

A SHORT OVERVIEW OF PREFIXED VERBS IN ENGLISH AND SERBIAN

Starting from the point that the main aim of this paper is to compare prefixed verbs in English and Serbian, which belong to two different language families, certain problems can be encountered. Therefore, a concise summary of how prefixed verbs are seen in the aforesaid languages will be offered. But, from the first moment one starts studying prefixed verbs in more detail, they will realize that in order to do this properly they will have to take into consideration the whole procedure of prefixation, because verbs represent just one part of speech to which prefixes can be attached. For that reason, this paper will commence with a brief elucidation of prefixation and then we will finally focus on the prefixed verbs in both English and Serbian.

Key words: prefixation, prefixed verbs, English, Serbian

Prefixation in English and Serbian

If a prefix is defined as an affix that precedes its base, prefixation can then very easily be defined as the process of adding a prefix. Before we start expounding the process of prefixation in English and Serbian, one point should be made clear. In English, prefixation is seen as a part of affixation, whereas in Serbian it is usually seen as a separate word-formation process.

It should be highlighted that in English, all prefixes are derivational and thus, *un-* in *unhappy*, *de-* in *decontaminate*, *counter-* in *countersignature*, and others create new lexemes rather than inflected forms of *happy*, *contaminate*, and *signature*. All prefixes can be productive or non-productive. This means that they can either still do what they usually do when applied to new words, or that what has already been done is forever and cannot be done anymore. The best way to describe prefixes in English is either by using the alphabetical order or by classifying them according to their semantic functions. Vidanović does both in his book *An Outline of English Morphology with Elements of Lexicology* (1994).

¹ nikolatatar@gmail.com

He starts with the semantic classification and then he provides a list of prefixes which he further furnishes with their meaning, origin and examples (VIDANOVIĆ 1994: 26–29). Generally speaking, there can be ten groups of prefixes depending on their underlying meanings (VIDANOVIĆ 1994: 25): negative (*impossible*), reversative (*unpack*), pejorative (*maltreat*), degree and size (*substandard*), attitude (*anti-imperialistic*), locative (*transatlantic*), time and order (*postwar*), number (*monosyllabic*), conversion prefixes (*embody*) and miscellaneous (*neoclassicism*).

No matter how strange it may seem today, the truth is that the very notion of *prefix* arrived on the scene very late in Serbo-Croatian literature. By the 1970s, authors still viewed prefixed words as compounds with prepositions. The term *префикс* or *предметак* appeared for the first time in the works of Aleksandar Belić (1949), but he also saw prefixation as a hyponym of the superordinate term *composition*, i.e. prefixation was included in composition. Stevanović (1964: 443–471) went a step forward and talked about compounds with prefixes. The full autonomy of prefixation was finally achieved in the grammar written by Barić et al. (1979: 230–231). Stanojčić and Popović (1999: 133) define words with prefixes as “*an especially productive type of compounds*”.

In the introductory part to prefixation, Klajn holds a grudge against Serbo–Croatian grammarians because they saw no difference between prepositions and prefixes. He concludes that the identicalness that can be found between the two groups is just illusory and diachronic. He, however, admits that prefixes mostly developed from prepositions and that they still keep their form, e.g. *на-*, *из-*, *од-*, but he also points out that prefixes now functionally represent a different language unit – they stand for formants and words. Even the prefix *не-* cannot be identified with the negative particle *не*: the clause *ти си нечовек* could not have developed from **ти си не човек*. This prefix is comparable to corresponding prefixes in other Indo-European languages – Greek *a-*, Latin *in-*, and German *un-*. In Klajn’s opinion, if we want a conclusive proof why Serbian prefixes and prepositions should not be identified, it is enough to consider Russian. Almost all the prefixes are similar in Serbian and Russian, and still Russian grammarians do not jump to conclusions that their prefixes correspond to their prepositions (KLAJN 2002: 176–177).

As we have seen, grammarians who were concerned with the Serbian language thought that prefixes and prepositions were one and the same, but at the same time they did not do one more thing which is very important – they did not try to determine what kind of relationship prefixes can have with the roots which they precede. Klajn offers a solution to this problem. He concludes that almost always we can have two kinds of relationship. In the first case, prefixes

keep the original meaning of the preposition from which they grew when they are attached to certain nouns and verbs, as in the following examples:

поткровље, противотров, безболан, ванземаљски, etc.

The second and most important correlation between a prefix and its stem is the one when a prefix is added to a verb. Verbs such as *избацити*, *упасти* and *потписати* cannot have sprung from *из бацити*, *у пасти* and *под писати*. They cannot have stemmed from the inversion of the verb and a preposition (*бацити из*, *пасти у*, etc.), because the same preposition is used after the prefixed verbs: *избацити из*, *упасти у*, *довући до* and the like. The presence of the preposition proves that a prefix is not a preposition; otherwise, it would be inexplicable how the same word can appear before and after the verb. Prefixes in these verbs actually have the adverbial function (KLAJN 2002: 177–178):

*бацити напоље => избацити, пасти унутра => упасти, писати доле
=> потписати.*

All the facts point to the conclusion that we should definitely discard the thesis which suggests that prefixes are in fact prepositions.

So far we have explained how the term prefix entered the Serbian language and offered reasons for distinguishing prepositions and prefixes, and now a couple of facts about prefixes in Serbian could be mentioned. Firstly, prefixes do not change a word-class of the stem to which they are added. Secondly, some prefixes can be free morphemes, or they can correspond to free morphemes in terms of shape (unlike suffixes which are all bound). Thirdly, while suffixes go naturally one after another, prefixes do not. Each prefix keeps its own meaning, and what is more, when they are added hardly ever any phonemic changes occur². Up to two prefixes can be added and rarely can we find three prefixal morphemes before a word (KLAJN 2002: 179).

In the second part of his book, *Творба речи у савременом српском језику 1*, entitled *Префиксација*, Klajn, besides the introductory part, offers four chapters that deal with particular word-classes – nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. Apart from providing the alphabetical order of prefixes that can be combined with the aforementioned word classes, the author enriches each unit with examples which are very well explained (v. KLAJN 2002: 183–300).

Bauer claims that prefixes perform very much the same function as suffixes, i.e. they are derivational. Prefixes can also be used in the combination with suffixes, for example *unthankful* (BAUER 2003: 27). Plag states that there is a vast majority of prefixes which do not influence the alteration of

² This is not the case with suffixes; when added, suffixal morphemes merge into complex suffixes and various phonemic changes take place (e.g. *мировњачки* from *мир* + *-ов* + *-(а)н* + *-јак* + *-ски*) (KLAJN 2002: 179).

the base words' syntactic category. What the author points out is that prefixes in these cases merely function as modifiers. What is more, it can be seen that prefixes can commonly be attached to more than one type of syntactic category (verb, adjective, or noun). The stress pattern of the bases is also not influenced by prefixes (PLAG 2002: 124). Plag gives a short list of prefixes that can be used with verbs (2002: 124–127).

Prefixed verbs in English and Serbian

Just like in many other Indo-European languages (e.g. Greek, Latin, German), verbs in the Serbian language represent the word class with which prefixes are most heterogeneously and widely used (KLAJN 2002: 239). Then, we should not be taken aback by the fact that old authors mentioned prefixes exclusively in relation to verbs. The number of prefixes that can be combined with verbs was first established by Maretić (1899), who explained sixteen prefixes (he referred to them as prepositions):

до, из, на, над, о(б), од, по, под, пре, при, про, раз, с(а), у, уз, and за.

Since then, different authors did the only thing they could do, they enlarged the list and the number of prefixes grew. Therefore, Barić (1979) increased the number of prefixes by adding three more: *мимо-, пред-* and *су-*. Besides adding *на-, нај-, проту-* and *супрот-* (each of these occurs in only one or two verbs), Babić (1986) also included three foreign prefixes: *де-, дус-* and *пе-* (KLAJN 2002: 239–240). Finally, Klajn (2002) defines twenty prefixes which are alphabetically ordered:

до-, за-, из-, мимо-, на-, над-, нај-, о-, об-, од-, па-, по-, под-, пре-, пред-, при-, про-, против-, раз-, сла-, су-, супрот-, у- and уз-.

He also states that apart from few authors no grammarians bothered to write about prefixes, which has brought about the lack of papers on prefixes in Serbo–Croatian literature.

What should be underlined at this point is the fact that four phenomena are characteristic of the process of prefixing verbs in Serbian (KLAJN 2002: 240):

- 1) the influence which prefixes have on aspect
- 2) the influence of prefixes on transitivity (“the verbal gender”)
- 3) the link between prefixation and meaning
- 4) and depreverbatation.

Prima facie, it can be concluded that Serbian, as a typical Slavic language, changes aspectual characteristics of its verbs by means of prefixes.

This is not the case in English. In order to understand better why prefixation is so important, a couple of words have to be said about aspect. But, since this paper does not take aspectology for its main aim, only a short overview of how aspect is seen in Serbian and English will be offered before we go on explaining prefixed verbs in Serbian.

A situation denoted by the verb in both English and Serbian (as well as in any other language) may be viewed from two different perspectives. It may be viewed from the objective perspective, expressed by tense, which relates the time of the situation denoted by the verb to the time of the utterance. Tense is, therefore, a category which deals with grammatical location in time. When we use tenses, we approach situations from the perspective of time, which is an extralinguistic, unchangeable category. However, we may also approach a situation from an internal perspective; we may observe a manner in which a situation denoted by the verb is experienced. In such situations, we deal with the aspect of the verb. In English, for instance, each tense is named according to its combination of time and aspect.

Aspect is a grammatical category which is systematically expressed in a language (in the form of past, present and future) and has its markers (*be + Ving, have + Ven*). It is said that aspect is subjective because a speaker or a writer has a choice - aspect is her or his comment on the situation denoted by the verb. Carlota Smith (1986: 97) said that "*aspect of a sentence presents a situation in a certain light, contributing to the point of view conveyed by the sentence*". Therefore, a speaker or writer chooses the appropriate approach to the situation - he or she constructs a sentence with the appropriate linguistic forms for that type of situation, as well as with appropriate aspectual perspective, which may be perfective or imperfective. Comrie (1976: 3) says that "*aspects are different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation*". He also divided imperfective situations in habitual and durative situations, whereas he subdivided durative situations into progressive and non-progressive (NOVAKOV 2005: 13).

It has been noticed that the change of aspect does not induce a change of the lexical meaning of the verb. However, Comrie says that there is an "*inherent or semantic type of aspect which does result in a modification of the verb's lexical semantics*". This type of aspect is often referred to as Aktionsart. Aktionsart describes the manner in which the event takes place. It is distinguished from aspect by assuming that it changes the lexical meaning of the basic verb. Laurel Brinton (1988) perhaps gave the most suitable explanation by saying that "*Aktionsart is associated not so much with the speaker's point of view but rather with the inherent nature of the situation portrayed: whether it is static or dynamic, punctual or durative, continuous or iterative*". However, she also stated that the "*distinction between aspect*

and *Aktionsart* is an old but blurred one" (BRINTON 1988: 2–4). Even grammarians mix these two notions because it is not always easy to distinguish what is grammatical and what is lexical, especially in Serbian where aspect is lexicalized. There is a lot of lexical-grammatical interaction, for example:

пре- + *радити* => *преградити*; *из-* + *радити* =>
изградити; *од-* + *радити* => *одградити*.

Aspect in Serbian is denoted by the division of Serbian verbs into three major groups: imperfective, perfective and dual aspect (or biaspectual) verbs. The duration of the situation denoted by the verb is sometimes taken as a criterion for determining the aspect of verbs. Thus, Stevanović (1981) claims that imperfective verbs denote unlimited duration of the event, while perfective verbs denote limited duration. However, verbs denoting both perfective and imperfective aspect may occur with adverbials denoting duration. Thus, we can conclude that aspect in Serbian is not primarily related to the duration of the situation denoted by the verb.

Stanojčić and Popović (1999) are among the authors who agree that imperfective verbs denote actions or states of unlimited duration and that an imperfective aspect does not present the action as finished, but rather as continuing or repeating. For example, such verbs are: *шетати*, *куцкати*, *јављати се*, *јести*, *сумњати*, *прибојавати се*, *радити*, *читати*, *певати*, *свирати*, *скакати*, *седети*, *носити*, *спавати*, etc. Although these verbs are basically the same, since they all denote actions or states of unlimited duration, they, nevertheless, may be divided into two subgroups:

- 1) Durative verbs which denote longer or shorter, uninterrupted performing of the action or state denoted by the verb. For example: *шетати*, *јести*, *сумњати*, *имати*.
- 2) Iterative verbs which denote repetition of an action or state, unlimited in length but with interruptions, such as: *куцкати*, *јављати се*, *прибојавати се*.

Here again, Stanojčić and Popović (1999) are consistent with the idea that perfective verbs denote actions or states with limited duration, which last for one short period of time. But, we are going to discard their difference of opinion and we will stick to the definition which has been provided. Such are, for instance, the following verbs: *доћи*, *упитати се*, *сести*, *попити*, *искористити*, *потражити*, *урадити*, *проговорити*, *прочитати*, *запевати*, *одспавати*, *скочити*, *трепнути*, *дозвати*, etc. These verbs denote one finished moment of the action, whether it is a moment when the action is performed, *сести*, *трепнути*, or the moment when the action begun, *запевати*, *проговорити*, or when it ended, *прочитати*, *одсвирати*, *саградити*.

The basic difference between perfective and imperfective verbs is realized through the existence of verbal pairs “imperfective - perfective”:

падати - пасти, седети - сести, писати - написати, жалити - зажалити.

In that manner, Serbian differs from languages of Germanic origin, because these languages mostly have only one verbal form for expressing both aspectual oppositions. For example, for the English verb *to lunch*, there is only one translational equivalent which may be both perfective and imperfective - *ручати*. However, for some English verbs, such as *to fall*, there are two Serbian verbs, one perfective *пасти*, and the other imperfective, *падати*.

Biaspectual verbs denote either a perfective or an imperfective action. Whether it is perfective or imperfective may be concluded solely in the context. For example, biaspectual verbs are: *чути, видети, ручати, вечерати, телефонирати*. These verbs have the same semantic base for both aspectual types, and thus the exact aspect may be determined only when they are used in a sentence (STANOJČIĆ, POPOVIĆ 1999):

Док руча никад не пије, а када руча, пије две чаше пива.

In this example, we have two instances of the same verb, *ручати* (to have lunch). However, in the first instance, *руча* is imperfective because the process of having lunch is still in progress. In the second instance, *руча* is perfective, because it refers to the period after the process of having lunch is already finished. The same logic may be applied to a number of Serbian verbs, such as: *видети* and *чути*, which may be both perfective and imperfective. Thus, *видети* may be interpreted as imperfective when it has the meaning of *зледати* (to observe), and as perfective when it has the meaning of *уочити* (to notice).

In English, the category of aspect is far more controversial than the category of tense. There are various definitions and classifications. For our purposes the one offered by Quirk et al. (1985) seems to be the most appropriate for this paper. They distinguish two types of aspect: the progressive aspect, having the opposition progressive/non-progressive, and the perfective aspect having the opposition perfective/non-perfective.

The perfective aspect is formed with the auxiliary *have* and the *-ed* form of the lexical verb. This type of aspect gives information about the duration of events, as well as about the relationship of events to one another in time. Thus, the situation described by the verb may be viewed as being related to some other situation in a different time frame. For example, an event which occurred in the past may somehow be related to the present moment, or some other reference moment, as may be noticed in the following example:

I had finished just before I went to work.

Progressive aspect is formed with the auxiliary *be* and the *-ing* form of the lexical verb. The focus of this type of aspect is mostly on the duration of the situation denoted by the verb. By using the progressive aspect, the speaker adds information about his or her perspective on time. Thus, they may view the situation as ongoing, unfinished or extended in time but yet temporary. Speaker may indicate that something is, was or will be in progress in the moment when something else happened or happens. Therefore, we may conclude that the focus is not on the starting or ending point of an event, but on the event viewed from its centre.

After this short description of aspect in both Serbian and English, the story about the changes that prefixes can provoke when they are attached to verbs in Serbian will now be finished. While perfective verbs remain perfect even though the prefix has been added to them (*дати* – *издати*), imperfective verbs become perfective by the process of prefixation. However, when describing prefixed verbs in Serbian a serious problem occurs, i.e. it is extremely, but on the other hand very important, to differentiate the so-called “pure” perfectivization (e.g. *писати* – *написати*) from the perfectivization which besides the change of aspect causes other modifications to the verb – a new modified meaning (KLAJN 2002: 241).

Thus, for an imperfective verb *прати* we can have a number of perfective counterparts, such as: *опрати*, *допрати*, *пропрати*, *сапрати*, *напрати*, *испрати*, etc. These verbal counterparts have minor or major alternations concerning the verb’s original meaning. The reason for the existence of these verbal pairs in Serbian can be seen in the fact that a verb in Serbian is supposed to denote an action, as well as to indicate whether the action is:

- in progress: *Док је прала веш, киша је напољу падала.*
- repetitive: *Док је испирала веш, телефон је звонио.*
- or completed: *Када је опрала веш, раширила га је у дворишту.*

The verb in the second example shows that prefixation was not the only change that happened to *испирала*, the process of infixation also took place. So, this verb denotes the process that consists of segments of the same quality. It should not be so complicated and problematic to realize that conjunctions play a very important role in these examples. It also seems appropriate to mention here that different prefixes applied to this verb only discover the polysemy which is already present in the verb. Grickat (1966) wrote about this in detail.

Another characteristic which is attributed to prefixes is that in Serbian they can change the intransitive verb into the transitive one. This phenomenon can be ascribed to many verbal prefixes, but not to all of them. It encompasses a considerably lower number of verbs than perfectivization does, and it is

impossible to find any kind of laws or regularities in it. However, transitivity can be found in (KLAJN 2002: 242):

*мислити – замислити; пливати – препливати;
спавати – проспавати; плакати – расплакати; etc.*

For prefixes such as *на-*, *од-*, *по-*, *под-*, and *уз-*, which are very frequent, definite cases of transitivity cannot be found. On the other hand, it is undemanding to find verbs which despite the addition of the prefix still remain intransitive:

*летети – долетети; лутати – залутати; страдати – настрадати;
сумњати – посумњати; etc.*

It should be spotlighted here that in certain categories of meaning, the addition of prefixes results in the transformation of the transitive or intransitive verb into the reflexive one (KLAJN 2002: 242):

јести – најести се; спавати – наспавати се; пити – пропити се; etc.

According to Klajn, language historians became aware of one very noteworthy trend concerning the prefixes and verbs in Slavic languages, including Serbian. They found out that certain verbs could not appear without a prefix. Of course, those linguists did not refer to them as “bound bases”, because this is a structuralist term. The most prominent group of the previously mentioned verbs is (v. KLAJN 2002: 242–244):

по – чети, на – чети, за – чети, запо – чети;

and there are other verbs that belong to this group, such as (KLAJN 2002: 242–244):

за – неми, рас – неми, ода – неми, etc.

What is also significant and what Klajn pays special attention to is the fact that verbs with prefixes and suffixes should not be labelled as verbs with bound bases. These verbs include the following (KLAJN 2002: 244):

опаметити, распаметити, овластити, развластити, etc.

It would seem more than interesting to talk about depreverbation now, because Klajn represents it as the most noteworthy feature of regressive derivation. The term depreverbation refers to the deprefixation of verbs and the term itself is etymologically connected to the English term “*preverb*” which was used to allude to prefixes which were used with verbs. According to Klajn, depreverbation is obviously associated not only with perfectivization, to which it stands in opposition, but also with bound bases, since depreverbation in its most complete sense signifies the procedure by which bound bases become

free. The same author offers several examples and they include (KLAJN 2002: 244–246):

- *дрешуми* evidently originated from *раздрешуми*;
- *зодуми* understandably originated from *узодуми*;
- *заруми* recognizably originated from *озаруми*; etc.

Out of sixteen “classical” verbal prefixes in Serbian, thirteen are considered to be prepositions in terms of their meaning. If we take into consideration the development of polysemy among prepositions³ and the detail that every prefix has other meanings besides its prepositional ones, it seems clear beforehand how ungratefully hard it is to describe and categorize the meanings of verbal prefixes. If we start comparing chapters on verbal prefixes from the time when Maretić (1899) wrote till nowadays, we will encounter a number of inevitable dissimilarities. Different authors in this period did the following:

- firstly, they offered more or fewer subgroups of meaning,
- secondly, they explained the same examples in diverse ways,
- thirdly, some of them were more inclined to generalize and some of them were more inclined to go into details,
- and lastly, some wanted to elucidate the meaning of verbal prefixes by putting forward a broad clarification and some wanted to label the meaning firmly with the help of Latin terms (KLAJN 2002: 246–248).

Therefore, whenever needed, it is suggested to consult either Klajn’s taxonomic classification of the verbal prefixes and their meanings (v. KLAJN 2002: 250–300), or monolingual Serbian dictionaries which also offer every possible meaning which a single prefix can have in the union with certain verbs. Janda (1985: 26) refers to this classification as the atomistic approach. This approach actually implies that the semantic connection between the prefix and the verb is taken into consideration while the grammatical meaning of the prefix is connected to the category of aspect (NOVAKOV 2005: 64).

In all likelihood, it can be stated that prefixation of verbs is more developed and important (due to several characteristics, the most crucial of which is the change of the aspect of the verb) in Serbian than it is in English. However, this was not the usual state of affairs. In the course of the history of the English language, English used to have a very developed system of prefixed verbs. But then, one of the most significant changes happened and English partly lost its verbal prefixes and got a highly developed system of particles.

³ *Речник Матице српске*, for instance, offers twenty-seven different meanings for the entry *за*; nearly fifty meanings for *на*; etc.

According to Lamont (2005), in Old English prefixed verbs were common. Those prefixed verbs can be directly comparable to current phrasal verbs. For example, in today's English, there is the monotransitive verb "to burn" and then the phrasal monotransitive "to burn up." In Old English there were "bærnan" (to burn) and "forbærnan" (to burn up). The prefix "for-" was affixed to the verb and it was not able to move as modern particles can. What is interesting here is that these Old English compound verbs also had highly idiomatic meaning, i.e. the meaning of the compound form did not inevitably reflect the meaning of the root. The word "berædan" can be provided as an example because it meant "to dispossess", while its root verb, "rædan", meant "to advise". This phenomenon is very much alive today and it can be seen in the verb "understandan", which does not today mean "to stand underneath (something)", but idiomatically "to comprehend".

Conclusion

On the basis of this short outline, whose aim is neither to be all-encompassing nor to present an in-depth critical analysis of the literature concerned with Serbian and English morphology, a couple of conclusions can be drawn. Unlike in Serbian, when prefixes are attached to verbs in English it is obvious that the only special phenomenon that happens is the creation of a new word, because all the prefixes in English are derivational, as it has already been pointed out. On the other hand, when a prefix is added to a verb in Serbian, both verbal aspect and the meaning of the verb are modified. The situation in Serbian is even more complicated, since it is not always easy to make a distinction between the semantic and the grammatical level, to put it more exactly it is not always easy to determine the scopes of Aktionsart and aspect. This distinction between the two languages can be ascribed to the fact that they belong to different language groups: Serbian is a member of the Slavic languages, which take the combination of prefixes and verbs as one of their main characteristic when it comes to denoting different aspects of a situation, while English is in the group of Germanic languages, which express specific verbal aspect by means of syntax.

References

- BABIĆ 1986: Бабић, Стјепан. *Творба ријечи у хрватском књижевном језику*, Загреб: ЈАЗУ – Глобус, 1986.
- BARIĆ 1979: Барић et al. *Приручна граматика хрватског књижевног језика*, Загреб: Школска књига, 1979.

- BAUER 1983: Bauer, Laurie. *English Word-Formation*, Cambridge: CUP, 1983.
- BAUER 2003: Bauer, Laurie. *Introducing Linguistic Morphology*, 2nd edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003.
- BELIĆ 1949: Белић, Александар. *Савремени српскохрватски књижевни језик. II део: Наука о грађењу речи*, Београд: Научна књига, 1949.
- BRINTON 1988: Brinton, Laurel. *The Development of English Aspectual Systems*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- COMRIE 1976: Comrie, Bernard. *Aspect*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- GRICKAT 1966: Грицкат, Ирена. „Префиксација као средство граматичке (чисте) перфектизације“, *Јужнословенски филолог XXVII*, 322–324, 1966.
- LAMONT 2005: Lamont, George. The Historical Rise of the English Phrasal Verb, 2005. <<http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cpercyc/courses/6361lamont.html>> 29.01.2016.
- JANDA 1985: Janda, Laura. “The Meaning of Russian Verbal Prefixes: Semantics and Grammar”, in Flier, M., and A., Timberlake, eds. *The scope of Slavic aspect*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Press, 26–40, 1985.
- KLAJN 2002: Клајн, Иван. *Творба речи у савременом српском језику I: слагање и префиксација*, Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, 2002.
- MARETIĆ 1899: Маретић, Томо. *Грамматика и стилистика хрватскога или српскога књижевног језика*, Загреб: Штампa и наклада књижаре Ј. Хартмана, 1899.
- NOVAKOV 2005: Novakov, Predrag. *Glagolski vid i tip glagolske situacije u engleskom i srpskom jeziku*, Novi Sad: Futura publikacije, 2005.
- PLAG 2002: Plag, Ingo. *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- QUIRK et al. 1985: Quirk et al. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, London: Longman, 1985.
- SMITH 1986: Smith, Carlota. “A Speaker-Based Approach to Aspect”, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9: 97–104, 1986.
- STANOJČIĆ, POPOVIĆ 1995: Станојчић, Живојин и Љубомир Поповић, *Грамматика српскога језика*, Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, 1995.
- STEVANOVIĆ 1964: Стевановић, Михаило. *Савремени српскохрватски језик*, књига I (Увод, фонетика, морфологија), Београд: Издавачка установа „Научно дело“, 1964.
- VIDANOVIĆ 1994: Vidanović, Đorđe. *An Outline of English Morphology with Elements of Lexicology*, Niš: Prosveta, 1994.

Sources

Речник српскохрватскога књижевног језика, Нови Сад: Матица српска, 1967.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 8th edition, Oxford University Press, 2010.

Никола М. Татар

КРАТАК ПРЕГЛЕД ГЛАГОЛА СА ПРЕФИКСИМА У ЕНГЛЕСКОМ И СРПСКОМ ЈЕЗИКУ

Почевши од тога да је главни циљ овог рада да упореди глаголе са префиксима у српском и енглеском језику, који припадају двома различитим језичким породицама, може се наићи на одређене проблеме. Стога, биће понуђен концизан преглед о томе како гледамо на глаголе са префиксима у горенаведеним језицима. На основу једног тако кратког прегледа, који не претендује да буде свеобухватан нити да пружи подробну критичку анализу литературе која се бави морфологијама српског и енглеског језика, може се доћи до неколико врло важних закључака. Међутим, од првог тренутка када се глаголи са префиксима почну проучавати детаљније, схватамо да је потребно да узмемо у обзир цео процес префиксације да бисмо то урадили ваљано, зато што глаголи представљају само једну врсту речи на коју можемо додати префикс. Управо из тог разлога, на почетку овог рада биће дато кратко појашњење префиксације, а онда ћемо се коначно фокусирати на глаголе са префиксима како у енглеском тако и у српском језику. Важно би било напоменути да за разлику од српског језика, у случају када се префикси додају на глаголе у енглеском језику више је него очигледно да је једина ствар која се овом приликом може десити стварање нове речи, зато што додавање префикса на глагол у енглеском језику представља чисто деривациони процес. Са друге стране, када додамо префикс на глагол у српском језику мења се и аспект али се такође мења и значење глагола. Ситуација је још компликованија у српском језику, с обзиром на то да није увек лако одредити разлику између семантичког и граматичког нивоа, односно прецизније речено, није увек лако одредити тип глаголске ситуације (Aktionsart) и аспект. Разлика између ова два језика може се приписати чињеници да они припадају различитим језичким групама: српски припада словенским језицима, који користе комбинацију префикса и глагола као једну од својих главних одлика, како би одредили различите аспекте одређене ситуације, док енглески припада групи германских језика који изражавају посебне глаголске аспекте уз помоћ синтаксе.

Кључне речи: префиксација, глаголи са префиксима, енглески, српски

