti slasti/čari ljubavi* 'to experience the taste/charm of love'). According to the corpus data, nouns appearing

---

31 Note the existence of the verb *guštati* 'to enjoy' in some Čakavian idioms, a loanword related to the Italian verb *gustare* 'to taste', 'to enjoy'.

as arguments in syntactic structures with *iskusiti* can be nouns signaling not only pleasant experiences, but unpleasant experiences as well, such as *iskusiti boli/patnju* 'to experience (emotional) pain/suffer'.

In Turkish, the noun *tat* 'taste', like the Croatian noun *okus*, refers to an unpleasant experience, i.e. bad feeling or unpleasantness in contexts such as *dünyanın acı bir tadı vardı* 'the world had a bitter taste' ("the world felt painful") or *Yalanların tadını sevmedim hiç.* 'I didn't like the taste (the feel) of lies at all'. But in contrast to Croatian *okus*, Turkish *tat* is very frequent in expressing pleasant experiences as well (*Sevginin tadını seviyorum* 'I like the taste/good feeling of love'). Furthermore, it can be used in contexts in which the Croatian noun *okus* does not appear, such as following: *Bazı kitapların satırlarına tüneyip dünyaya oradan bir süre bakmanın tadını seviyorum.* 'I enjoy (lit. like the taste of) roosting on lines of some books and watching the world from over there for a while', *hayatın her anından ve her tadından zevk almak* 'to enjoy every moment and every taste (feeling, experience) of life', *Gerçekten uykunun ayrı bir tadı vardı* 'Sleeping really felt special (lit. had a special taste)'. Thus, it can be said that *tat* compared to *okus*: i) extends its meaning to the domain of pleasant or unpleasant experience more generally, ii) it is much more productive and frequent (not restricted to a limited set of constructions) and iii) it has no poetic connotations, but is rather neutral. The same holds for almost all Turkish verbs which are used to express physical experience or activity of tasting food: *tatmak* 'to taste', *tadını almak* (lit. 'to receive/take the taste of'), *tadını görmek* (lit. 'to see the taste of'), *tadını duymak* (lit. 'to feel the taste of') and *tadına varmak* (lit. 'to come to/to reach the taste of'). They can all be used to express pleasant or unpleasant experiences from domains other than food in much more varied contexts compared to Croatian *okusiti* and *kušati*,[32] e.g. *anneliği tatmak* 'to taste/experience (a feeling of) motherhood', *başarmanın tadına varmak* "to reach/experience the taste (a feeling of) success", *ayrılığın tadını görmek* "to see/experience the (the pain of) a breakup", etc. This brings us to another significant difference between Turkish and Croatian which can be observed with respect to the influence grammar had on the change of meaning. In Turkish the same verbs and [Ntat–N] constructions that denote tasting food can be used in other domains without any change in form. On the other hand, in Croatian a change of meaning is related to a change of form, particularly in prefixes (*kušati, okusiti,* and *iskusiti*) and suffixes (*iskušati* 'to test' vs *iskušavati,* imperf. 'to test', 'to put into temptation').[33]

Nevertheless, in Turkish some other verbs can combine with the noun *tat* to convey exclusively abstract meanings. These are, however, still within

---

32 As already mentioned in chapter 4.1., although both *kušati* and *okusiti* are used in the concrete domain of tasting food, the main difference between them is that *okusiti* appears more often in meanings related to domains other than food while *kušati* is hard to find in such meanings. Nevertheless, there are some examples of that kind in HrWaC, although they are rare and stylistically very marked, e.g. *onaj tko je kušao iskustvo boli* 'the one that has tasted the experience of suffer', *kada duša želi kušati ovaj materijalni svijet* 'when the soul wants to taste this material world".

33 Note that in the HrWaC corpus the verb *iskušavati* appears more frequently in the meaning 'to put into temptation'. The verb *iskušavati* rarely appears with the meaning 'to test'.

the same type of [Ntat–V] constructions. Some of the most frequent verbs are *çıkarmak* 'to extract', *kaçırmak* 'to let slip', and *kalmak* 'to stay'. These verbs, similarly to those analyzed so far, relate primarily to activities and experiences from concrete domains of motion and movement and they form with the noun *tat* constructions that have a high degree of idiomaticity. In other words, in constructions with *tat* they convey very specific meanings such as 'to enjoy fully' (*tadını çıkarmak* lit. 'to extract the taste of'), 'to spoil' (*tadını kaçırmak* lit. 'to let the taste slip away'), 'to lose its charm' (*tadı kalmamak* lit. 'not to remain the taste of'), as in the following examples:

> *Hayatın/tatilin tadını çıkarmak istiyorum.* "I want to enjoy life/holidays to the fullest" (lit. I want to extract the taste of life/holidays.)
> *Bu da düğünümüzün tadını kaçırdı* "And that spoiled the (good) atmosphere of our wedding" (lit. And that let the taste of our wedding slip away.)
> *Yolculuğun artık tadı kalmamıştı* "After that, the charm of the journey was lost" (lit. After that the taste of the journey didn't remain.)

As the examples show, the most prominent abstract concepts related to the noun *tat* are the concepts 'pleasant', 'joy' and 'enjoyable'. For instance, if there is no taste left in a wedding, a holiday or a journey, they have lost their pleasantness, joy or charm. The salience of these concepts can also be observed when abstract meanings of the adjectives/adverbs *tatlı* and *tatsız* are concerned. *Tatlı*, which can be literally translated as 'with taste',[34] can convey different meanings (like 'pleasant', 'mild', 'tender', etc.). These are related to a whole variety of concrete and abstract experiences, but they are all in some way connected to the concept 'pleasant': *tatlı sohbet* 'pleasant conversation', *tatlı yaz sabahları* 'mild/pleasant summer mornings', *tatlı heyecan* 'sweet/pleasant excitement', *tatlı tatlı bakmak* 'to look tenderly'. In much the same way, the adjective/adverb *tatsız*, formed from the noun *tat* and the privative suffix *–sız* (which can literally be translated as 'without taste'), can refer to a whole variety of unpleasant experiences, e.g. *tatsız olay* 'unpleasant scene/incident', *tatsız önsezi* 'unpleasant/bad hunch', *tatsız gerçek* 'cruel reality', *tatsız bitmek* 'to end unhappily', *tatsız havada uyanmak* 'to wake up in a bad mood'. These are all contexts in which none of Croatian lexemes formed from the root *kus* can be used. Nevertheless, the Croatian adjective *neukusan* 'tasteless'[35] can refer to a similar concept as the Turkish lexeme *tatsız* in the following contexts: *neukusna šala* 'inappropriate/unpleasant joke', 'joke that insults' (Tur. *tatsız şaka*), or *neukusna igra* 'disgusting/ugly game' (Tur. *tatsız oyun*). It is clear that such contexts are much less varied than those with Turkish *tat*, which means that Turkish *tat* is more productive in the domain of pleasant/unpleasant experience.

---

34 See the discussion in chapter 4.1.
35 The same does not hold for the adjective *bezukusan* 'tastless', 'without taste', whose meaning refers exclusively to the domain of tasting food.

4.3. *The domain of 'system of aesthetical criteria'*

In the last section of the analysis we will consider the domain of 'system of aesthetical criteria'. We consider this domain as separate from the two larger ones because of its less prominent semantic links with the meanings of 'taste' as related to food, and trying and experiencing as described in section 4.2.

As mentioned previously, in many IE languages lexemes referring to taste refer to a system of aesthetical criteria as well. In Croatian, different lexicalization patterns have been recognized since the meanings 'taste' and 'system of aesthetical criteria' are lexicalized by two different nouns formed from the root *kus*: *ukus* and *okus*. *Ukus* appears 14,592 times and in 200 randomly chosen tokens, it appears exclusively in the meaning 'system of aesthetical criteria', as in *glazbeni/književni ukus* 'taste for music/literature' or *dobar ukus* 'good taste' (when referring to manners as well). The overlapping between the meaning 'taste' and the meaning denoting a system of aesthetical criteria is visible in the motivated words formed from the noun *ukus*. The adjective *ukusan* conveys both meanings (concrete and abstract), whereas its antonyms lexicalize more frequently one meaning or the other. *Bezukusan* appears mostly in constructions such as *doručak je bio potpuno bezukusan* 'the breakfast was completely tasteless', i.e. in meanings related to the concrete domain of tasting food. The adjective *neukusan* appears in the CNC 414 times. In only 5 occurrences is it used to refer to taste of food as in *neukusna hrana* 'tasteless food'. In all of the other examples the adjective *neukusan* refers to aesthetical judgements, e.g. *neukusna haljina* 'inappropriate dress (dress without taste)'. The adjective *neukusan* also relates to the concept of 'disgust' which makes it semantically close to the French adjective *dégoûtant* and the English adjective *disgusting*.

As for the domain of 'system of aesthetical criteria' in Turkish, concepts encoded by the Croatian lexemes *ukus* (in contexts like *glazbeni ukus* 'taste for music') and *ukusno/neukusno* (in contexts like *ukusno/neukusno odjeven* 'dressed with/without taste') cannot be expressed by lexemes having the root *tat* as their basis. Instead of *tat*, in similar contexts lexemes formed from the Arabic root/noun *zevk* ('enjoyment', 'pleasure', 'good/bad taste' in abstract meaning) are used (e.g. *zevkli giyinmek* 'to dress with taste/style', *ince/rafine müzik zevki* 'delicate taste for music').[36]

Discussion

As we have shown in previous sections, lexical structures based on the root *kus* and *tat* can be categorized within three larger domains according to their semantic structures: 1) the domain of 'taste' as related to food, 2) the domain of 'trying and experiencing' and 3) the domain of 'system of aestheti-

---

36 The interesting thing is that the noun *zevk* also has the concept 'pleasant' as the most prominent feature of its meaning structure, but it cannot refer to food.

cal criteria'. Although the conceptual relation of the first two domains is more obvious (especially with respect to etymological data), it is possible to define conceptual relations among all three of them as well. We consider that one of the most important motivational links among them is based on the concept of 'likes/dislikes', as pointed out by Sweetser (1990). This concept connects the domain of taste related to food (e.g. we like or dislike different food tastes) with the domain of aesthetical criteria (we like or dislike a certain style, behavior, etc.). The same concept is the link between the domain of aesthetical criteria with the subdomain of experiencing pleasantness/unpleasantness (we like or dislike a certain feeling).

When different conceptual domains are concerned, the analysis of lexicalization patterns showed little overlapping between Croatian and Turkish lexical structures. In Croatian, one of the most prominent concepts in the morphosemantic field of the root *kus* seems to be the concept 'to try'. It is lexicalized in different aspects in almost every lexeme belonging to this morphosemantic field. In Turkish the most saliently lexicalized concept is the concept 'pleasant'. Conceptual and semantic overlappings and differences captured by diverse lexicalization patterns between the two languages can be illustrated as in following two tables:

		CROATIAN	**TURKISH**
domain of 'taste'		+	+
domain of trying and experiencing	subdomain of trying to achieve something	+	–
	subdomain of acquiring new experiences/knowledge	+	–[37]
	subdomain of temptation	+	–
	subdomain of experiencing pleasantness/unpleasantness	–(+)	+
domain of aesthetical criteria		+	–

Table 2 Conceptual and semantic overlappings and differences between morphosemantic fields of the Croatian root *kus* and the Turkish root *tat*

---

37 As we mentioned in section 4.2.2., lexemes within the morphosemantic field of *tat* are very restricted in the meanings related to the 'subdomain of acquiring new experiences/ knowledge'. There are no Turkish lexemes derived from *tat* which can convey the meaning 'testing one's abilities/possibilities' (Croatian *okušati se u/na* 'to try out in', *iskušati* 'to test'), or which can relate to experience in a more general sense (the Croatian noun *iskustvo* 'experience' or the adjective *iskusan* 'experienced', 'skilled'). The meanings conveyed by *tat* in constructions such as *anneliği tatmak* 'to taste/experience (a feeling of) motherhood' can be in a way related to the 'subdomain of acquiring new experiences/knowledge' but since they refer more to 'the feeling of experiencing something', or 'experiencing what something is like', we consider them as being related more to the 'domain of experiencing pleasantness/unpleasantness'.

		CROATIAN	TURKISH
domain of 'taste'		*okus, (ukus,)*[38] *kušati, (okusiti,) ukusan, (neuku-san), bezukusan*	*tat, tatlı, tatsız, tatmak, tadına bakmak, tadına varmak, tadını görmek, tadını almak, tadını duymak/hissetmek tadını tatmak*
domain of trying and experienc-ing	subdomain of trying to achieve something	*pokušati, pokušaj*	–
	subdomain of acquiring new experiences/ knowledge	*okušati okušati se u/na iskusiti, iskušati iskustvo, iskusan/neiskusan*	–
	subdomain of temptation	*kušnja, iskušenje, iskušavati*	–
	subdomain of experiencing pleasantness/ unpleasantness	*okus, okusiti čari/ slasti iskusiti, neukusan*	*tat, tatlı, tatsız, tatmak, tadına bakmak, tadına varmak, tadını görmek, tadını almak, tadını duymak/hissetmek, tadını tatmak, tadını çıkarmak, tadını kaçırmak, tadı kalmamak*
domain of aesthetical criteria		*ukus, ukusan, neukusan*	–

Table 3 Examples of Turkish and Croatian lexical units with respect to their relatedness to different conceptual domains

Concluding remarks

Based on our analysis several main observations can be made. First, defining lexicalization patterns provides an in–depth semantic analysis of how certain conceptual and semantic structures are captured and conveyed by diverse grammatical devices. This kind of approach enables a more fine–grained definition of conceptual domains and subdomains that are lexicalized

---

38   Lexemes inside brackets are more frequently used in meanings not related to food.

via semantically close roots in the two typologically different languages. The domains and subdomains actually represent encyclopedic knowledge that is encoded in different lexical forms in the two languages. As shown in Tables 2 and 3, three domains can be identified for Croatian: 'domain of taste', 'domain of trying and experiencing', and 'domain of aesthetical criteria'. On the other hand, in Turkish no lexeme within the morphosemantic field of *tat* can relate to the 'domain of aesthetical criteria', nor are there lexemes referring to subdomains of 'trying to achieve something' and 'temptation' within the 'domain of trying and experiencing'. As for the subdomain of 'acquiring new experiences/knowledge', Turkish lexemes never refer to testing out one's qualities or performances. They refer to the subdomain of 'experiencing pleasantness/unpleasantness' since they always carry encyclopedic knowledge of what is one's impression of something experienced. In Croatian only constructions such as *okusiti čari/slast* 'to taste savours' has a meaning referring to pleasant impression of a certain experience. Therefore, it can be claimed that the conceptual relation between 'taste' and 'to try/(to) experience' is regularly and frequently lexicalized in Croatian (and in the IE language family), while in the Turkish language this relation is not so prominent. The most salient abstract concepts related to the Turkish root *tat* in the experience domain are the concepts 'pleasant', 'joy' and 'enjoyable', especially with regard to internal feelings, mood, atmosphere, etc. The salience of these concepts can be observed when abstract meanings of the adjectives/adverbs *tatlı* and *tatsız* are concerned as well. To sum up, it can be stated that overlappings between Croatian and Turkish in lexicalization of concepts within the experience domain are only partial.

Lexicalization patterns can represent a typological regularity within a certain language family, such as the lexicalization of meanings 'taste' and 'system of aesthetical criteria' by lexical reflexes of the IE root *$\hat{g}eus$–. However, some specificities with respect to lexicalization patterns can also been highlighted, as was presented in Table 1. Some of the lexemes such as French *goût* are polysemous and some languages have two lexemes formed with the same root that have clearly separated meanings (Croatian *okus* and *ukus*).

Besides being able to account for conceptual and semantic regularities, lexicalization patterns can capture linguistic variability with respect to the diversity of grammatical devices languages use to encode certain meanings. This is well illustrated by the [Ntat–V] lexicalization pattern in Turkish in which diverse verbs referring to sensory modalities other than taste are used to highlight different facets of the experiential domain. Moreover, a significant difference between Turkish and Croatian can be observed in the grammatical influence on the change of meaning. Turkish uses the same verbs and [Ntat–V] constructions to convey concrete and abstract meanings without any change in form, whereas in Croatian a change of form, i.e. change in prefixes (*kušati* 'to taste' vs. *pokušati* to try', *okusiti* 'to taste in small quantities/to experience superficially' vs. *iskusiti* 'to experience thoroughly') is necessary for the realization of new meanings. This fact leads us to the conclusion of a higher degree of constructional polysemy within the morphosemantic field of *tat* in Turkish

compared to the degree of polysemy within the Croatian morphosemantic field of *kus*. Nevertheless, in Turkish some other verbs can combine with the noun *tat* to convey exclusively abstract meanings within the same type of [Ntat–V] constructions (see 4.2.4.).

The model of lexicalization patterns also clearly points to the fact that in Croatian diverse syntactic constructions also play a significant role in building the lexicon and thus represent a particular way of capturing a variety of meanings. For example, the domains of 'taste' and 'experience' are regularly and frequently encoded within the morphosemantic field of *kus* in Croatian as an IE language, but the diversity of language elements and devices that are operative in their lexicalization also represent a diversity of fine–grained semantic differences which are captured by lexicalization patterns. This is well illustrated by the lexical unit *okušati se u* that has a specialized meaning 'to try a certain activity' as opposed to the verb *pokušati* 'to try' that has a very broad meaning and is used in a variety of contexts.

Taking all of these insights into account, it can be concluded that one of the major advantages in defining lexicalization patterns within a certain morphosemantic field is that they clearly reveal regular or specific conceptual relations that are lexicalized by means of different language (i.e. grammatical) devices.

Finally, it has to be noted that it was not possible to give overall fully exhaustive analysis of the lexicalization patterns related to the morphosemantic fields of the roots *kus* and *tat* due to their complexity. However, we believe that the main similarities as well as differences between the two languages have been pointed out. Moreover, we are convinced that there is room to improve the present model. At the moment we consider that this kind of approach has proven its applicability in: a) defining relevant grammatical devices that are effective in building lexicon and thus, capturing different meanings; b) synchronic and diachronic analysis of lexical, semantic and conceptual structures; b) typological research focused on finding regularities and specificities in the lexicalization of semantic and conceptual relations.

We hope that this research will open some relevant issues regarding lexicalization patterns in typologically different languages that could or should be further investigated.

References:

Babić, Stjepan. 2002. *Tvorba riječi u hrvatskome književnome jeziku*. Zagreb: Globus – HAZU

Čaušević, Ekrem. 1996. *Gramatika suvremenoga turskog jezika*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada

Evans, Nicholas and David Wilkins. 2000. In the Mind's Ear: The Semantic Extension of Perception Verbs in Australian Languages. *Language* 76(3): 546–592 https://doi.org/10.2307/417135

Feldman, Jerome and Srinivas Narayanan. 2004. Embodied meaning in a neural theory of language. *Brain and Language* 89(2): 385–392 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X(03)00355-9

Göksel, Aslı and Celia Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish. A Comprehensive Grammar*. London and New York: Routledge

Guiraud, Pierre. 1967. *Structures étymologiques du lexique français*. Paris: Larousse

Ibarretxe–Antuňano, Iraide. 2008. Vision Metaphors for the Intellect: Are they Really Cross–Linguistic?. *ATLANTIS. Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo–American Studies* 30(1): 15–33

Johnson, Mark. 1987. *The Body in the Mind. The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press

Katunar, Daniela. 2015. *Ustroj leksikona u konstrukcijskoj gramatici – primjer prijedloga u hrvatskom jeziku*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Zagreb.

Katunar, Daniela, Matea Srebačić, Ida Raffaelli and Krešimir Šojat. 2012. Arguments for Phrasal Verbs in Croatian and Their Influence on Semantic Relations in Croatian WordNet. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation* (LREC'12)

Kerovec, Barbara. 2016. Polisemija glagola osjetilne percepcije u turskom jeziku s osvrtom na hrvatski jezik. Paper presented at the international conference *Istraživanja turske kulture*, 4th – 5th September 2015, Sarajevo

Kövecses, Zoltán. 1986. *Metaphors of Anger, Pride, and Love: A Lexical Approach to the Structure of Concepts*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2002. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2005. *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Raffaelli, Ida. 2012. The Conceptual Category of 'light' in Croatian: A Diachronic Perspective. Brdar, Mario, Ida Raffaelli and Milena Žic Fuchs (eds). *Cognitive Linguistics between Universality and Variation*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing: Newcastle upon Tyne, 383–410

Raffaelli, Ida. 2013. The model of morphosemantic patterns in the description of lexical architecture. *Lingue e linguaggio* 1: 47–72 https://doi.org/10.1418/73676

Raffaelli, Ida. 2015. Morfosemantička struktura hrvatskoga korijena *kus* iz dijakronijske perspective. Belaj, Branimir (ed.) *Dimenzije značenja*. Zagreb. Zagrebačka slavistička škola: 211–242

Raffaelli, Ida and Barbara Kerovec. 2008. Morphosemantic fields in the analysis of Croatian vocabulary. *Jezikoslovlje* 9(1–2): 141–169

Raffaelli Ida and Barbara Kerovec. 2015. 'Taste' and its conceptual extensions: the example of Croatian root *kus/kuš* and Turkish root *tat*. Pirrelli, Vito, Claudia Marzi and Marcello Ferro (ed.) *Word Structure and Word Usage*. Proceedings of the NetWordS Final Conference, Pisa, March 30–April 1, 2015, http://ceur–ws.org

Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics. Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Talmy, Leonard. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: semantic structures in lexical forms. Shopen, Timothy (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description III: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57–149

Viberg, Åke. 1984. The verbs of perception: A typological study. Butterworth, Brian, Bernard Comrie and Östen Dahl (ed.) *Explanations for language universals*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 123–62 https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1983.21.1.123

Williams, Joseph M. 1976. Synaesthetic Adjectives: A Possible Law of Semantic Change. *Language* 52 https://doi.org/10.2307/412571

Žic Fuchs, Milena. 1991. Metafora kao odraz kulture. Yvonne Vrhovac and Marin Andrijašević (ed.) *Zbornik radova »Prožimanje kulture i jezika«*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku, 27–33

Dictionaries:

Clauson, Gerard. 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre–Thirteenth–Century Turkish*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Damjanović, Stjepan. 2004. *Mali staroslavensko hrvatski rječnik*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska

Đinđić, Slavoljub, Mirjana Teodosijević and Darko Tanasković. 1997. *Türkçe–Sırpça Sözlük*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu

Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik. 2002. Zagreb: Novi liber

Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke

Püsküllüoğlu, Ali. 2005. *Arkadaş Türkçe Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Arkadaş Yayınevi

http://tureng.com/

Türkçe Sözlük, 1983. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları

Pojam 'okus' u izgradnji hrvatskoga i turskoga leksika – kontrastivna analiza

U radu se raspravlja o ulozi pojma 'okus' u izgradnji hrvatskoga i turskoga leksika. Temeljni su ciljevi ovoga rada: 1) odrediti i opisati sličnosti i različitosti u pojmovnom preslikavanju kojega je osnova pojam 'okus' u dvama tipološki i genetski različitim jezicima analizom vokabulara tvorenog na temelju hrvatskoga korijena *kus* i turskoga korijena *tat* te 2) definirati u kojoj se mjeri vokabular utemeljen na korijenima *kus* i *tat* u dvama jezicima razlikuje s obzirom na leksikalizacijske obrasce kojima se leksikaliziraju značenja.

Keywords: the concept of 'taste', lexicalization patterns, morphosemantic fields, conceptual mappings, Croatian language, Turkish language

Ključne riječi: pojam 'okus', leksikalizacijski obrasci, morfosemantička polja, pojmovno preslikavanje, hrvatski jezik, turski jezik