

SERBIAN EQUIVALENTS OF THE ENGLISH PREPOSITION *OF*: A CONTRASTIVE CORPUS ANALYSIS

ABSTRACT: The study deals with the analysis of the parallel corpus data of the English preposition *of* and its translation equivalents in Serbian, with the aim of revealing its relevance to theory and practice. The contrastive analysis was done on the corpus of 847 instances of the uses of *of*, collected from Paul Auster's short story *The City of Glass* and its translation into Serbian *Grad od stakla*. The analysis focuses on prepositional equivalents and their distribution in Serbian, but it also reveals that in most cases *of* is translated by non-prepositional means. The results of the study offer material that could contribute to the field of lexicography, but could also serve for further analysis in the fields of semantics and syntax, and could help to better understand preposition(s) in both English and Serbian.

Key words: prepositions, preposition *of*, translation equivalents, contrastive analysis.

1. Introduction

This paper represents a contrastive study of the English preposition *of* and its translation equivalents in Serbian. As the task of contrastive analysis is to describe similarities and differences among elements of different languages (Đorđević 1987: 1), the paper analyzes a parallel corpus in order to study the distribution of equivalents of the preposition *of* in Serbian. The aim of this paper, therefore, is to offer a better understanding of the use of *of* in terms of its theoretical and practical relevance.

The theoretical aspect of the analysis is primarily aimed at semantics and lexicography, as defining the precise meaning of any word is key to its proper understanding. The entry for *of* in a large bilingual English Croatian or Serbian dictionary (*Englesko-hrvatski ili srpski rječnik*) lists only the following 6 prepositions in Serbian: *od, iz, po, na, s* and *(iz)među*. On the other hand, another bilingual dictionary, *Englesko-srpski rečnik*, does not list any translation equivalent, but defines *of* in terms of different senses it can have, those of belonging, quantity and material or quality. It is therefore necessary to provide a precise definition and meaning to the equivalents in Serbian in order to offer a detailed and illustrative material that could be relevant to English-Serbian lexicography.

The practical need for the analysis naturally follows from the theoretical aspect: as linguistic and cognitive researches show, foreign and second language learners exhibit a tendency to stick to the first listed meaning of a word in the dictionary (Laufer 1997:16). Such findings are important as they show that inconsistency in presenting various meanings of a word may have negative implications in learning a foreign language, which therefore leads to the conclusion that a proper analysis of *of* and its equivalents in Serbian is crucial to understanding them.

2. Prepositions and their definition

Although prepositions, as an uninflected class of words, represent a class which seems to be easy to analyze, in academic literature they have not been searched for as much as other word classes and thus represent a challenge that could offer surprising results. As this paper is concerned with a contrastive analysis of prepositions in English and Serbian, it is important to state that English language offers far more literature about prepositions, both in various representative grammars of the English language (Biber et al. 1999, Quirk and Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik) and various studies (Bennet 1975, Tyler and Evans 2003, Saint-Dizier 2006, Lindstromberg 2010). Still, not all of the grammar books define prepositions in the same way or discuss them within the same range. Leech and Svartvik, for example, define prepositions within their position in a sentence, as words that stand in front of some other noun phrase (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 254-255), while Quirk and Greenbaum devote the whole chapter to prepositions and focus primarily onto the semantics of prepositions, defining them as a relation between two entities that may express their various relational meanings (Quirk and Greenbaum 1976: 143). Weber observed an interesting fact that many grammar books neither devote a single chapter to prepositions nor provide their definitions (Weber, cited in Macková 2012: 3).

Definitions of prepositions in grammar books of Serbian language also focus on their place in a sentence: "Prepositions stand in front of a noun or a pronoun..." (Klajn 2005: 159)¹; Stanojčić and Popović give a more detailed definition which states that prepositions do not undergo inflectional processes and stand in front of specific gender forms of words (Stanojčić i Popović 1992: 119). Moreover, both grammar books treat prepositions as expressing various relations towards the word following it, but both emphasise their relatedness to case forms. One of the definitions states that „prepositions make the meaning of case forms more precise“². The meaning of prepositions, as an independent lexeme, is not analyzed in any of the grammar books, but only within their use with the noun or pronoun following them (Dragičević 2012: 92). Dragičević cites Klikovac, and her observation that defining prepositional meaning faces two difficult points: first being the impossibility of defining a single preposition by one definition that would comprise all of its senses; second being the characteristic related not only to prepositions – a preposition usually has to be defined by itself (Dragičević 2012: 92).

Grammars of both languages present classifications of prepositions. English prepositions have traditionally been divided into simple (one-word prepositions, such as *at, in, of, off*) and complex (two or three-word prepositions, e.g. *away from, out of, by means of, in front of*) (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 254-255, Quirk and Greenbaum 1976: 145). Quirk and Greenbaum offer another classification according to the type of the relation they express, like place and time and their further subclassifications (Quirk and Greenbaum 1976: 146-166). The consulted grammars of Serbian language divide prepositions into real (Serbian *pravi*; those which function exclusively as prepositions) and unreal (Serbian *nepravi*; those which belong to other word classes, but may function as prepositions) (Stanojčić i Popović 1992: 119 and Klajn 2005: 159). However, prepositions are essential in learning and understanding a language as they are related to the word(s) following them, and need to be explored further.

As the contrastive analysis in this paper focuses on the English preposition *of*, some of its basic characteristics need to be outlined. In terms of phonology, it is a monosyllabic

¹„Predlozi stoje ispred imenice ili zamenice...“ (Klajn 2005: 159)

²„predlozi preciziraju značenja padežnih oblika“ (Stanojčić i Popović 1992: 119).

preposition. Morphologically, it falls into the category of simple prepositions. Semantically, its position has not been clearly defined. *Oxford English Dictionary* says that all of the existing senses of *of* are derivative in their origin, and all of them almost entirely remote from its original, primary sense *away, away from*, due to various influences that the English language has suffered throughout history. The dictionary lists numerous senses of *of*: „the notions of removal, separation, privation, derivation, origin or source, starting-point, spring of action cause, agent, instrument, material, and other senses, which involve the notion of taking, coming, arising, or resulting from.“ Quirk and Greenbaum discuss *of* as a prepositional phrase functioning as a post-modifier, with the meaning of *having*. Thus, *a man of courage* is interpreted as *the man has courage* (Quirk and Greenbaum 1976: 161).

However, more recent publications discuss *of* in more detail. Tyler and Evans mention various senses that *of* can take, indicating those of derivation, source agents and material, but primarily focus on two of its senses (within the context of their discussion of *out of*), that of 'a source relation' (e.g. *This wine is a product of Italy.*) and that of the 'material source' (e.g. *This carving is made of oak.*) (Tyler and Evans 2003: 209-212). Lindstromberg (2010) goes into further discussion, listing the integrative and possessive sense that *of* has, but also its uses in expressing privation, ridding, emptying, in phrases of time and in some fossilized meanings of *of* (e.g. *do something of your own free will*).³

In order to offer a simple classification of the different senses of *of*, the classification in this paper is done with regard to the relationship between a Subject (or, "a thing whose location the reader wants to indicate") and a Landmark (indicates the location of the Subject) (Lindstromberg 2010: 6). The following three senses of *of* have been chosen in order to facilitate the semantic analysis and establish a correlation between Serbian prepositional equivalents and the senses:

1. integrative (refers to the integration of a Subject and a Landmark, like *eddies of ash, the windshield of your car*)⁴,
2. separative (refers to the separation of a Subject from a Landmark, like *out of her hands*),
3. possessive (where a Subject is possessed by a Landmark, like *writings of Herodotus*).

3. Methodology and corpus

The contrastive analysis in this paper focuses onto the English preposition *of*. Based on the British National Corpus, *of* represents not only the most frequent preposition in written and spoken English language, but also the second most frequently used word in English after definite article *the*. It is expected that the analysis of the equivalents of *of* in Serbian would reveal its possible correspondents and their distribution.

An important step in the analysis is to precisely define what units should be considered in the corpus. Following Klégr and Markéta's classification (in analyzing

³Within the discussion of its fossilized uses, Lindstromberg also contrasts *of* with *from*, as these two prepositions can have similar meaning: *from* indicates spatial separation, but in modern English, *of* never has "the robust spatial meaning of separation" (Lindstromberg 2010: 209), as it has become largely dissociated from its spatial origin (Tyler and Evans 2003: 209).

⁴The senses of belonging, material and source have been merged with the integrative, as they overlap in many aspects.

English equivalents of Czech prepositions), the analysis in this paper deals with translation equivalents using the criteria from different levels of language⁵. The equivalents are classified into three groups:

(1) prepositional equivalents – when the function of the English preposition *of* matches that of the Serbian preposition, for example, the English sentence *This is a matter of utmost urgency*. translated as *Stvar je od najveće važnosti*.

(2) non-prepositional equivalents –further subclassified into

(a) lexical-structural - when the translation equivalent represents a lexical and/or structural transposition that compensates for the English preposition, e.g. *He heard the sound of someone entering the room behind him*. translated as *Čuo je kako je neko iza njega ušao u sobu*.

(b) zero – when there is equivalence at textual level, but no identifiable equivalent of the English preposition, for example: *These words were written under the name of William Wilson*. in Serbian translation as *Ova dela pisao je pod imenom Vilijam Vilson*. Zero equivalents represent a particular, special group: although the preposition *of* in these cases is not explicitly translated into Serbian, there is equivalence at textual level and the message is possibly less clear because the lack (or omission) of a preposition in translation also gives some information about the preposition itself, its function and its meaning.⁶

(3) textual non-correspondence – when the English sentence has no correlate in Serbian. Klégr and Markéta (2009) regard these cases as being higher-level textual shifts or translator’s freedom of expression: “Unlike lexical-structural transpositions and formal zero translations, where some kind of compensation can be detected, they involve virtual absence of any equivalent whatever”.

As the analysis focuses on various ways in which *of* is translated into Serbian, with the aim of finding certain regularities in it, the paper explores the first above mentioned group, or prepositional equivalents of *of* in Serbian language, as they best reveal the core, central meaning of a preposition. The remaining groups are left to be analyzed in future papers.

4. The Analysis of the corpus

This part of the paper presents the corpus consisting of 847 instances of the use of *of*. The General distribution of its equivalents is shown in Table 1.

⁵“...it is impossible to describe translation equivalents using criteria from just one level (e.g. morphological)” (Klégr and Markéta 2009).

⁶As further in the paper will be shown, these cases make the largest part of the translation equivalents, more than a half.

type of equivalent	number of occurrences	frequency %
prepositional	197	23.26
zero	473	55.84
lexical-structural	108	12.75
non-textual	69	8.15
total	847	100

Table 1. Distribution of of equivalents in the text

Table 1. shows some surprising results: more than a half of the examples are zero equivalents (55.84%) and 12.75% lexical structural – more than two thirds of the uses of *of* in English have non-prepositional equivalents in Serbian, and only 23.26% instances of the use of *of* have their equivalents in a form of prepositions in Serbian language. A possible explanation for such uneven distribution lies not only in the different structure of Serbian language and the phenomenon of cases, but in the nature of the word class analyzed: in prepositions and their syntactic functions - adverbial, postmodifying, and those of a prepositional object or complement. Although the main aim of this paper is not a syntactic analysis of prepositions, the syntax must not be neglected when analyzing prepositions, as those prepositions that occur in free syntactic combinations are typically not prone to transpositions in translation, mostly because they exhibit semantically composite behaviour. This task, however, should be left for the next paper, as it requires a much deeper analysis and discussion.

This section will be further divided into two sub-sections, following the above classification. Both sub-sections will offer a short discussion and analysis of equivalents, where prepositional equivalents will receive most attention, as they are in the focus of the research.

4.1. Prepositional equivalents

As Table 1 shows, prepositional equivalents count for 197 instances, or 23.26%. This percentage presented a surprising result in the analysis, especially when compared to the percentages of non-prepositional equivalents. However, the relatively low number of prepositional equivalents is, again, due to the syntactic function that a PP has.⁷

Table 2 shows the formal presentation of prepositional equivalents that were used to translate *of*. It shows 15 different prepositional equivalents in Serbian, the number which far exceeds the number of 6 prepositional equivalents listed in *Englesko-hrvatski ili srpski rječnik*.

⁷This view is in line with Klégr and Markéta's hypothesis that the syntactic function of a PP actually determines the translational equivalent: adverbial and postmodifying PPs tend to be translated as prepositional equivalents, while PPs realizing obligatory complements tend to be translated as non-prepositional equivalents. Such behaviour, therefore, affects the semantics of prepositions (Klégr and Markéta 2009: 10).

preposition	number of occurrences	frequency %
od	58	29.44
o	52	26.40
na	28	14.21
iz	20	10.15
za	12	6.09
u	11	5.58
s	7	3.55
među	2	1.02
van	1	0.51
po	1	0.51
bez	1	0.51
pod	1	0.51
zbog	1	0.51
pre	1	0.51
kod	1	0.51
total	197	100

Table 2. Prepositional equivalents of the English preposition of

Two of the prepositions in Table 2 (*od* and *o*) are far more dominant than the others, as together they occur in more than half of the cases. *Od*, with 58 examples, was expected to be in top position, as it is listed as the first equivalent in the English-Croatian or Serbian Dictionary. Still, what is striking is that Serbian *o* occurs in the sample almost as equally as *od*, but it is not even listed in the consulted dictionary. Table 2 also shows some discrepancies between the prepositions listed in the dictionary and those used in the corpus, mainly referring to the marginal use of *po* and (*iz*)*među* in the corpus (only one example for both was found in the corpus).

Table 3 presents the distribution of the senses of *of*, and shows that when *of* is used as an adverbial prepositional phrase (and has prepositional equivalents in Serbian), it is primarily used with the idea of integration (67,00%). The separative meaning of *of* is also present (31,98%), but not as much as the integrative, while the possessive meaning is marginal (1,01%).

integrative	separative	possessive
132	63	2
67,00%	31,98%	1,01%

Table 3. Distribution of the senses of *of* (in cases it has prepositional equivalents in Serbian)

When the different senses of *of* are correlated with the translation equivalents of *of* in Serbian, the results show that the separative sense, although numerically lower (with 63 instances of prepositional equivalents) has more different prepositional equivalents (12) than the integrative sense, which is translated by 10 different prepositions. The table also shows that the first eight most frequently used prepositional equivalents in Serbian (*od, o, na, iz, za, u, s* and *među*) are used to translate both the integrative and separative sense. The remaining seven prepositions refer to one sense only: *pod* and *zbog* to the integrative, *van, po, bez* and *pre* to the separative, while *kod* refers to the possessive sense. *S* is the only prepositional equivalent that is used in all three senses.

preposition/sense	integrative	separative	possessive
od	40	17	
o	44	8	
na	23	5	
iz	4	16	
za	9	4	
u	7	4	
s	2	4	1
među	1	1	
van		1	
po		1	
bez		1	
pod	1		
zbog	1		
pre		1	
kod			1
total	132	63	2

Table 4. Distribution of the senses of *of* in corpus and their corresponding prepositional equivalents

When *of* is used in the sense of integration, it is translated by 10 different prepositions in Serbian, mostly by *o* (44 instances). *O* is used as the equivalent usually when it follows verbs and nouns of thinking, cognition and (mostly verbal) expression (*Think of that!* – *Razmislite o tome!*, ...*to think of the things* – ...*da razmišlja o stvarima*, *I know nothing of any of this.* – *Ja ništa ne znam o svemu tome.*, *I'm speaking of Columbus' egg.* – *Govorim o Kolumbovom jajetu.*, *He told of the phone calls for Paul Auster...* – *Ispričao je sve o telefonskim pozivima za Pola Oстера...*). The examples of translation with *od* are almost equal in number with *o* (40); some of them are the following: *in one of his notebooks* – *u neku od svezaka*, *eddie's of ash* – *pepeo od cigareta*, *made of air* – *načinjena od vazduha*, *each of his absurd and ludicrous*

delusions - *svaka od njegovih apsurdnih i smešnih iluzija*. The relatively high incidence of *od* and *o* within integrative sense is in accordance with their semantics: one of the meanings of *od* refers to something/someone to what something else belongs, or to an integral part of a whole, while *o* can refer to the subject of a talk, discussion or writing (as defined in *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika*). The preposition *na* in Serbian seems to exhibit behaviour similar to *o* in that it mostly occurs with verbs and nouns of cognition: *you remind me of a somesuch* – *podsećate me na nekog*, *the memory of his past* – *sećanjena prošlost*, *the idea of what lay behind him* – *misao na ono što se nalazi pred njim*, *Quinn thought of his own dead son* – *Kvin je nesmotreno pomislio na svog mrtvog sina*. *Za* likewise exhibits a pattern in translation, as *of* is translated with *za* in all the cases where it occurs with the verb *hear*, for example *I'm sure you've heard of the family*. – *Sigurna sam da ste čuliza njih*. or *Quinn had heard of cases...* – *Kvin je i ranije čuo za slučajeve...*, *Perhaps you have heard of me*. – *Možda ste čuli za mene*.

With the separative sense the distribution of Serbian equivalents is more even than it is the case with the integrative sense, which is not surprising, as “all the existing uses ...are... so weakened down as to be in themselves the expression of the vaguest and most intangible of relations” (Oxford English Dictionary). There are 17 examples with *od* and 16 with *iz*, which are in top position, because their meaning in Serbian correlates with separation: *od* is defined as referring to separation, parting, leaving, while *iz* indicates a location where something is taken from, or separation and parting. Some typical examples are *west of anything* – *zapadno od bilo čega*, *In spite of what he had been expecting of himself ...* - *Uprkos onome što je od sebe očekivao...*, *They just come out of my mouth* – *One jednostavno same izlaze iz mojih usta.*, *...to get Peter out of the hospital* – *... da Piter izade iz bolnice*. Table 4 also reveals that *iz* and *s* are the only prepositional equivalents that have more occurrences in the separative than in the dominant integrative meaning: 16:4 with *iz* and 4:2 with *s*. As expected, *s* is defined in terms of separation or parting from a surface or a location, and that is why it correlates with the separative sense of *of* in translation: *He climbed out of bed...* – *Sišao je s kreveta...*, *...has not much appearance of truth* - *...nemaju puno zajedničkogs istinom*, *... and take also of the tree...* – *...i uzbere i s drveta...*, *...sliding the bill along the surface of the counter...* - *...i svukao novčanicu s pulta...* In four cases where *of* was used in the separative sense, three of them are the fossilized *sure of* construction⁸: *Quinn could not be sure of any of it*. – *Kvin ni u šta nije mogao biti siguran.*, *...he could never be sure of any of it* - *...ni u šta nije bio siguran*, *I'm sure of it*. – *Siguran sam u to*.⁹

Finally, the third and the least prominent sense, possessive, is expressed by two examples only: *the first of the Max Work novels and writings of Herodotus*. These have been translated as *prvi od njegovih romana s Maksom Vorkom* and *kod Herodota* respectively. With the possessive sense, *of* indicates that “a thing possessed is integrated into its possessor's sphere of influence” (Lindstromberg 2010: 208), which is reflected in translation equivalents: one of the meanings of *s* refers to the object that is possessed by the main entity, while *kod* refers to an entity belonging to its possessor.

⁸This and the similar constructions (*kind/silly/stupid of*) refer to the person/object as the source of being sure, kind, silly, stupid etc. (Lindstromberg 2010: 210).

⁹Two of the examples from the corpus (*an umbrella shorn of its material* – *kišobran na rasklapanje bez platna* and *short of its punchline* – *prekinuta pre same poente*) are more related to the use of *of* in expressions of privation, ridding and emptying (Lindstromberg 2010: 211), but they are classified within the sense of separation in order to make the classification simpler.

4.2. Non-prepositional equivalents

As already presented in Table 1, the non-prepositional equivalents make the largest part of the corpus, but, as they are not the focus of the analysis in this paper, each of the subgroups will be briefly discussed and exemplified.

The zero equivalents represent the largest subgroup, with 473 examples, or 55.84%. In these cases, it is impossible to assign the meaning of *of* to any form in Serbian sentences, but they correspond at the sentential level, as the message of the English sentence has been modulated, or is not as detailed:

(1) a) *This blue was almost the same as the blue of his eyes: a milky blue that seemed to dissolve into a mixture of sky and clouds.* (15)

b) *To plavetnilo bilo je gotovo identično plavetnilu njegovih očiju mlečnoplave boje koja kao da se razlivala u mešavinu boje neba i oblaka.* (19)

The lexical-structural equivalents are present with 12.75%, or 108 examples. These equivalents represent lexical or structural transposition that compensates for the English preposition (Klégr & Markéta 2009: 3):

(2) a) *He cleared the table of the breakfast dishes, tossed the newspaper on the couch, went into the bathroom, showered, shaved, went on to the bedroom wrapped in two towels, opened the closet, and picked out his clothes for the day.* (11)

b) *Sa stola je sklonio posuđe od doručka, novine bacio na kauč, otišao u kupatilo, istuširao se, obrijao, otišao do spavaće sobe umotan u dva peškira, otvorio orman i izabrao odeću za taj dan.* (17)

The underlined structure in the above examples in the Serbian translation serves as both a lexical and structural equivalent, where *clear* is not translated as *(po)čistiti*, but as *skloniti* - by the verb that collocates with *posuđe od doručka* and does not require a prepositional complement.

Finally, the non-textual equivalents are present in the corpus with 69 instances of use, or 8.15%. In these cases, *of* has no correlate in the Serbian translation, for example:

(3) a) *Some of the tension went out of the woman.* (61)

b) *Zena postade malo manje napeta.* (59)

5. Conclusion

The final section of the paper provides conclusions based on the results obtained in the analysis. In the first part of the analysis, the general distribution of equivalents in Serbian showed unexpected results: the proportion of the prepositional and non-prepositional equivalents is 1:4. Most instances of *of* are translated with zero correspondents (55.84%), while prepositional equivalents count only for 23.26%. This is due to the fact that in Serbian it is possible to express relations not only by prepositions, but by other linguistic means which allow more flexible word order that compensates for the English preposition.

The second part of the analysis concentrates on prepositional equivalents.

The formal part of the analysis showed that their number exceeds the number of prepositional equivalents given in the dictionary: there are fifteen prepositional equivalents in the Serbian part of the corpus, while the bilingual dictionary lists only six of them, which is indicative in terms of a wide range of senses that *of* covers.

The last part of the analysis of the prepositional equivalents discusses the distribution of the different senses that *of* can assume. The aim was to establish correlation among the different senses and the prepositional equivalents referring to them. The integrative sense is represented by 132 instances and is translated by ten different prepositions in Serbian. However, the distribution of the separative sense is somewhat more interesting: there are 63 instances which are represented by 12 different prepositions, eight of them the same as those representing the integrative sense. The possessive sense occurs in only two instances, while non-prepositional equivalents occur in 650 examples in the Serbian part of the corpus. Such discrepancies in the number of prepositional (197) and non-prepositional equivalents (650) are related to differences in the two languages and require analysis in a separate paper.

The findings in the paper represent only a base for further studies and analyses. The analysis presents the qualitative and quantitative distribution of the senses of *of*, and is aimed to contribute to the area of semantics and lexicography. Moreover, the obtained results should be relevant in classroom practice as they provide a helpful material to learners of English. The paper should, therefore, help to better comprehend prepositions, not only in theoretical, but in practical aspect too, while future research should be done on a wider corpus that would offer a more detailed insight into the field of prepositions and their translation (and non-translation) equivalents.

Sources

- Auster, Paul. 2006. *The New York Trilogy*. London: Penguin Books.
 Oster, Pol. 2013. *Njujorska trilogija*. Beograd: Geopoetika izdavaštvo.

References

- Драгићевић, Рајна. 2012. „О именицама у служби предлога“. *Јужнословенски филолог*. 2012: 91-111.
 Đorđević, Radmila. 1987. *Uvod u kontrastiranje jezika*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
 Filipović, R. ed. 1990. *Englesko-hrvatski ili srpski rječnik*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga i Grafički zavod Hrvatske.
 Klajn, Ivan. 2005. *Gramatika srpskog jezika*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
 Klégr, Aleš, Markéta Malá. 2009. “English Equivalents of the Most Frequent Czech Prepositions. A Contrastive Corpus-based Study”. *5th Corpus Linguistics Conference*. University of Liverpool, UK. available at <http://www.liv.ac.uk/english/CL2009>
 Koljević, Svetozar, Đurić Paunović Ivana. 2002. *Englesko-srpski rečnik*. Prvo izdanje. Beograd: Prosveta.
 Laufer, Batia. 1997. The Lexical Plight in Second Language Reading: Words you Don't Know, Words you Think you Know, and Words you Can't Guess. In: Coady, James et al. (eds), *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition*. Cambridge/New York/Melbourne: CUP, 20-34.
 Leech, Geoffrey. 1970. *Towards a semantic description of English*. Bloomington and

- London: Indiana University Press.
- Leech, Geoffrey and Svartvik, Jan. 1975. *A Communicative Grammar of English*. Longman Singapore Publisher.
- Macková, Bc. L. 2012. *A Contrastive Analysis of the Prepositions "To" and "Into"*. (Master's Diploma Thesis) available at https://is.muni.cz/th/261212/ff_m/MA_thesis.pdf (9.6.2015.)
- Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd edition. 2009. (on CD-ROM, v. 4. 0), Oxford University Press (OED).
- Quirk, Randolph and Greenbaum, Sidney. 1976. *A University Grammar of English*. Fifth impression. Longman Publishing Group.
- Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika. I-VI*. 1967. Novi Sad: Matica srpska, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Станојчић, Живојин и Поповић, Љубомир. 1992. *Граматика српскога језика. Уџбеник за I, II, III и IV разред средње школе*. Друго, прерађено издање. Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства. Нови Сад: Завод за издавање уџбеника.
- Tyler, Andrea and Evans, Vyvyan. 2003. *The Semantics of English Prepositions. Spatial Scenes, Embodied Meaning and Cognition*. Cambridge: CUP.

Jelena Biljetina

EKVIVALENTI ENGLSKOG PREDLOGA OF U SRPSKOM JEZIKU: KONTRASTIVNA ANALIZA KORPUSA

Rezime

Rad se bavi analizom engleskog predloga *of* i njegovih prevodnih ekvivalenata dobijenih iz paralelnog korpusa. U ovoj kontrastivnoj analizi korpus se sastoji od 847 primera upotrebe predloga *of* prikupljenih iz priče Pola Oстера *The City of Glass* i njenog prevoda na srpski jezik *Grad od stakla*. Analiza se prvenstveno fokusira na predložke ekvivalente i njihovu distribuciju u srpskom jeziku, ali takođe otkriva da je u većini slučajeva engleski predlog *of* preveden drugim sredstvima, a ne predlozima. Više od dve trećine primera iz korpusa prevedeno je nultim ili leksičko strukturalnim ekvivalentima, što ukazuje na razlike u strukturi engleskog i srpskog jezika, prvenstveno one na polju padeških nastavaka, a koje u srpskom jeziku omogućavaju znatno širu mogućnost izražavanja istih odnosa. Analiza je pokazala da je broj predložkih ekvivalenata koji se javljaju u prevodu predloga *of* na srpski jezik mnogo veći od broja predloga navedenih u dvojezičnom englesko-srpskom rečniku. Osim toga, kvalitativna analiza dobijenih ekvivalenata pokazuje da najveći broj predložkih ekvivalenata predloga *of* izražava njegovu integrativnu funkciju, manji broj separativnu, a najmanji broj posesivnu funkciju. Dobijeni rezultati studije mogli bi da doprinesu polju leksikografije, ali i da posluže daljoj semantičkoj i sintaksičkoj analizi, a u cilju boljeg razumevanja predloga i u engleskom i u srpskom jeziku.

Кljučне речи: predlozi, predlog *of*, prevodni ekvivalenti, kontrastivna analiza.