https://doi.org/10.18485/belida.2022.1.ch7

Tijana Vesić Pavlović*
University of Belgrade, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering

Milena Jakić Šimšić
Institute for the Serbian Language of SASA, Belgrade

THE EFFECT OF CONTEXT ON THE (A)SYMMETRY OF SERBIAN ADJECTIVE ANTONYMS

Abstract

The paper deals with the symmetry of antonymic relationships of 22 polysemous Serbian adjectives, i.e. 11 posited antonym pairs, when their specific senses (primary, secondary concrete, secondary abstract) are activated within the context of a sentence or a phrase. We use data from two empirical studies conducted with participants who had the task to replace the adjective in a sentence or a phrase with its antonym. It is shown that, in both tasks, the existence and level of symmetry in terms of mutual elicitation and strength of associative relationship depends on the context in which the adjective is activated.

Key words: antonymy, adjectives, Serbian language, symmetry, sentence context, phrase context

* tvesic@mas.bg.ac.rs
milena.jakic@isj.sanu.ac.rs

1. Introduction

Although antonymy is a well-investigated linguistic phenomenon, various debates are still raised as to the nature of the antonymic relationship and the features which a lexeme should possess to be subsumed under the term antonym. Two major approaches to defining antonymy have been outlined in the pertinent literature. One states that antonymy should be treated as a lexical-categorical relation, while the other, the cognitive prototype approach, treats it as a conceptual relation (Storjohann 2016). The latter approach emphasises the role of context, arguing that antonymy is a category which exhibits prototypicality effects, involving a continuum with good and less good representatives (e.g. Kostić 2016, Paradis et al. 2009).

The behaviour of antonymous pairs across contexts has been discussed in previous studies. Namely, some antonym pairs tend to be more strongly connected and hence are regarded as better opposites than others (Storjohann 2016). An important issue relates to the existence of polysemy and the possibility for an antonym relation to hold for all senses of antonyms. Rasulić (2016: 178) underlines that "antonymy relates particular, not necessarily all senses of one lexeme to another", further drawing attention to the fact that, frequently, there are"asymmetries in the extended senses of the two members of an antonym pair", since one member of the pair commonly has "richer semantic extensions than the other" (Rasulić 2016: 180).

In this paper, we deal with the symmetry of antonymic relationships of polysemous Serbian adjectives when they are used in different contexts, that is, when their specific senses are activated in an empirical task with sentences and phrases as stimuli. We focus on 11 posited antonym pairs from the perspective of their lexicographically defined primary meaning, with the aim of exploring whether the posited opposition is stable across different contexts, that is, the three selected adjective senses and in two different types of tasks.

The paper is organised as follows. In the second section, we dwell on the findings of previous studies related to antonym symmetry and dependence on context. Then we proceed with specifying the aim

of the paper in the third section and describing the materials and methods used in the study in the fourth section. The fifth presents the findings of the research, while the final section elaborates on the results and offers concluding remarks.

2. Theoretical considerations

J. Deese (1964) was the first to argue and empirically demonstrate that mutual elicitation of words in a free association task may serve as a strong indicator of antonymy. Evidence shows that some antonym pairs tend to be stable across word senses, while other pairs do not (Murphy 2003: 33); hence, according to Murphy (2003: 34), stability of some antonym pairs across senses and contexts serves as good evidence that those are canonical antonyms. The issue of antonym symmetry has been raised often due to its relevance in lexicography, and pertinent studies have shown that the lexicographic treatment of antonyms differs, implying that different dictionaries employ different approaches to this issue (Jakić 2015; Paradis & Willners 2007; Šarić 1994).

The strength of the relationship of antonyms in a pair has been attested through another phenomenon. If one member in an antonym pair acquires a new sense, the other member may also develop a similar sense, i.e. their original opposition may remain in the new domain (Paradis et al. 2009: 415). Rasulić (2020) analysed corpus instances of occurrence of 10 pairs of English canonical antonyms (*high/low*, *long/short*, *broad/narrow*, *deep/shallow*, *thick/thin*, *heavy/light*, *hard/soft*, *large/small*, *fast/slow*, *hot/cold*) in their semantic extension to investigate the potential of antonymy for dynamic meaning construal. She found that, in semantically creative instances of antonym use, antonym relations can be projected so that in the other adjective in the pair, an extended sense is activated, referred to as 'dormant sense' (Rasulić 2020: 147) (e.g. *high priest – low priest* (dormant sense); *cold statistics – hot statistics*); this projection is induced by context (Rasulić 2020: 149).

Various authors have pointed to the importance of context for the phenomenon of antonymy. M. L. Murphy argues that antonym variability may lead us to conclude that "antonymy relates senses or word uses rather than relating the words themselves" (Murphy 2003: 34). G. Murphy and Andrew (1993) empirically explored whether different contexts, e.g. different nouns used with adjectives, elicited different antonyms. Fourteen English adjectives were shown to respondents in isolation and in the context of a noun (*dry* vs. *dry wine*, *dry cake*). Respondents' task was to first provide an antonym when the adjective was given in isolation and then when it was paired with nouns. It was shown that the elicited antonyms differed depending on the presence or absence of context. Deignan (1999) used corpus data to investigate whether the antonymy relation between adjective pairs such as *hot/cold* or *warm/cool* in literal senses holds in metaphorical senses. She found that these adjectives were relatively rarely used as antonyms in metaphorical senses. In a corpus-based study, Rasulić (2004) also established that the antonymous relationship holding between the literal senses of adjective pairs *high/low* and *visok/nizak* may not be replicated in their metaphorical senses. In the empirical research by Jakić Šimšić and Vesić Pavlović (2020) on 22 Serbian adjectives shown to respondents in their three senses within a sentence, it was found that different senses (primary, secondary concrete, secondary abstract) affected the number of antonyms given by respondents in an elicitation task.

In empirical tasks, context plays a significant role in mutual elicitation of antonyms; namely, "the less contextually constrained the pairings are, the more strongly they will elicit one another in context-free elicitation experiments" (Paradis et al. 2009: 415). The results of a previous empirical study on 394 adjectives of Serbian language (Jakić Šimšić 2021), shown to respondents without any context, indicate that certain adjective pairs exhibit a strong degree of symmetry while in others the level of symmetry is quite low, possibly due to the existence of alternative lexemes with similar meaning in the linguistic system which may serve as more appropriate antonyms. It is argued that different factors influence antonym pair asymmetry

in isolation, such as the number of adjective meanings (polysemy), meaning probability, the existence of alternative lexemes with the same or similar meaning (synonyms, near synonyms) etc. Some authors propose that markedness may also play an important role in the strength of associative relationship between antonyms so that the marked member of an antonymous pair may elicit the other member much more frequently than the reverse (e.g. *crn* elicits *beo* much more frequently than *beo* elicits *crn*; Todić 2016: 99).

3. Research aim

Bearing in mind the results of previous studies on the importance of context for antonymy, we wish to empirically investigate the effect of context on adjective antonym symmetry in Serbian.Under antonym symmetry, in this paper we imply the strength of the associative relationship between the members of the antonym pair in both directions (Jakić Šimšić 2021). As for the notion of context, it should be borne in mind that, in this study, it refers to different senses in which the adjective was activated, but also to different contexts in which the adjective was shown to respondents, i.e. the sentence and phrase context.

The aim of the research is: (1) to determine whether the given adjectives reciprocally elicit each other in each of the investigated contexts (primary, secondary concrete, secondary abstract sense); (2) to establish whether the strength of symmetry varies depending on the sense in which the adjective is activated and (3) to compare the results obtained in two separate tasks – one, where adjectives were activated within a sentence and the other, where adjectives were activated within a phrase.

4. Materials and Methods

We analyse 22 polysemous Serbian adjectives, i.e. 11 pairs from the perspective of their primary meaning: *pun – prazan* [full – empty],

širok – uzak [wide – narrow], *dubok – plitak* [deep – shallow], *čist – prljav* [clean – dirty], *lak – težak* [light – heavy], *veliki – mali* [big – small], *gust – redak* [thick – thin], *topao – hladan* [warm – cold], *visok – nizak* [tall – short], *dug – kratak* [long – short] and *brz – spor* [fast – slow]. Three senses were selected for each adjective relying on the referent dictionary of Serbian (RSJ 2007): primary, secondary concrete, and secondary abstract sense. Since some of the selected adjectives did not have the listed secondary concrete or abstract sense in the used referent dictionary, this yielded 62 senses in total[1].

Based on the descriptions of the senses extracted from the dictionary, we constructed sentences and phrases which served as stimuli in two empirical studies with native speakers of Serbian[2]. They were instructed to replace the underlined adjective in a sentence or a phrase with its antonym.

For Task 1, we constructed stimuli in which the given adjectives were used in a sentence which activated one of the senses (e.g. *Kamen je upao u dubok bunar*. [A stone fell into a deep well]; *Trčali su po dubokom snegu*. [They were running through deep snow]; *Znali su malo o dubokoj prošlosti*. [They knew little about the deep past])[3]. Participants in Task 1 were native speakers of Serbian (N=81), first-year psychology students of the University of Belgrade. There were 82.7% female and 17.3% male respondents in the sample. Mean age of respondents in the first sample was 20 (M=20.43, SD=4.94).

For Task 2, based on the same adjective senses extracted from the dictionary, we constructed phrases in which the adjective was used in a particular context – primary sense: *dubok bunar* [a deep well], secondary concrete: *dubok sneg* [deep snow] and secondary abstract:

[1] This pertains to the adjectives *uzak*, *prljav* and *hladan*, for which we had no secondary concrete sense, and the adjective *slow*, with no secondary abstract sense.

[2] A detailed account of the process of selection of adjective senses from the RSJ dictionary can be found in Jakić Šimšić and Vesić Pavlović 2020 (59–61).

[3] For the full list of sentence stimuli, see Appendix 1.

duboka prošlost [the deep past][4]. Phrases served as stimuli in the second empirical study conducted on the second sample. Participants in this task were native speakers of Serbian (N=59) belonging to general population. The gender structure of this sample included 64.4% female and 35.6% male respondents, with the mean age of 34.6 (M=34.59, SD=17.88).

In data analysis, we performed the following steps. First, based on the collected data, we established a list of antonyms stated as dominant by the respondents in both tasks and calculated the percentage in which the dominant antonym was stated by the respondents in both tasks. Second, we singled out the cases in which adjectives from the posited pairs mutually elicited each other, as well as those in which elicitation was not reciprocal. In the next step, we calculated the difference between the stated percentages in cases where symmetry was recorded to establish the strength of symmetry (relying on methodology implemented in the previous study by Jakić Šimšić 2021). Finally, we compared the results obtained in two tasks with the aim of investigating the relevance of context in which the adjective was used (primary, secondary concrete, secondary abstract sense) and the effect of the type of task (sentence-stimuli vs. phrase-stimuli) on the occurrence of antonym symmetry or asymmetry in the collected data.

5. Results

The obtained findings are presented in tables which contain the percentage in which the dominant antonym was stated by the participants and an additional column in which we calculated the difference between the percentages in which dominant antonyms were stated for both adjectives in cases where symmetry was recorded.

[4] For the full list of phrase stimuli, see Appendix 2.

5.1. *Antonym symmetry when the adjective is used in its primary sense*

When the adjective is activated in its primary sense in a sentence, symmetry is recorded in all posited pairs but one (*dug – kratak*). The adjective *dug* elicited the antonym *kratak* in 100% of cases, but *kratak* dominantly elicited the antonym *dugačak* (71.6%). Still, this may be viewed as seeming asymmetry since *dug* and *dugačak* may be regarded as forms of the same adjective. The percentage in which the dominant antonym was stated by respondents is very high and it ranges from 100% to 83.9% (Table 1).

Table 1: Antonym symmetry when the adjective is activated in primary sense in a sentence

Stimulus (X)	Dominant antonym (Y)	(%)	Stimulus (Y)	Dominant antonym (X)	(%)	Difference
dubok	plitak	100	*plitak*	dubok	100	0
pun	prazan	100	*prazan*	pun	100	0
čist	prljav	100	*prljav*	čist	98.8	1.2
brz	spor	96.3	*spor*	brz	93.8	2.5
uzak	širok	96.3	*širok*	uzak	93.8	2.5
nizak	visok	100	*visok*	nizak	96.3	3.7
veliki	mali	98.8	*mali*	veliki	93.8	5
lak	težak	100	*težak*	lak	91.3	8.7
topao	hladan	98.8	*hladan*	topao	88.9	9.9
redak	gust	98.8	*gust*	redak	83.9	14.9

In the case of activating the adjective in its primary sense in a phrase, we obtain similar results as in the above-case (Table 2). There is symmetry is all pairs but one (*dug – kratak*; the dominant antonym given for the adjective *kratak* is again *dugačak*). The percentage in which the dominant antonym was stated is also high, ranging from 100% to 74.9%.

Table 2: Antonym symmetry when the adjective is activated in primary sense in a phrase

Stimulus (X)	Dominant antonym (Y)	(%)	Stimulus (Y)	Dominant antonym (X)	(%)	Difference
veliki	mali	93.2	*mali*	veliki	94.8	1.6
pun	prazan	98.3	*prazan*	pun	100	1.7
uzak	širok	96.6	*širok*	uzak	94.9	1.7
nizak	visok	98.3	*visok*	nizak	96.6	1.7
čist	prljav	96.6	*prljav*	čist	100	3.4
dubok	plitak	94.9	*plitak*	dubok	100	5.1
topao	hladan	96.6	*hladan*	topao	86.4	10.2
lak	težak	94.9	*težak*	lak	83	11.9
brz	spor	98.3	*spor*	brz	84.7	13.6
redak	gust	96.6	*gust*	redak	74.9	21.7

5.2. *Antonym symmetry when the adjective is used in its secondary concrete sense*

When the adjective is used in the secondary concrete sense in a sentence, there is symmetry in all of the pairs (Table 3)[5]. The percentage in which adjectives were mutually elicited ranges from 100% to 55.5%.

[5] Still, bearing in mind that there were three adjectives without the secondary concrete sense, as mentioned earlier.

Table 3: Antonym symmetry when the adjective is activated in secondary concrete sense in a sentence

Stimulus (X)	Dominant antonym (Y)	(%)	Stimulus (Y)	Dominant antonym (X)	(%)	Difference
spor	brz	100	*brz*	spor	98.8	1.2
pun	prazan	95	*prazan*	pun	97.5	2.5
težak	lak	79	*lak*	težak	81.5	2.5
mali	veliki	100	*veliki*	mali	96.3	3.7
nizak	visok	98.8	*visok*	nizak	91.3	7.5
redak	gust	100	*gust*	redak	83.9	16.1
plitak	dubok	98.8	*dubok*	plitak	82.7	16.1
dug	kratak	100	*kratak*	dug	55.5	44.5

Similar to the above case, when the secondary concrete sense is activated in a phrase, there is symmetry in all of the pairs (Table 4). The percentage in which adjectives were mutually elicited ranges from 100% to 71.2%.

Table 4: Antonym symmetry when the adjective is activated in secondary concrete sense in a phrase

Stimulus (X)	Dominant antonym (Y)	(%)	Stimulus (Y)	Dominant antonym (X)	(%)	Difference
spor	brz	91.5	*brz*	spor	89.8	1.6
težak	lak	74.6	*lak*	težak	71.2	3.4
mali	veliki	100	*veliki*	mali	96.6	3.4
nizak	visok	100	*visok*	nizak	94.9	5.1
pun	prazan	98.3	*prazan*	pun	91.5	6.8
redak	gust	94.9	*gust*	redak	83	11.9
dug	kratak	98.3	*kratak*	dug	78	20.3
plitak	dubok	100	*dubok*	plitak	78	22

5.3. Antonym symmetry when the adjective is used in its secondary abstract sense

When the adjective is activated in its secondary abstract sense in a sentence, symmetry is recorded in one half of pairs, with the percentage in which the dominant antonym was stated ranging from 91.3% to 46.9% (Table 5).

Table 5: Antonym symmetry when the adjective is activated in secondary abstract sense in a sentence

Stimulus (X)	Dominant antonym (Y)	(%)	Stimulus (Y)	Dominant antonym (X)	(%)	Difference
mali	veliki	90.1	*veliki*	mali	82.7	7.4
prljav	čist	53	*čist*	prljav	64.2	11.2
težak	lak	88.9	*lak*	težak	76.5	12.4
dug	kratak	91.3	*kratak*	dug	77.8	13.5
topao	hladan	88.9	*hladan*	topao	46.9	42

There are five pairs in which there is no symmetry, with two subcases:

(1) one adjective elicits the other from the posited lexical antonym pair in varying percent, but the second does not (Table 6).

Table 6: Antonym asymmetry when the adjective is activated in secondary abstract sense in a sentence (subcase 1)

Stimulus (X)	Dominant antonym (Y)	(%)	Stimulus (Y)	Dominant antonym (Z)	(%)
nizak	visok	87.6	*visok*	**dubok**	59.2
plitak	dubok	49.4	*dubok*	**blizak**	38.3
uzak	širok	95	*širok*	**kratak**	43.2

(2) both adjectives from the pair elicit other adjectives as antonyms, i.e. not the ones posited as members of the lexical antonym pairs (Table 7).

Table 7: Antonym asymmetry when the adjective is activated in secondary abstract sense in a sentence (subcase 2)

Stimulus (X)	**Dominant antonym (Z)**	(%)	**Stimulus (Y)**	**Dominant antonym (W)**	(%)
pun	**tih**	18.5	*prazan*	**značajan**	33.3
redak	**čest**	70.4	*gust*	**opušten**	21

When the adjective is activated in its secondary abstract sense within a phrase, there are 8 pairs in which symmetry is recorded, which is a difference compared to the case in which the adjective is activated in the same sense within a sentence (Table 8). The percentage in which the dominant antonym is stated is fairly similar to that of the first task and ranges from 95% to 30.5%.

Table 8: Antonym symmetry when the adjective is activated in secondary abstract sense in a phrase

Stimulus (X)	**Dominant antonym (Y)**	(%)	**Stimulus (Y)**	**Dominant antonym (X)**	(%)	**Difference**
prljav	čist	64.4	*čist*	prljav	64.4	0
pun	prazan	30.5	*prazan*	pun	33.9	3.4
težak	lak	91.5	*lak*	težak	79.7	11.8
dug	kratak	88.1	*kratak*	dug	72.9	15.2
mali	veliki	88.1	*veliki*	mali	72.8	15.3
topao	hladan	93.2	*hladan*	topao	57.6	35.6
nizak	visok	84.7	*visok*	nizak	49.1	35.6
uzak	širok	95	*širok*	uzak	52.5	42.5

Consequently, there are fewer posited adjective pairs that do not exhibit symmetry compared to the case in which the adjective is activated in this sense in a sentence; there are two pairs in which there is no symmetry (Table 9). If we compare these findings with those in the task with sentences as stimuli, it can be observed that all five pairs in which symmetry was present in the sentence-stimuli task also prove to be symmetrical in the task with phrases as stimuli. Two pairs in which there is asymmetry in the phrase-stimuli task also showed asymmetry in the sentence-stimuli task.

Table 9: Antonym asymmetry when the adjective is activated in secondary abstract sense in a phrase

Stimulus (X)	**Dominant antonym (Y)**	(%)	**Stimulus (Y)**	**Dominant antonym (Z)**	(%)
plitak	dubok	47.5	*dubok*	**blizak**	22
gust	redak	32.2	*redak*	**čest**	64.4

To summarise the above-presented findings: in the case of activating their primary sense, a vast majority of adjectives within the posited pairs reciprocally elicit each other in both the sentence context and phrase context, i.e. the results show existence of symmetry in 10 adjective pairs, while the case of the antonym pair *dug – kratak* may be deemed as only seeming asymmetry. When the adjective is used in the secondary concrete sense, whether in a sentence or a phrase, there is symmetry in all 8 posited pairs. Finally, when the adjective is used in the secondary abstract sense, there are some differences, depending on whether it is activated in a sentence or a phrase. Symmetry was found in 5 out of 10 pairs in the case when sentences were used as stimuli, and in 8 pairs out of 10 when phrases were used as stimuli.

Now we proceed with a discussion on the differences in the percentage in which the dominant antonym was stated by the respondents in two members of the pair, which may serve as an indicator of the strength of symmetry in the posited antonymous pairs. If the difference is low, this implies that the adjectives were

mutually elicited in a similar percent, which points to a relatively stable symmetry between them.We will draw on the data on the calculated difference, presented in the final column of Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8, i.e. all the tables which contain adjective pairs in which symmetry was found.We interpret the strength of symmetry through three levels of symmetry: high (up to 5% difference), medium (between 5.1 and 16.1) and low symmetry (16.2 onwards).

In the case of activating the adjective in primary sense in the sentence context (Table 1), we can see that the level of symmetry is dominantly high (7 pairs), followed by medium (3 pairs). Results are similar in the phrase context (Table 2): high level of symmetry in 6 pairs, followed by medium (3 pairs) and low (1). When the adjective is used in secondary concrete sense in the sentence context (Table 3), the level of symmetry is again dominantly high (5 pairs), followed by medium (2 pairs) and low (1 pair); the results are almost the same when the adjective is activated in the phrase context (Table 4): high (5 pairs), medium (1 pair) and low (2 pairs). Finally, when we activate the adjective in the secondary abstract sense within a sentence (Table 5), symmetry ranges from medium (4 pairs) to low (1 pair). The results are slightly different when this adjective sense is activated within a phrase (Table 8): all three levels of symmetry are present, high symmetry in 2 pairs, medium in 3 pairs and low in 3 pairs. Although the number of pairs in which symmetry is present is bigger in this task compared to the task with sentence-stimuli, we can see that the level of symmetry is mostly medium and low.

6. Concluding remarks

The focus of our paper was to explore the effect of context on the preservation of symmetry in antonymous adjective pairs in Serbian, relying on the data from two empirical studies. The obtained findings point towards a significant and diverse role of context with this respect.

First of all, the number of pairs that exhibit symmetry is overall the highest when the adjectives are activated in primary and secondary

concrete senses, while a lower number of pairs exhibit symmetry in the secondary abstract senses. This applies to both specific contexts in which antonyms were shown, sentence-stimuli and phrase-stimuli.

In the cases where asymmetry was recorded, there are some differences between two tasks. In the task using sentence-stimuli, there are cases of asymmetry where mutual elicitation occurs in one direction and cases where it does not occur at all. It may be argued that the reasons behind this kind of asymmetry predominantly lie in the absence of the corresponding sense in one of the adjectives posited as pair members or in both adjectives (*Otpevala je to punim glasom*. [She sang this in full voice.] vs. **Otpevala je to praznim glasom*. [She sang this in empty voice.] or *To su prazne reči*. [These are empty words.] vs. **To su pune reči*. [These are full words.]). That is why, in these cases, respondents in Task 1 dominantly stated antonyms *tih* (*Otpevala je to tihim glasom*. [She sang this in silent voice.]) and *značajan* (*To su značajne reči*. [These are significant words.]). Still, it is possible that, if the context in which the adjective is shown is morenarrow, the preservation of the original opposition seems like a viable option, which is shown by the answers of the respondents from Task 2 related to this same adjective pair. Namely, the dominant antonym in the respondents' answers for this pair was *pun glas* – **prazan glas*, *prazne reči* – **pune reči*, although there is no mention of these senses in the referent dictionary. However, for some other adjective pairs, respondents in both tasks, i.e. regardless of whether the adjective was shown in the context of a sentence or a phrase, chose the same antonyms which did not preserve the original symmetry (e.g. sentence-stimulus: *Znali su malo o dubokoj prošlosti*, phrase-stimulus: *duboka prošlost* – in both cases, the dominantly stated antonym was *blizak*[close]).

Another issue that was discussed is whether the strength of symmetry, expressed through the difference in which both antonyms were elicited, varies depending on the activated adjective sense. When using the adjective in primary sense, the level of symmetry is dominantly high in both tasks; the same holds in the case of secondary abstract sense, but in both tasks there appear cases of medium and

low symmetry as well. Finally, when it comes to secondary abstract sense, the level of symmetry is dominantly medium and low, with a slight difference in the task with phrases as stimuli, where two cases of high symmetry also occur. Hence, it is inferred that the associative relationship in these pairs is the strongest when the adjective is activated in the primary sense, slightly drops when the secondary concrete sense is activated, and is the lowest in the secondary abstract sense.This holds for both tasks.

Based on the results, it may be argued that context, in terms of different senses of an adjective, has an effect on adjective antonym symmetry. The effect of the context in which the adjective is shown to respondents, whether it is a sentence (a wider context) or a phrase (a narrower context), remains an open issue, which deserves further research attention in future. Another open issue is a possibility that, in some cases, a strong antonymous relationship between the pair members established in their primary meanings may lead the respondents to assume that the symmetrical relationship holds in the cases where the referent dictionary does not mention a corresponding sense of the other pair member at all. The possibility of the aforementioned dynamic meaning construction in this type of empirical tasks also deserves to be explored in more detail.

The findings of the study may bear practical relevance for lexicographers, for instance, to include specific qualifiers when stating an antonym for a given word which would explain whether it refers to all senses of the word or a specific sense only. Still, the presented research results are significantly limited by a small number of adjective pairs used and a restricted number of their senses. Hence, future studies should focus on the effect of context on antonym symmetry using larger sets of adjectives and various classes of polysemous adjectives, which would be activated in a variety of contexts. Additionally, a more precise methodology for investigating antonym symmetry in different contexts should be developed, combining different measures used to assess symmetry, so as to yield more reliable findings.

References

Deese, J. (1964). The Associative Structure of Some Common English Adjectives. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour*, 3(5): 347–357.

Deignan, A (1999). Metaphorical polysemy and paradigmatic relations: A corpus study. *Word*50(3): 319–338.

Jakić, M. (2015). Formalno označavanje antonimije u Rečniku SANU. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* LVIII(1): 155–178.

Jakić Šimšić, M. and T. Vesić Pavlović (2020). Značenjska suprotnost prideva srpskog jezika u rečeničnom kontekstu. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* LXIII(2): 55–74.

Jakić Šimšić, M. (2021). Simetrija antonimske veze prideva srpskog jezika u testu kontrolisanih asocijacija. *Naš jezik* LII(1): 45–61.

Kostić, N. (2016). On conceptual nature of antonymy: Evidence from corpus-based investigations. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, Spring, 175–188.

Murphy, G. and J. Andrew (1993). The conceptual basis of antonymy and synonymy in adjectives. *Journal of Memory and Language*32(3): 301–319.

Murphy, M. L. (2003). *Semantic relations and the lexicon: Antonymy, synonymy and other paradigms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paradis, C. and C. Willners (2007). Antonyms in dictionary entries: methodological aspects. *Studia Linguistica* 61(3): 261–277.

Paradis, C., C. Willners and S. Jones (2009). Good and bad opposites. Using textual and experimental techniques to measure antonym canonicity. *The Mental Lexicon* 4(3): 380–429.

Rasulić, K. (2004). *Jezik i prostorno iskustvo: Konceptualizacija vertikalne dimenzije u engleskom i srpskohrvatskom jeziku*. Beograd: Filološki fakultet.

Rasulić, K. (2016). *Exploring Semantic Relations*. Beograd: Filološki fakultet.

Rasulić, K. (2020). High Expectations and Low Blows: Antonymy and Dynamic Meaning Construction. *Belgrade English Language and Literature Studies*, 12 (1): 137–161.

RSJ: Rečnik srpskoga jezika. Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 2007.

Šarić, Lj. (1994). Antonimija u strukturi jednojezičnih rječnika. *Filologija* 22–23: 269–274.

Storjohann, P. (2016). Sense relations. In: *The Routledge Handbook of Semantics* (N. Riemer, ed.), New York: Routledge, 248–265.

Todić, B. (2016). Priroda asocijativne veze antonima, *Naš je*zik XLVII/3–4: 89–103.

Тияна Весич Павлович и Милена Якич Шимшич

ЭФФЕКТ КОНТЕКСТА НА (А)СИММЕТРИЮ ПРИЛАГАТЕЛЬНЫХ-АНТОНИМОВ В СЕРБСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

Р е з ю м е

Данная работа исследует антонимическое отношение 22 полисемичных сербских прилагательных, т. е. 11 пар прилагательных-антонимов из перспективы первичного значения, когда три их значения (первичное, вторичное и вторичное отвлеченное) активируются в задании в рамках предложения или словосочетания. Мы опираемся на данные двух эмпирических исследований, в которых респонденты, носители языка, имели задание привести антоним к подчеркнутому прилагательному, активированному в соответствующем значении в предложении или словосочетании. Работа преследует следующие цели: (1) установить, возникает ли взаимная элицитация прилагательных в рамках данных пар в любом из активированных значений, (2) установить, варьирует ли степень антонимичности в зависимости от значения, в котором прилагательное активировано и (3) сравнить полученные результаты в двух заданиях – первом, в котором прилагательные активированы в предложении, и другом, в котором прилагательные активированы в словосочетании. Когда прилагательные активируются в первичном и вторичном конкретных значениях, несмотря на тип задания, оказывается, что симметрия имеется во всех анализируемых парах. Однако, когда прилагательное активируется во вторичном отвлеченном значении, количество пар, у которых симметрия наблюдается, уменьшается в обоих заданиях. В задании, в котором стимулами были предложения, симметрия возникает в половине пар; в случаях асимметрии различаем две ситуации: одна, в которой одно прилагательное вызывает в разном проценте другой элемент пары, но другое не вызывает (напр. *nizak* – visok, но *visok* – dubok), и другая ситуация, когда оба прилагательных, составляющих пару, вызывают другие прилагательные в качестве антонимов (напр. *pun* – tih, *prazan* – značajan). В задании со стимулами-словосочетаниями, количество пар, в которых наблюдается симметрия, – меньше, чем в случае задания со стимулами-предложениями. Когда прилагательные активируются в первичном и вторичном конкретных значениях, степень антонимичности – высокая в обоих заданиях, в то время как во вторичном отвлеченном значении уровень симметрии несколько различается в зависимости от типа задания. В заключении мы коснемся роли контекста в поддержании симметрии антонимической пары и продискутируем о возможных причинах наблюдаемой симметрии.

Ключевые слова: антонимия, прилагательные, сербский язык, контекст предложения, контекст словосочетания

APPENDIX 1
THE LIST OF SENTENCES USED AS STIMULI IN TASK 1.

1. Stela je brz konj.
2. Na poslu su bili baš brzi.
3. Pomoć davljenicima bila je veoma brza.
4. Došao je u veliku šumu.
5. Ove cipele su mi velike.
6. Njagovo znanje je veliko.
7. Eno ga onaj visoki momak.
8. Kroz oblake se videlo visoko sunce.
9. Čuo je njen visoki glas.
10. Pili su gusto južno vino.
11. Na horizontu se pojavio gust dim.
12. Situacija je bila prilično gusta.
13. Kamen je upao u dubok bunar.
14. Trčali su po dubokom snegu.
15. Znali su malo o dubokoj prošlosti.
16. Više volim dugu kosu.
17. Haljina mi je duga.
18. Izmorila ga je duga bolest.
19. Imao je kratak rep.
20. Ovi rukavi su mi kratki.
21. Nastade kratka tišina.
22. Podigla je svoj laki kofer.
32. Ovde je reka prilično plitka.
33. To je zbog njegove plitke pameti.
34. Na stolu je bila prazna kesa.
35. Poslali su prazan kamion.
36. To su prazne reči.
37. U kesi su prljave košulje.
38. Bavio se samo prljavim poslovima..
39. Uzeo je punu čašu.
40. Sve sobe su pune.
41. Otpevala je to punim glasom.
42. Prošao je prstima kroz svoju retku bradu.
43. Kroz retku maglu nazirale su se kuće.
44. Njegov deda bio je redak junak u ratu.
45. Tako je spor u pokretima.
46. U gradu je često spora vožnja.
47. Ugledao je teško kamenje.
48. Bila je u haljini od teške svile.
49. Igrao je uvek teške uloge.
50. Popila je toplo mleko.
51. Uzmi ovu toplu haljinu.
52. Posmatrao ju je toplim pogledom.
53. Provela nas je kroz uzak hodnik.

23. Hodao je u kaputu od lakog štofa.
24. Išao je lakim korakom.
25. Sedeo je u svojoj maloj sobi.
26. Sve reči pisao je malim slovima.
27. To je čovek male pameti.
28. Ne voli niske devojke.
29. U sobi je bio veoma nizak plafon.
30. Doveo mi je snaju niskog roda.
31. Obuo je plitke cipele.
54. Velika književnost nije za uzak krug čitalaca.
55. Pila je hladnu limunadu.
56. Tako je hladan prema meni.
57. Pored stola su čiste čarape.
58. Pogledala je u čisto nebo.
59. Imali su čist obraz.
60. Imao je široka ramena.
61. Iz hodnika se ulazi u široku prostoriju.
62. Usledila je široka debata.

APPENDIX 2
THE LIST OF PHRASES USED AS STIMULI IN TASK 2.

1. brz konj
2. brz na poslu
3. brza pomoć
4. velika šuma
5. velike cipele
6. veliko znanje
7. visoki momak
8. visoko sunce
9. visoki glas
10. gusto vino
11. gust dim
12. gusta situacija
13. dubok bunar
14. dubok sneg
15. duboka prošlost
16. duga kosa
32. plitka reka
33. plitka pamet
34. prazna kesa
35. prazan kamion
36. prazne reči
37. prljava košulja
38. prljavi poslovi
39. puna čaša
40. puna soba
41. pun glas
42. retka brada
43. retka magla
44. redak junak
45. spor u pokretima
46. spora vožnjavvv
47. težak kamen

17. duga haljina
18. duga bolest
19. kratak rep
20. kratki rukavi
21. kratka tišina
22. lak kofer
23. kaput od lakog štofa
24. lak korak
25. mala soba
26. malo slovo
27. mala pamet
28. niska devojka
29. nizak plafon
30. snaja niskog roda
31. plitke cipele
48. teška svila
49. teška uloga
50. toplo mleko
51. topla haljina
52. topao pogled
53. uzak hodnik
54. uzak krug čitalaca
55. hladna limunada
56. hladan čovek (prema nekome)
57. čiste čarape
58. čisto nebo
59. čist obraz
60. široka ramena
61. široka prostorija
62. široka debata