

Univerzitet u Sarajevu

Filozofski fakultet

Odsjek za anglistiku

Završni magistarski rad

Componential analysis of literary meaning in *The Caretaker* by Harold Pinter

**Komponencijalna analiza značenja u književnom tekstu na primjeru drame *The Caretaker*
Harolda Pintera**

Student:

Amra Ajanović

Mentor:

Prof. dr. Selma Đuliman

Sarajevo, 2023

Tati i mami, koji su uvijek vjerovali u mene.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	6
2. Corpus	7
2.1. <i>About author</i>	7
2.2. <i>The Caretaker</i>	9
2.3. <i>The Theatre of Absurd</i>	13
3. The meaning of meaning	15
3.1. <i>Figurative meaning of language</i>	20
4. Componential analysis	21
4.1. <i>Semic analysis</i>	22
4.2. <i>Componential analysis of literary meaning</i>	24
4.3. <i>Metaphors</i>	25
5. Componential analysis of adverbs and adjectives	27
5.1. <i>Componential analysis of adverbs</i>	27
5.2. <i>Componential analysis of adjectives</i>	34
5.3. <i>Componential analysis of intensifiers</i>	43
6. Conclusion	48
References	49

Abstract

Even though it has been quite a young part of linguistics, componential analysis has found its place since the middle of the previous century. It is used to help us understand deeper meaning of a particular word or lexeme. This thesis focuses on componential analysis of adverbs and adjectives in an example of Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker*, as well as seeing whether it can actually help us to gain deeper meaning of the word and context. The first part of this work will cover the historical background and development of componential analysis in the United States and Europe, as well as corpus review. Second part of this work will focus on corpus analysis, i.e. componential analysis of adjectives and adverbs. Besides, while analysing and discussing corpus, we will try to answer the main questions, which are: whether componential analysis can help us in gaining deeper meaning of particular semantic relations and whether componential analysis can be helpful in translating these relations into B/C/S?

Keywords: componential analysis, adjectives, adverbs

Sažetak

Iako je poprilično nova grana, komponencijalna analiza je uspjela da se izbori za svoje mjesto u polju lingvistike još sredinom prošlog stoljeća. Njena svrha je bila da nam pomogne da razumijemo dublja značenja datih riječi i leksema. Sam rad se fokusira na komponencijalnoj analizi priloga i pridjeva na primjeru drame Harolda Pintera *The Caretaker*. Isto tako, za cilj ima da nam pokaže da li nam komponencijalna analiza može pomoći prilikom shvatanja dubljeg značenja pojedinih riječi, ali i konteksta. Prvi dio ovog rada će pokriti historijski pregled i razvoj komponencijalne analize u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama i Evropu, kao i pregled korpusa. Drugi dio će se fokusirati na samu analizu korpusa, tj. komponencijalnu analizu pridjeva i priloga. Pored toga, uz analizu i diskusiju o samom korpusu, pokušat ćemo odgovoriti na glavna pitanja ovog rada, a to su: da li nam komponencijalna analiza može pomoći pri shvatanju dubljih značenja datih semantičkih odnosa i na koji način su semantička polja realizirana u prevodu na B/H/S?

Ključne riječi: komponencijalna analiza, pridjevi, prilozi

1. Introduction

Even though componential analysis has been quite new part of linguistics, it has been shown that linguists used it to help them gain deeper meaning. Based on the knowledge and experience people have, they saw world differently, hence, the meaning of particular expressions was different. In the 1950s and 1960s, linguists realised that they need a tool which would help them understand and gain deeper meaning of those expressions. Many linguists tried to find something that could help them reduce complex meaning into a simpler one, but the first person who actually did it and started discussing componential analysis was Louis Hjelmslev (Zhang, 2003). However, at the time, componential analysis was only represented in the United States. Nevertheless, more linguists around Europe, such as Geoffrey Leech and Francois Rastier, believed that componential analysis should be spread all over Europe. Therefore, they established a new part of linguistics, i.e. semic analysis. Rafaelli (2015) mentioned Rastier in her book *O značenju – uvod u semantiku* and his view on componential analysis in Europe, stating that it should be a part of, rather than distinguishing it from it.

Since componential analysis was used to reduce complex meaning, it gave a huge impact in literary meanings as well. It is widely known that literary meanings, and metaphors especially, can have many ambiguities. Componential analysis made a huge impact on this, since the whole phrases and sentences were divided into smaller units or components, and after that, it was easier to discuss the deeper meaning of each of them, and later on, the meaning of those whole phrases and sentences together. Belfarhi (2013) believed that componential analysis can be a very helpful tool in this case, giving an opportunity for everyone to perceive it the perfect way. After analysing each word using componential analysis, it would be easier to gain meaning of the whole text. It might happen that people read the same text, but perceive it differently, since they have different experiences and different view on the world.

This thesis is organised in various sections. The first section will focus on corpus – Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker*. The main information about the author and the plot will be given here, discussing The Theatre of Absurd, as well, pointing out main features of this movement.

Second section will discuss “the meaning”, analysing different approaches to the meaning of a word, phrase or expression and their relations. Beside this, important discussion about figurative

meaning and metaphors will be discussed here, giving different insight into how people perceive things differently, even though we talk about same things. After that, historical background of componential analysis will be given, together with the development of the analysis itself around the United States of America and Europe.

The next section will be componential analysis of adjectives and adverbs, together with intensifiers. In this particular section, an elaborate and deep analysis and discussion have been done on adjectives and adverbs, trying to answer the main questions: whether componential analysis can help us in gaining deeper meaning of particular semantic relations and whether componential analysis can be helpful in translating these relations into B/C/S? All of the examples have been taken from Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker*. They are analysed as single components, and after that, these are placed in the context, analysing and discussing the whole meaning.

2. Corpus

2.1. About author

Harold Pinter was born on 10 October, 1930 in London, England. He was an English playwright, known as “one of the most complex and challenging post-World War II dramatist”, whose plays portrayed “the substance of character’s thought” (Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia, 2020). Besides, he was a director actor, poet and political activist. He became an acting student at the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art, but he left after two terms in order to become a professional actor for a repertory company. His first play was produced in 1957, named *The Room* and was considered as “comedy of menace”. The very first full-length play was *The Birthday Party*, produced in 1958. After this one, Pinter wrote his second full-length play, *The Caretaker*, produced in 1960, which secured him an important place in the so-called *Theatre of the Absurd*. From 1960s onwards, Pinter wrote many plays which were referred as his “memory plays”, and these include *Old Times* (1971), *No Man’s Land* (1975) and *Betrayal* (1978). During his lifetime, Pinter wrote 32 plays and 12 sketches. His fully developed language of dialogues and his individual style were labelled as “*Pinteresque*”.

“It is not clear who first used the word “Pinteresque,” but it is obvious that by now it has acquired the status of an often used and accepted critical term describing the specific quality of Harold Pinter’s output”. (Uchman, 2017, p. 387)

In order to understand better the meaning of the term *Pinteresque*, we found a simple definition, which goes as follows:

“resembling or characteristic of the works of the English playwright Harold Pinter, in particular by having a sense of menace and featuring dialogue marked by many pauses”.(Lexico Dictionary, 2021)

Pinter’s plays were usually lightly occupied with slight plots; we were not given a lot of details about characters’ backgrounds. A lot of pauses were used throughout the plays’ scripts, indicating silence where needed. (Lan, 2009). His distinctive style and the use of dialogues and pauses throughout the plays, but also introducing a new kind of realistic dialogue, we might call Pinter an

innovator. *The Pinter Pause* which he introduced in his plays was given high importance by many critics and theatre people, thus becoming “his trademark” (Uchman, 2017, p. 389).

Harold Pinter won the David Cohen British Literature Prize in 1995, awarding him for his lifetime achievement in literature. A year after this, in 1996, he won another prize – Laurence Olivier Award for his lifetime achievement in theatre. In 2005 he won one of the most prestigious awards for literature – the Nobel Prize.

Harold Pinter died on 24 December, 2008 in London.

2.2. *The Caretaker*

The Caretaker is a three-act play, written, published and first produced in 1960. It was first presented by the Arts Theatre Club at the Arts Theatre in London, on 27 April, 1960. The play takes place during 1950s, in a room of a house in West London. The play follows the story of two brothers Mick, a man in his late twenties, Aston, a man in his early thirties and an old man named Davies.

Act one takes place on a winter night. Mick is alone in the room and he hears somebody coming to his room. His brother, Aston comes in, bringing an old tramp, Davies, but Mick is no longer in the room; he left before they came in. While Davies was fighting with somebody in front of a café where he was working, Aston saw it and helped him. Since Davies did not have proper clothes (he wore sandals in the middle of the winter), Aston offered him clothes, shoes and a place to spend the night. While sitting in a room, Davies explains Aston what happened at the café and what led to a fight. Aston listens while Davies talks about the previous events, but also tells Aston about his views, which are mostly prejudicial, on different nationalities and races. After telling him the story and some of his prejudiced views on life, Aston offers Davies two pairs of shoes, but none of them seem to fit on his feet, thus letting to Davies’ complaining. He not only complains about the shoes; he also starts complaining when Aston tells him that he needs to use lavatory, which is shared with other people, namely the blacks. Davies tells Aston that he goes under another name – Bernard Jenkins and also tells him that he needs to go to see Sidcup, a man who has his paper which can prove his identity, in order to obtain his papers. Davies keeps complaining about different things he sees around the apartment, statue of Buddha, ceiling leaking, and stove being too close to his

bed. Later, Aston leaves the house and Davies stays alone in the room, promising him that he will try to find a job. Mick enters the room and starts staring at Davies.

Act two takes place a few seconds after the last scene from act one. At first, Mick just stares at Davies, and finally, after some time, he asks for his name. Davies says that his name is Jenkins. The two get into a fight over Davies' trousers, during which Davies tells that Aston, the owner of the house, has brought him there. Mick tells him that he is the owner, and if he wants, he can rent the room. Then, Aston comes with a bag with Davies' things, but soon, Davies realises that these things and the bag itself do not belong to him, which has made Davies really annoyed. Aston offers Davies to be a caretaker of the house. He is not sure if this is the right job for him, but he agrees to do it anyway. Later, when Davies comes into the room, he gets scared by the vacuum sound made by Mick in the darkness. They start talking and Mick asks Davies if he wants to be the caretaker of the house. At this point, Davies is not sure which brother is the master of the house, but he accepts the job anyway. However, when Mick asks for his references, Davies promises him that he will go to Sidcup the next day to get all the papers that he needs, including references. When the morning comes, Davies has to go to Sidcup to get his papers, but does not go instead, blaming the bad weather. Aston then tells him his story of being placed in a mental facility for his hallucinations, where he was given electroshocks against his will. He blames his mother for him not being able to walk and talk properly, since she is the one who authorized the doctors to do the electroshock procedures on Aston.

Act three takes place two weeks later. Mick and Davies talk about renovating the house. Davies hope that, if he helps him, Mick will let him live with them in the house, but Mick ignores Davies when he asks him if he can live in the house with them after it is renovated. Aston brings him another pair of shoes, but Davies says that they do not fit since they do not have shoelaces. Aston brings him shoelaces, but he is not happy because shoes are black and shoelaces are brown. Davies complains again that he cannot go to Sidcup because of the bad weather and bas shoes. That night, Davies groans in his sleep and wakes Aston up. Aston stands up, wakes Davies up and tells him to stop making the noise while he is sleeping. They get in a fight and Aston tells Davies that he is no longer working as a caretaker and that he needs to leave their house. Still, Davies is angry and he tells him that he will talk about this with Mick, since he is the one who has hired him as a caretaker and he believes that Aston is the one who needs to leave the house. They get in a fight; Aston tells

Davies he stinks which was a huge offense for Davies. Davies says Aston that he will talk to Mick about that, hoping that he will let him stay. Later, Davies talks to Mick and says that he believes that Aston needs to leave the house and that the two of them can start renovating the house. However, Mick starts to ask question if Davies is an interior decorator, as he claimed before, but it turns out he is not. Afterwards, Davies gives bad nicknames to Aston and Mick is forced to fire Davies. He gives him the money for his service and orders him to leave. When Mick leaves, Davies is so desperate and he begs Aston for another chance, promising him that he will be better. Eventually, he sees that he cannot stay there, thus he leaves.

From the very beginning of the play, we can see that Davies is not pleased with things he is given. If a person saves you from fight, offers you a shelter and food, isn't the other person supposed to be grateful?! However, the readers never get a real insight into Davies' life – we do not know where he comes from, what he has done in his life or any background story which may give us an opportunity to know him better.

“His motives are never explained, and he is a remarkable example of a confused and dubious identity. He cannot tell where he was born, apparently he has no family, his very name is uncertain, and he has nowhere to live and has no definite future.” (Mahmoudi, Azizmohammadi & Kohzadi, 2012, p. 148)

When we take a look at this, a person can say that Davies has no identity. Even when Mick and Aston ask him about his background, they rarely get an answer. However, that poses questions – does he really know anything about his past or does he maybe want to leave a halo of mystery around himself? Nevertheless, the play itself gives me a feeling that Davies has a kind of background story, but does not want to share it anybody. From my point of view, it seems like he has spent his whole life by himself, having no one by himself, and now he just wants to be a part of something. However, since we are not given the truth about him, this could only be another guess.

Another important theme which prevails throughout the play is isolation. The characters are not only isolated, but also alienated, both from the outside world and from each other, as well. Even the brothers, Mick and Aston, have no proper communication among themselves, although they live in the same house (Patil, 2011). On the other hand, Davies and Aston are also alienated, from

themselves and from the world as well. Despite this fact, both of them long for a friendship, but it seems like they are not able to have one (Ahmed & Mohammed, 2019), since Davies constantly expresses his discontent, no matter what Aston does in order to help him.

“Aston not only rescues Davies but helps him by providing with tobacco, a pair of shoes, bed and above all allowing him to share a room with him. Aston’s activities of helping Davies express Aston’s need for companionship” (Patil, 2011, p. 1)

Throughout the whole play Aston has tried to make Davies comfortable, providing him with the basic things he needs. I believe this shows Aston’s desperate need for companionship, but on the other hand, it also shows how greedy Davies is. Nothing is good enough for him, even though he has not had anything before (or at least that is what he says), and he constantly complains about everything. Moreover, Aston is naive and believes everyone, although he knows he is not supposed to do so.

While on one hand we have Aston, who is kind, honest and caring, we have Mick on the other hand, who is considered to be cruel and violent (Ahmed & Mohammed, 2019). He does not care about other people’s feeling and all he wants to do is to tease and harm others, just like he does to Davies all the way through the play. He was the one, beside his mother, who sent Aston to electroshock treatment, which has left permanent consequences on his brother. Mick likes to be in charge and torture others, while wearing “the mask of a civilized man (Ahmed & Mohammed, 2019). Personally, Mick is seen as an epitome of an ambitious modern man, who seeks nothing but interest and power. He constantly interrogates Davies; he does not believe him very much and he wants to be in control. From my point of view, Mick is the reason why two brothers are estranged from each other; he has rarely spent time with his brother and even when he does, he does not say much. It seems like he is jealous when Aston brings Davies home – he again wants to be in control of both of them. Nevertheless, he is left alone at the end (although his brother still lives with him) and once again, they have been returned to their usual state of isolation and non-communication (Ahmed & Mohammed, 2019).

2.3. *The Theatre of the Absurd*

In the late 1950s, as a consequence of World War II, a new movement emerges throughout European and American dramatists, called *the Theatre of the Absurd*.

“The term is loosely applied to dramatists and their works that agreed with the Existential philosopher Albert Camus’s assessment in his essay “the Myth of Sisyphus” (1942), that the human situation is essentially absurd, devoid of purpose” (Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia, 2021).

Dramatists who were so-called founders of the movements included Samuel Beckett, Eugène Ionesco, Jean Genet, Arthur Adamov, Harold Pinter and many others. Their contribution to this movement was immense, presenting different and unusual forms, responding to everyday life changes and gaining readers’ attention (Tiwari, 2012). People were devastated after World War II and they were looking for a kind of distraction from all the things that happened. Together with Absurdist dramatists, they shared pessimistic view of the world, feeling hopeless and anxious (Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia, 2021). The purpose of the Theatre of Absurd was to give dramatic insight into the abovementioned, moving away from the traditional norms, seeking for any kind of audience/reader’s reactions. Esslin (1960) indicated that some events on the stage had different impacts on audience. Some were perplexing, hence leaving it unclear whether the events were the real ones or dreams. Absurdist characters mostly have no identity or are in constant pursuit for such (just like Davies; even though he mentions two names in the play, he actually has no identity), they are alienated from others and from the world. Playwrights tried to highlight the absurdity and irrationality of everyday lives. One of the most prominent and absurd examples can be seen in *The Caretaker* itself – Davies complaining about shoes and non-matching shoelaces, although he has no shoes at all. The absurdity of his life is perfectly displayed in this part, but also all the way through the play.

Although the Absurdist dramatist displayed the stories in the 1960s, I personally believe that we can also connect it to the nowadays. It has been more than fifty years from the beginning of the movement, and for me, it seems like nothing has changed. One could say that the Theatre of the Absurd can be seen as a synonym of the modern world that we are living in. We are getting estranged and alienated from each other, becoming more and more isolated. The Theatre of the

Absurd did not only portray the absurdity of man's everyday situations and their lack of sense, but it also showed us that there were no solutions for such situations and nobody did anything in order to find any (Tiwari, 2012).

3. The meaning of meaning

Meaning of a word, phrase or any utterance can be seen differently based on the environment in which it occurs. However, in order to understand the meaning in particular, one should first consider the study which deals with meaning in language – semantics (Hurford, Heasley and Smith, 2007). Nevertheless, Kroeger states that it would be “more accurate to define it as the study of relationship between linguistic form and meaning” (2021, p. 14). Words, phrases or any other utterances behave differently based on the environment in which they occur. One word could possibly have many meanings and functions, as well, and we as speakers and listeners, give it the meaning and function we want, i.e. based on our previous knowledge and experiences.

“A potato can be used for a number of things. It can be cooked in various ways and eaten, whether in boiled, mashed, baked, fried or chipped form. It can be turned into potato flour; it can be used to hold cocktail sticks carrying lumps of cheese or other delicacies; it can be used to make stamps for printing with; it can be used to make pellets to fire from a potato gun. The same basic item, the potato, has various functions” (Bauer, 2007, p. 58).

Just as it has been aforementioned, different words, phrases and utterances can be used in different context, thus it can lead to different meaning and function. Moreover, assigning meaning to a word depends on the speaker or listener. Everyone experiences and perceives the world around us differently and that can highly impact us when assigning the meaning to the word, phrases or utterances. For example, when somebody says *sea*, I personally assign it with positive meaning; tranquillity and relaxation. On the contrary, somebody, who may have experienced it in a different way, may have negative meaning. Hence, every word is assigned different meaning by everyone.

When we talk about meaning, we can talk about different types of it. Kroeger (2019) distinguishes three types of meanings – word, sentence and utterance meaning. Word meaning is already self-explanatory, so less attention would be given to it and we will focus more on the other types of meaning. Kroeger (2019) refers to sentence meaning as semantic content of a sentence, i.e. meaning is derived from the words themselves. On the other hand, utterance meaning “*refers to the semantic content plus any pragmatic meaning created by the specific way in which the sentence gets used*” (p. 16).

Besides Kroeger, Hickey (Scribd, n.d.) distinguished four different types of meaning: lexical, grammatical, sentence and utterance. Lexical meaning can be seen as similar to the word meaning according to Kroeger. Lexical meaning can also include compound words, according to Hickey (Scribd, n.d.). Grammatical meaning gains its meaning only when it has some kind of a connection to lexical words, i.e. its meaning can only gain its full potential when it contains lexical items. Hickey emphasises that these elements can have many functions; e.g. *to* – it is usually used as an infinitive marker as in *They decided to come*, but it can also have a different function in *He gave a lovely present to his wife* (Scribd, n.d., p. 3). Sentence meaning is seen as a result of combining different words into a sentence. What is important to mention here is the fact that the sentence meaning can vary, although the same words can be used to form a sentence. E.g. *All the boys ate the food* and *The boys ate all the food*. Even though the same words are used to form both of the sentences, these two have different meaning. Changing the positions of the words in the sentences, it has led to grammatical sentences with rather different meanings Utterance meaning “*is that of a sentence in a particular spoken context which is not necessarily the same as its literal meaning*” (p. 3). Even though we have seen different types of meaning, Hurford, Heasley and Smith (2007) offer an additional type of meaning, which has not been mentioned before – speaker meaning. Although it is more or less self-explanatory, i.e. what a speaker means by pronouncing a word, phrase or utterance, it can carry a hidden meaning. As it has been already mentioned, perceiving and experiencing the world differently can lead to different meaning of the things which have been said. While Kroeger and Hickey consider word and sentence meaning as two individual types of meaning, Hurford, Heasley and Smith consider it as one type of meaning, although the definition is quite similar to the aforementioned.

When we talk about relation between form and meaning of the word, Kroeger (2019) believes that it is quite arbitrary, even though it is not always the case. Onomatopoeic words can be seen as an exception, since their “*forms are intended to be imitations of the sounds which they refer to*” (p. 17). English speakers would be familiar with form *woof woof* when they come across to it. Also Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian (BCS) speakers would also be familiar when they come across to the form of *av av*, which is corresponding translation to English onomatopoeic form *woof woof*. However, if a non-English speaker comes across *woof woof*, or a non-BCS speaker comes across *av av*, they may find difficulties in understanding the aforementioned. Even though the forms have the same meaning, to non-speakers of these languages it may be difficult to understand them.

While, on one hand, the relation between form and meaning is arbitrary, on the other hand, Kroeger (2019) states that relation between the form of a sentence and its meaning is compositional, i.e. the meaning of the sentence can be predictable, based on the words which it contains and the way these words are combined. Here, he offers a simple example *yellow submarine*, in accordance to the Beatles' song, referring to *something that was both yellow and submarine* (p. 17). Nevertheless, there are exceptions even to the compositionality – idioms. One cannot actually comprehend or predict the actual meaning by only looking at the words given in a sentence. Even if we take a look at each word on its own or a phrase as a whole, we still cannot predict the meaning (Kroeger, 2019). E.g. *kick the bucket* – if we want to analyse the words themselves, then a person may think of a literal meaning of a unit, which is to actually kick the bucket. However, since this is an idiomatic expression and needs to be learnt as a whole, then a speaker needs to know its actual meaning – to die.

The meanings of words and sentences are essentially independent of the context or occasion of use; [...] the meaning of a composite expression is essentially compositional (Hurford, Heasley and Smith, 2007, p. 327).

Beside types of meaning which have been discussed before, we can distinguish two types of meaning relationship, based on Hickey's *Semantics*: basic and internal meaning relationship (Scribd, n.d.). Basic meaning relationship includes sense and denotation as two major subtypes. Sense *refers to the semantic relations between linguistic items* (p. 4). However, Kroeger cites German logician Gottlob Frege, who defines sense as *aspect of meaning which do not depend on the context of use* (p. 28). Moreover, Hickey gives a simple definition to denotation, referring to it as *the relation between words and the non-linguistic world* (Scribd, n.d., p. 4). Kroeger, again referring to Frege, cites and defines denotation as a *sort of meaning which does depend on the context* (p.28). For instance, if we say *phone*, this item can denote to all phones, including smartphones, telephones and all kinds of phones. However, denotation can be seen as quite more difficult when it comes to proper names – the Prime Minister is usually referred to a specific person. On the other hand, denotation like *your father* is not quite specific, and will depend on the speaker/addressee (Kroeger, 2019, p. 28).

When we talk about internal meaning relationships, we can distinguish several types, in which we have three of the most prominent ones – synonymy, autonomy and hyponymy.

Synonymy is internal relationship of meaning where two words/items have the same meaning.

“We will say that two words are synonymous (for a specific sense of each word) if substituting one word for the other does not change the meaning of a sentence” (Kroeger, p. 86).

Let us try to demonstrate the aforementioned definition with following examples:

(1) a) While I was walking down the street, I saw a *big* house.

b) While I was walking down the street, I saw a *large* house.

Even though the word *big* is substituted by word *large*, it is quite obvious that the meaning is the same in both sentences. However, Kroeger (2019) points to an important issue when we talk about synonyms. If we use the same adjectives as modifiers for certain kinship relationship, then it no longer can serve as a synonym, i.e. sentence will no longer be grammatical, and thus it will not have the same meaning.

(2) a) Susan lives in a big/large house.

b) Susan lives with her big/large sister.* (Kroeger, p. 86)

As we can see, in sentence (b) we cannot replace *big* with *large*. By doing so, sentence loses meaning, i.e. it is ungrammatical.

Furthermore, antonyms, unlike synonyms, have a difference in meaning, i.e. they are pure opposites. However, Hurford, Heasley and Smith (2007) do not find this definition as adequate, stating that *words may be opposite in meaning in different ways, and some words have no real opposites* (p. 121). As an example of words which do not have the actual opposites, they mention lunch and liquid. When we take a look at word lunch, we could say that breakfast or dinner could be proper opposite but still it does not seem right. Moreover, liquid also undergoes the same process – even if solid and gas can be considered as opposites, the aforementioned authors do not agree with this. On the other hand, they introduce *binary antonyms – predicates which come in pairs and between them exhaust all the relevant possibilities* (p. 121). As the most prominent examples of this category, they mention true and false – if something is true, then it cannot be false and vice versa (Hurford, Heasley and Smith, 2007). On the other hand, Hickey (Scribd, n.d.) distinguishes two types of antonyms – graded and non-graded. Graded antonyms are seen as a matter of “more”

or “less” (e.g. small, clumsy), while non-graded antonyms can be given one or two values (e.g. dead, alive). Kroeger goes into a deeper analysis of antonyms, distinguishing four different types: complementary pairs (simple antonyms), gradable (scalar) antonyms, converse pairs and reverse pairs. By his definition examples in (1) are seen as simple antonyms, i.e. they usually denote to the same collocation. Gradable antonyms usually name values which are more relative than absolute (2019). Converse pairs take into account words which have an *asymmetric relation between two entities*, e.g. *parent – child* (p. 88). Reverse pairs include change in opposite directions, such as: *push/pull, come/go*, etc. (2019). Furthermore, Kroeger (2019) implies that antonyms are usually the words which denote similar collocations. For example, *big* and *small* are antonyms, since both denote to the degree of size. Moreover, we cannot say that *big* and *alive* are antonyms, although the meaning of these two is totally different, but still, they do not denote the same collocation.

While researching the topic, various definitions for hyponymy are given, but the simplest one and easiest to comprehend was given by Hurford, Heasley and Smith (2007):

“Hyponymy is a sense relation between predicates (or sometimes longer phrases) such that the meaning of one predicate (or phrase) is included in the meaning of the other” (p. 109).

They offer an example – *scarlet* is a hyponym of *red*, since we are already familiar with the fact that scarlet is a kind of red colour. In that case, *red* is the subordinate term, and as it has already been mentioned, *scarlet* is a hyponym of *red* (2007). Hyponymy is usually limited to the words which have some kind of relation, i.e. which show some kind of hierarchy, such as *chair, stool, couch, sofa*, which are co-hyponyms of *furniture* (Scribd, n.d. , p. 6).

Furthermore, Kroeger cites Cruse in his work, offering us a deeper analysis of special type of hyponymy – taxonomy, suggesting that a word is a taxonym of another word if it feels natural to say that “*An X is a kind/type of Y*” (2019, p. 89). He offers few examples in order to support the aforementioned definition:

- (a) A beagle is a kind of a dog.
- (b) Gold is a type of metal.

3.1. Figurative meaning of language

As it has been already mentioned, not everyone perceives things the same. The environment and our previous experiences highly impact the way we perceive them. Moreover, language and its utterances have many different meanings, just it has been already stated, but one of the most intriguing one is the figurative meaning of language.

“An essential part of abstract thought, and hence language, is the figurative use of literal terms. Just as it is helpful to treat abstract entities as if they were objects, so it is often useful to use literal terms to refer to less tangible entities” (Scribd, n.d., p. 6).

Hickey (Scribd, n.d.) gives an example of *computer virus*. Even though we do not consider it as a real, biological virus, it still causes harm to the computer which it attacks. It eats, in a way, parts of the computer software, just as the regular, biological virus eats parts of the organism it attacks. Furthermore, when we talk about virus and put it in the same sentence as computer, we are already familiar that we talk about different kind of virus, not the biological one. In that way, Hickey shows us a simple figurative use of language – we have rather different connotations, based on different contexts (Scribd, n.d.).

4. Componential analysis

Before we dig deeper into componential analysis of literary meaning, one must establish a proper definition of componential analysis itself. In order to understand deeper meaning and sense of a language, linguists started turning to componential analysis. Zhang (2003) defines it as a lexical decomposition. Lyons, as defined in Zhang's (2003) *Componential Analysis Method* defines it as "a way of formalising, or making absolutely precise, the sense-relations that are hold among lexemes" (p. 3). Kroeger (2019), on the other hand, believes it can serve as "neat explanation for some sense relations" (p. 99). When a simple word undergoes a process of componential analysis, it means that it is analysed by different semantic features/components. These semantic features/components have a simple function – they are used in order to distinguish particular word, utterance or lexeme in their near surrounding, i.e. they can help us to gain a deeper meaning of particular word, utterance or lexeme. In *Componential Analysis of Meaning* (2015), Nida distinguishes and categorize these components in two main categories: common components and diagnostic or distinctive components. When all lexemes in the same semantic field share central component, then we talk about common component. On the other hand, when we use components to differentiate the meanings in the same field/area, then, in that case, we talk about diagnostic or distinctive components. From the early beginnings of componential analysis, different linguists offered simple examples in order for others to understand componential analysis. Nida's (2015) interpretation of different components (both common and diagnostic/distinctive) offered a simple example, showing us the distinction between the aforementioned components.

components	<i>man</i>	<i>woman</i>	<i>boy</i>	<i>girl</i>
[human]	+	+	+	+
[adult]	+	+	-	-
[male]	+	-	+	-
[female]	-	+	-	+

Table 1: Common and distinctive components of *man*, *woman*, *boy* and *girl*

In the table above, *man*, *woman*, *boy* and *girl* are seen as common components. The things that distinguish them from each other are [human], [adult], [male] and [female], namely distinctive/diagnostic components.

Componential analysis did not happen to become a part of linguistics overnight. It took many years for linguists to find it out and tell us a little bit more about it. Among the first people who wanted to reduce complex meaning into the simpler one and who gave proposal for componential semantics was Louis Hjelmslev, a Danish linguist (Zhang, 2003). Although Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure was searching for a simple answer in structural method, Hjelmslev was the first one to find it, becoming one of the most prominent representatives of European Structuralism (Zhang, 2003). Besides Saussure and Hjelmslev, who are seen as the first linguists discussing componential analysis, we have others who gave their impact to the development of the aforementioned. Among the most prominent ones are Lyons, Lamb, Katz and Fodor who started using lexical decompositions as a general semantic structure (Zhang, 2003).

4.1. Semic analysis

Around Europe, componential analysis had different name – semic analysis. Ida Raffaelli in her book *O značenju – uvod u semantiku* (2015) talks about different authors and their views on this topic. Here, she mentions Leech, who thought of componential analysis as a unique semantic model, although there might be some methodological and theoretical differences in its form and tradition in which it occurred from the very beginnings. On the other hand, she also mentions Rastier who believed that semic analysis should not be distinguished from componential analysis, but rather be a part of it (p. 94). However, Hjelmslev was one of the linguist who gave a huge impact on development of semic analysis, since, as it has been already mentioned, he was the one who proposed structuralistic semantics. Using this branch of linguistics, he would describe the meaning and expression in almost the same way. He talked in details about this relationship between meaning and expression in book *Prolegomena to a theory of language* (1953), where the same meaning of an expression can be shaped and structured in completely different ways, depending on a language (Raffaelli, p. 96). On the other hand, Raffaelli mentions another Hjelmslev's view in which he claimed that each component of an expression or a phrase depends on the other parts of an expression, hence, the meaning of that component cannot be conveyed by itself. After all, Hjelmslev was a person who set the foundations to semic analysis to the future

generations of linguists (such as Bernard Pottier, Julien Greimas, Georges Mounin, and many more), where each component of an expression can be described with the smallest units of meaning (Raffaelli, p. 99).

As aforementioned, Hjelmslev set the foundations for the development of semic analysis, but this development was later done in details by Bernard Pottier. Ida Raffaelli talked about his contribution as well. In his work *Vers une sémantique moderne* (1964), Pottier introduced the smallest unit of meaning – seme (s). Set of semes has been given a name of semem (S). He used these so-called semes to define meaning of any lexeme or expression given, but also to establish different relationships among the units that might share these semes. When we can differentiate which meaning can be assigned to a particular seme, it is easier for us to perceive and understand the relationship among possible meanings, but also, we are given a possibility to establish relationship between that particular seme and other semes that can be found within one lexeme or an expression. As it has been already established, Pottier played a very important role in the development of semic analysis. Another important issue, as stated in Raffaelli's work (2015), is that Pottier introduced class to semic analysis, which helped not only to describe particular lexemes, but it also helped to put certain lexemes in relation to other areas of different lexemes. By doing this, Pottier left a great impact on semic analysis and managed to meet one of the fundamental principles of the analysis itself, i.e. defining relations between lexemes (Raffaelli, p. 102).

Nonetheless, componential analysis did not only occur on the European ground; it also developed in the United States of America, independently (Zhang, 2003). The biggest contribution to componential analysis in the USA and lexical semantics was made by Steven Pinker, who believed that “grammatically relevant subset” should be given a huge importance when researching the acquisition of language (Zhang, 2003).

From the very beginnings of componential analysis' development, it ought to give a detailed description of its components, making it easier to understand particular language utterances. Moreover, certain and minimal amount of these components can give us a deeper insight into a language, thus easing the description process. However, sometimes it can be difficult to take these components out of phrases and utterances; but nevertheless, it also depends on the context which linguists want to present and do the research on. There have been cases when componential analysis could not prove the thesis that linguists were researching (or it was considered vague). Nonetheless,

it has always been seen as a good analysis when it comes to distinguishing synonyms and phrases that may be ambiguous (Matulina-Jerak, 1990).

4.2. Componential analysis of literary meaning

Ambiguity of sentences comes very often, and for some people it can be difficult to comprehend them. It usually happens with literary meaning, when there always raises a question “What did author want to say with this”? Well, this question is difficult to answer at first, since we cannot know what was going on in author’s head at the moment of him writing the text. Moreover, not everyone thinks in the same way, thus, not everyone will perceive one sentence or literary text in the same manner. This mostly depends on our previous experiences, as it has already been established. Literary texts almost always hide a deeper meaning, and if we want to dig for it, we might want to use an analysis. I believe that componential analysis can help us in doing this and I will try to prove it hereinafter. Belfarhi (2013) believes that componential analysis and its application on literary texts can lead to establishment of different kinds of lexical interactions among the words, phrases and utterances, since minor components cannot be seen from the surface level. By applying componential analysis on such texts, we can search for it on the deeper level; hence, we can search for the meaning if we go deeper based on these interactions and relations.

Whenever reading or analysing a literary text, a person needs to be open-minded and be prepared for anything that may come. Belfarhi states that we can use different analysis and theories which can help us understand the text itself “*as most of them follow logical inference and reach meaning by processes of semantization that make the utterance the centre of attention*” (p. 289, 2013).

“The literary text, however, is a poetic language to read inside its utterances by means of a semantic analysis which aims principally to deliver the way words are realised in the text” (Belfarhi, 2013, p.289).

However, in order to gain deeper meaning, words need to be analysed in the context (in this case, it would have no sense to analyse them individually and outside of the context). How many times it has happened to all of us that we do not understand a particular word in a text?! As far as I am concerned, I rarely reach out to a dictionary, but I would rather try to find its meaning from the

context. The surrounding of the word helps us to understand it, i.e. context. A word can occur in a million different surroundings, but it would rarely have the same meaning in each of them. Thus, its surrounding, i.e. context and different interpretations of the given word, gives it completely new meaning. When we start reading a book, we embark ourselves on fictional adventure. Even though we all read the same words, sentences, dialogues and many more, each of perceives it differently. Each of us makes its own pictures, and new world, as well in our heads and we cannot say that literary text can be “set to truth tests since in itself it depicts a subjective discourse” (Belfarhi, 2013, p. 293).

Literary texts can be ambiguous sometimes, but I will try to prove in this work that componential analysis can help us to understand its meaning on the deeper level. Nevertheless, one part of speech in English language can be seen as quite challenging when it comes to analysing it, and it is metaphor. Can componential analysis help us to gain deeper meaning of metaphors, but to translate them in B/C/S, we will see hereinafter.

4.3. *Metaphors*

When we talk about literary meaning in a language, the focus is sometimes put on metaphors. They can be used in order to resolve deviant language (Robson & Stockwell, 2005), but also *to structure and construe abstract areas of knowledge and experience in more concrete experiential* (Hurford, Heasley and Smith, 2007, p. 331). Physical world around us and different experiences lead to different perception of the world. This lead to use of different use of particular metaphors – not everyone will use the same metaphor for particular occasion. The choice of words/metaphors depends on us and our creativity (Robson & Stockwell, 2005) – someone may not understand our choice of particular words, but for us it would absolutely make sense. Different languages have different metaphors. Sometimes, same word/metaphor can be used in different context and hence, it can have different meaning. If we say *Fiona is going to learn Russian* (Scribd, n.d. , p. 7), verb *go* here does not have the connotation of a girl actually going somewhere. Here, it is used to refer to something that is about to happen. The same thing can be applied to B/C/S language – *Fiona ide na kurs ruskog jezika*. Even though the sentence does not the same meaning, verb *ići* (in this case *ide*, which is equivalent for verb *go*), does not actually refer to a person actually going somewhere,

but a person attending a Russian course. On the other hand, the same verb (both in English and B/C/S context) can be used, but it will have totally different meaning. For example, if we say a sentence *Fiona is going to school every day*, the sentence has a literal meaning, where a person is actually going to school. The same sentence can be translated to B/C/S, thus having a literal meaning – *Fiona ide u školu svaki dan*. These examples show us how same verbs can have different meaning, even when the context is similar, but not totally the same.

[...] *metaphor entails a constant remaking of meaning on every occasion of use* (Robson & Stockwell, 2005, p. 101).

The aforementioned only support the things which have been said before. Nonetheless, culture and tradition play very important role in every language, and hence, what native English speakers understand may be completely incomprehensible to B/C/S speakers and vice versa. Bosnian traditional songs, so called *sevdalinke* have always been full of metaphors, which for non-native speakers may be quite difficult to understand. Smajlović-Šabić (2013) offers various examples which are related to love and someone being in love. If a person is in love, we usually say *umire od sevdaha* (p.328). If we try to translate it (dying from *sevdah*), we could say that it has a negative connotation. However, B/C/S native speakers know that it does not have a negative connotation, even though the death itself is mentioned in this metaphor. Languages are full of metaphor expressions which are established based on culture, and are seen as more systematic in nature (Hurford, Heasley and Smith, 2007).

5. Componential analysis of adverbs and adjectives

As it has been already stated, componential analysis implies that each lexeme or a set of components can be given specific features which in further give them specific meaning and differentiate them amongst each other (Rafaelli, 2015). However, in order to look for components and their distinctive features, and put them under componential analysis, these need to be in the same category, i.e. the same parts of speech. This means that we cannot look for distinctive features amongst nouns and verbs, or adjectives and adverbs. Hence, componential analysis goes into details and has an aim to help us understand texts better. On the other hand, whether this is true or false will be discussed hereafter.

So far, nouns and verb have mostly undergone through the process of componential analysis. Finding distinctive features for the aforementioned ones should not be a problem for any researcher. On the other hand, there has not been a lot of studies about componential analysis of adjectives and adverbs and whether it can help us to understand specific context better. However, the following analysis of the aforementioned parts of speech will give us a better insight and maybe even an answer to this question.

5.1. Componential analysis of adverbs

In order to be able to find as many distinctive features for particular set of components, they will be divided into a few categories. As it has been already mentioned, adverbs are parts of speech that modify and describe verbs, adjectives, or other adverbs (Merriam-Webster Online dictionary, 2021). The first step to be taken when analysing particular components using componential analysis is to determine common features. Sometimes, this task can be problematic, since a lot of adverbs do not actually share any common features. Nevertheless, this paper has an aim to show that we can always hope that there will be at least a few common features that can show us similarities and differences among particular set of components.

The first components which will be analysed as a set are “silently”, “loudly”, and “quietly” The first two seem to have opposite meanings, while, on the other side, the first and the last have quite the same meaning, but different features will give us a deeper insight into this.

components	<i>silently</i>	<i>loudly</i>	<i>quietly</i>
high volume	-	+	-
low volume	+	-	+
in an inaudible manner	+	-	+
in a noisy manner	-	+	-

Table 2: Common and distinctive components of *silently*, *loudly* and *quietly*

When we take a look at the table, we can see that there could not be a found a single feature that the adverbs *silently* and *loudly* share. It is noticeable that these two have opposite meaning, thus, there lies the reason why there is not a shared feature. *Silently*, in this case can be defined with the help of features “low volume” and “in an audible manner”. This adverb has a specific meaning, and these two features give us a better insight into the word itself. On the other hand, *loudly* has quite the opposite meaning from *silently*. Features that are used here in order to show us the deeper meaning of the word are “high volume” and “in a noisy manner”. The last adverb from the table show – *quietly* show us that it shares the features with *silently*. Still, does it mean that these two have the exact same meaning or is it just a coincidence, since they share these features. Now, the important question raises; does all of the things mentioned here help us to understand meaning, and the context itself better? If we take a look into the context which these three adverbs have been taken from, i.e. Harold Pinter’s *The Caretaker*, only then we can give an answer to this question.

“Mick turns his head. He stands, move silently to the door, goes out, and closes the door quietly.” (p.1)

In the first example, we can see that two adverbs that share same features are used in a single sentence. However, if we take a look at the dictionary, the definition of *silently* given by Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary is “*without making any sound*” (p. 722)), while, on the other hand definition of *quietly* is “*in a quiet manner*” (p. 633). Now, if we look at these two adverbs which share features in componential analysis, does this mean that in each context any of the words given can be used? I would first like to explain and give a translation into B/C/S. Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary (2010) provides us with the equivalent for the aforementioned adverbs:

silently ► *tiho; nijemo* (p. 722)

quietly ► *tiho, mirno.*(p. 633)

As we can see, the meaning of these two adverbs and the translations are pretty much the same. Still, when you take a look at the example from *The Caretaker*, could an author use the same word twice? The answer is yes, in this case, but then we would have a repetition of the same word, which is quite unconventional in literary texts. Furthermore, when we look at the examples that has been provided in the aforementioned literary text, there raises a question if we can switch places of these two adverbs and would the meaning stay the same? A person can *move quietly* and *close the door silently*, and the meaning of adverbs in these two would still stay the same. These adverbs have basically the same meaning, so the meaning of the whole text would stay unchanged. Based on the data which was discussed before, we could say that componential analysis has helped us in understanding the text and the context, giving us a better insight into the aforementioned adverbs, showing us that they have the same meaning and that each of them could be used in both situations.

“Davies exclaims loudly, punches downward with closed fist, turn his back to Aston and stares at the wall.” (p.3)

However, the adverb *loudly* still needs to be discussed in details. As it is visible from the chart, and as stated before, this adverb does not share any of the features with *silently* and *quietly*. In other words, this adverb has the opposite meaning. Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary will be helpful again in this case, since it has given a definition for this one, as well: *loudly* – “*in a way that produces much noise*” (p.474). On the other hand, Oxford English-Bosnian dictionary has provided us with translation for the adverb *loudly* ► *glasno* (p. 474). All of the mentioned has proven that this adverb has nothing in common and share no common features with *silently* and *quietly*. On the other hand, if we take a look at the example from *The Caretaker*, we can notice that this adverb has no ambiguities and it is obvious what author wanted to say. Nevertheless, in this case, translation was not obligatory in order to understand the context better, but it is provided here.

However, when looking at the first set of components and examples from *The Caretaker*, we realise that parts of speech, in this case adverbs, that have the same meaning can switch places, and the meaning would remain the same. On the other side, we could not put *silently* and *quietly* in the second example and vice versa without changing the meaning.

Next set of components which will be discussed and analysed using componential analysis have three adverbs: *slowly*, *swiftly* and *quickly*.

components	<i>slowly</i>	<i>swiftly</i>	<i>quickly</i>
faster manner	-	+	+
hurriedly	-	+	+
at slower pace	+	-	-

Table 3: Common and distinctive components of *slowly*, *swiftly* and *quickly*

Similar to the previous set of components, from the Table 3 we can see that two adverbs (*swiftly* and *quickly*) share a couple of features, whereas we have one adverb (*slowly*) that share no features with other two. It is noticeable again that *swiftly* and *quickly* may have the same meaning, since these two share common features, but it will be analysed and discussed in details hereafter. Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary has provided us a definition for *slowly* and it goes as follows: “*at a slow speed, not quickly*” (p. 732). The definition itself shows us that the meaning is totally opposite from the other two adverbs that are mentioned in the table above. The only feature that corresponds to the meaning of adverb *slowly* is “at a slower pace”, while other two features play no role in the meaning of this one. In contrast, *swiftly* and *quickly* have different meaning, and dictionary will once again help us to understand the meaning better. Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary offers these definitions:

swiftly ► *at high speed, quickly* (p.784)

quickly ► *at fast speed, rapidly* (p.633)

From the definitions that are given here, we can see that these two have the same meaning, thus, that is the reason they share a couple of features. Still, we need to see the definitions in B/C/S to see if componential analysis can help us in this case to understand the deeper meaning of the adverbs in a given context better. Oxford English-Bosnian dictionary gives these definitions for these three adverbs:

slowly ► *sporo, polako* (p. 732)

swiftly ► *naglo, brzo* (p. 784)

quickly ► *brzo* (p. 633)

The definitions given here show that meaning in *swiftly* and *quickly* are pretty much the same, while, on the other hand, we can see that *slowly* has opposite meaning from these two. However, we still need to see the context in Pinter's *The Caretaker* in which these adverbs have been used in order to see the meaning and to see if componential analysis can help us to understand the deeper meaning of the given context.

"Mick turns slowly to look at the room." (p. 41)

"Davies stands still. He waits a few seconds, then goes to the door, opens it, looks out, closes it, stands with his back to it, turns swiftly, opens it, looks out, comes back, closes the door, finds the keys in his pocket, tries one, tries the other, locks the door. He looks about the room. He then goes quickly to Aston's bed, bends, brings out the pair of shoes and examines them." (p. 39)

The first example given here shows that the feature given in the table above corresponds to the meaning of the adverb. *Mick turns slowly*, i.e. he turns to look around the room at slower pace. However, when we look at the second example where the other two adverbs have been used, we can see that they totally correspond to the features that have been assigned to them in the table. Turning *swiftly*, and going *quickly* mean that he was moving hurriedly, or at faster manner, which, in conclusion, have the same meaning and parallel with the features that have been given to these two adverbs. Just like in the first set of components, which was discussed in previous paragraph, we could switch places for the latter two and the meaning would again stay the same. On the contrary, we cannot use any of these two and put them in the first example, i.e. *slowly* without changing the meaning of the context.

As it has been assumed before, and now it has been proved using English, as well as B/C/S definitions, *slowly* has totally opposite meaning from *swiftly and quickly*. Once again, we can say that componential analysis has helped us in this set of components to understand deeper meaning of the given context.

Finding components that share similar or the same features can be a difficult task sometimes. One must be very careful in doing so in order not to make it more complex than it is. However, few adverbs can undergo this process. In this part of the paper, two adverbs will be discussed – *downward* and *forward*. When we take a look at these, we can, using the knowledge of the English language that we have, notice that these two give us some sense of direction. Nevertheless, this will be discussed in details hereinafter.

components	<i>downward</i>	<i>forward</i>
moving to the front	-	+
moving to the lower level	+	-
sense of direction	+	+

Table 4: Common and distinctive components of *downward* and *forward*

As it has been already stated before, *downward* and *forward* share one common feature, and that is “sense of direction”. However, even though these two share this one feature, it is still questionable whether we talk about the same direction. Further analysis will give us an answer to this question, but using the knowledge that we have, it is quite obvious that here we do not talk about same direction. *Downward* corresponds to the feature “moving to the lower level”, while, on the other hand *forward* corresponds to the feature “moving to the front”. These two features and analysis will be supported by the help of dictionary again. Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary provides simple definition for *downward* – “*towards a lower place, point, or level*” (p. 243). From this definition, we can see that the feature which has been assigned to this adverb corresponds to the meaning. On the other hand, Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary provides us with translation to our mother tongue – “*usmjeren nadolje; nadolje*” (p. 243). Nonetheless, *downward* can be used both as an adverb and an adjective, but still, this depends on the context. *The Caretaker* will help us to analyse the meaning, hence, to understand the context in which it was given better.

“*Davies exclaims loudly, punches downward with closed fist, turns his back to Aston and stares at the wall.*” (p. 3)

In this particular example, we can notice that *downward* acts as an adverb, since it describes the way, or the manner in which Davies punches, i.e. it describes and defines the verb.

Forward has a different meaning and it expresses different way of direction. The aforementioned Table shows us that this particular adverb corresponds to the feature of “moving to the front”, as well as giving us “sense of direction”. From the Table, it is quite obvious that it has opposite meaning from *downward*, but again, dictionary and the context in which it was given, will help us with deeper analysis. The first step toward understanding the meaning of the adverb in a given context is finding the meaning in the dictionary. Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary provides us with this definition: “*in the direction that one is facing or travelling; towards the front*” (p.318). By taking a look at this, we can see that the word itself refers to someone or something moving in front of themselves. However, can we say that this one is the opposite of the adverb *downward*? The context in which these adverbs have been found may help us, but this is still quite unsure, and deeper analysis has to be done. Pinter’s *The Caretaker* provides with this example, and hence, there lies another step for analysis.

“*Pause. He comes forward.*” (p. 3)

In order to understand the meaning of this adverb in particular context, the dictionary will be used again. In this case, Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary will provide us with the corresponding translation of the given adverb. *Forward*’s corresponding translation is *naprijed* (p. 318). The translation given here parallels the feature that is given in the aforementioned chart. Again, we can say that componential analysis can actually help us in differentiating and understanding the deeper meaning of the given adverbs. However, *forward* can behave in a different way in different contexts. This particular word can act as an adjective, verb or noun. From the Pinter’s *The Caretaker*, and from the example that is mentioned above, we see that *forward* behaves as an adverb there. Nevertheless, the context and its surroundings help us to understand in which way a particular word behaves. It is familiar that adverbs define the verbs – which is the situation in our aforementioned example. If the position of the same word is different, it will behave differently, hence, the meaning would change as well.

In this particular analysis, we have seen that componential analysis can help us defining and understanding deeper meaning of particular adverbs. Nonetheless, it is possible only if we can find

features that set of components share. On the other side, if there are no shared features, we have nothing to compare and analyse in that case. Finding these features can be challenging sometimes, but it has been shown that componential analysis can be helpful when doing this task. The translation of the given adverbs has also helped us to understand the meaning of the context better, so we can say that componential analysis has proven as a very helpful tool in doing such a task.

5.2. Componential analysis of adjectives

Unlike adverbs that are usually bound with the verbs, adjectives are parts of speech that are bound to modifying and complementing nouns. Beside modifying and complementing a particular noun, in some cases, one or more adjectives, can do the same with a whole noun phrase. It is quite familiar that we can put more adjectives in a string, i.e. we can stack them. Still, some rules must be followed in order to do this, since it is important to know the order in which adjectives appear. Online Cambridge Dictionary offers a simple guide when it comes to stacking adjectives in a single sentence, and it goes as followed:

order	relating to	examples
1	opinion	<i>lovely, beautiful</i>
2	size	<i>big, small</i>
3	physical quality	<i>thin, thick</i>
4	shape	<i>round, square</i>
5	age	<i>young, old</i>
6	colour	<i>blue, yellow</i>
7	origin	<i>Bosnian, English</i>
8	material	<i>wood, metal</i>
9	type	<i>four-sided, general-purpose</i>

10	purpose	<i>cleaning, cooking</i>
----	---------	--------------------------

Table 5: Order to be followed when stacking adjectives

The table above shows us how are we supposed to stack the adjectives in case there are more of them in a sentence. However, this is a rule that we follow if we do not want to emphasise any of the adjectives. On the other hand, if we want to emphasize a particular adjective, it is usually put on the first place in a sentence; e.g. *I have seen a very big, yellow bird*. In this case, an emphasis is on the size, but if we wanted to emphasize the colour of the bird, then the order would be different, i.e. *yellow, big bird*.

Similar to adverbs, it can be problematic to find adjectives that share the same features, or at least similar ones. The first set of components which will be analysed and discussed using componential analysis is *young* and *old*.

components	<i>young</i>	<i>old</i>
existed for a longer period of time	-	+
not existed for a longer period of time	+	-
ancient	-	+
modern	+	-
age	+	+

Table 6: Common and distinctive components of *young* and *old*

From the table above, we can notice that these two adjectives share only one feature, and that is the feature of “age”. This means that both of them show us how old is something, i.e. modifying the noun which they stand close to. However, from the knowledge a person has, we can see that these two are opposites. Just like in the aforementioned examples with adverbs, here will be used dictionary, as well as context from Pinter’s *The Caretaker* to help us understand deeper meaning of the given adjectives. Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary provides us with the following

definition for *young* – “*having lived for only a short time*” (p.892), and with the corresponding translation for it – “*mlad*” (p. 892). So the meaning of this adjective corresponds to the feature that has been assigned to *young*, i.e. it has not existed for a longer period of life. Another feature that contributes to the meaning of the given adjective is “modern”. Once again, Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary will help us to understand the meaning, and it goes as followed: “*relating to the present or recent times as opposed to the remote past*” (p. 508). When we take a look at this one, the meaning is not quite specifically corresponding to the adjective, but it is still closely related to it. One thing is certain, and it is that something being modern means that it has not existed for a longer period of time. Being young and being modern may not have the same in meaning, but it still quite similar. So in order to understand the table better, after this discussion we could change symbols in Table 6 for *young* – instead of having a “+”, we could change it to “+/-”, since the meaning is not specific. On the other hand, the context in which this adjective occurs might help us to understand the deeper meaning.

“*But I’m not young any more. I was as handy as one of them.*” (p. 5)

Taking all of this into consideration, we can see that in this case, *young* cannot be replaced by modern in this case, without changing the meaning. A person can be young, and modern as well, but in this specific context that could not be the case. In fact, we could switch them, but as it has been stated, the meaning would be changed. So after the discussion, the table would look like this:

components	<i>young</i>	<i>old</i>
existed for a longer period of time	-	+
not existed for a longer period of time	+	-
ancient	-	+
modern	+/-	-
age	+	+

Table 7: Common and distinctive components of *young* and *old* after CA and discussion

All of the aforementioned has showed once again that componential analysis can be helpful when analysing deeper meaning of the context and words given. Nevertheless, we will see if this would help us when analysing the next adjective.

The opposite adjective from the one discussed above is *old*. The table shows us that it corresponds with three features: “existed for a longer period of time”, “ancient” and “age”. The latter has already been discussed, i.e. we have seen that both *young* and *old* share this feature, which shows how old is something or someone, depending on the noun which it modifies. Something or someone being old means that it has existed for a longer period of time, but it is still questionable how long is this longer period of life?! A person can have different associations with this particular adjective, but Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary will help us by giving definition of this one: “*having lived for a longer time, no longer young*” (p. 544). Beside this, they offer another definition, and it goes as followed: “*belonging to the past, former*” (p.544). So, when we take a look at this one, it is quite obvious that something or someone being old cannot be young. The other definition that is given here can be connected to the feature presented in the Table, i.e. “ancient”. Does being old necessary means that it is ancient as well? The following analysis might give us an answer to this question. Ancient means “*belonging to the very distant past or no longer in existence*” (Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary, p.31). With this definition we can see that the meaning is similar, but it is not quite the same. A person can be old, but still existent, but it cannot be ancient and be existent as well. Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary gives us translation for the adjective old: “*star*”(p. 544). Nevertheless, the context which these words have been taken from will help us to understand the deeper meaning.

“The filthy skate, an old man like me, I’ve had dinner with the best.” (p. 4)

From this example, we can see that the meaning of the adjective *old* corresponds to the translation that is given above. However, when taking a look at this example, we can notice that ancient, in this case, cannot be taken as a replacement for old, since it would change the meaning. When taking all of the aforementioned into consideration, it seems like the same thing has happened as with the adjective *young*. Here, some changes need to be made in the table, since the aforementioned analysis has showed us that the meaning is quite uncertain with adjective *old* as well. Instead having “+” in next to “ancient” feature, now we need to change it to “+/- “, since we have seen that meaning

is debatable when we talk about this feature. Hence, the table after the analysis and discussion would look like this:

components	<i>young</i>	<i>old</i>
existed for a longer period of time	-	+
not existed for a longer period of time	+	-
ancient	-	+/-
modern	+/-	-
age	+	+

Table 8: Common and distinctive components of *young* and *old* after CA and discussion

Another set of components that will undergo the process of componential analysis is *good*, *best*, *bad* and *worse*. By the knowledge that we have, we can notice that some of them have similar meaning, while on the other side, some of them have totally opposite meaning, which will be discussed hereinafter.

components	<i>good</i>	<i>best</i>	<i>bad</i>	<i>worse</i>
high standard	+	+	-	-
low standard	-	-	+	+
opinion	+	+	+	+
positive meaning	+	+	-	-
negative meaning	-	-	+	+

Table 9: Common and distinctive components of *good*, *best*, *bad* and *worse*

From the aforementioned table we can see that this set of components has only has same feature, i.e. “opinion”. When we take a look at these adjectives, it is quite familiar that we assign these to

a particular noun, or a noun phrase when we want to express our opinion about something or someone. However, even though these are connected with us giving opinions about something, it does not necessarily mean that they have the same meaning. As it has been shown in the table, *good* and *best* have positive meaning, while, on the other hand, *bad* and *worse* have negative meaning. Nevertheless, in order to understand deeper meaning of the word, we need to check the context in which it occurs. Like before, together with context, Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary will help us to understand the meaning we are talking about. Dictionary definition for the first adjective (*good*) goes as followed: “*having the required qualities, of high standard*” (p. 346). The corresponding translation “*dobar*” (p.346). When we want to tell someone or something that it has high qualities, in most cases we can say that it is good. Here, we can see that *good* has a positive meaning, an another feature that has been assigned to this particular adjective shows us that they are corresponding. Pinter’s *The Caretaker* gives us an insight into the context in which this particular adjective has been found:

“*Sit down? Huh... I haven’t had a good sit down... I haven’t had a proper sit down... well, I couldn’t tell you...*” (p. 2)

“*You’ve got to have a good pair of shoes*” (p. 13)

From the examples above, we can see that Pinter used one adjective in two different occurrences. However, even though the environments in which these two words occur are different, the meaning of the adjective stays the same. In both cases we can translate it as “*dobar*”. It seems like no matter the environment in which this adjective occurs, the meaning will stay the same.

On the other side, another adjective in Table 9 share the same features as *good*, and that is adjective *best*. We are familiar with the fact that adjectives have an ability to undergo the process of comparison, and in this case, we talk about superlative form of the same adjective, i.e. *good*. Since it is apparent that these two adjectives share the same feature, does it mean then that these two have the same meaning? With the help of componential analysis and context in which these words are given, as well, we will see if the aforementioned is true. By the knowledge that we have, we know that superlative forms of adjectives always have the “highest standard”, but Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary will help us once again in this case. *Best* has meaning “*of the most excellent or desirable type or quality*” (p. 73) as found in the aforementioned dictionary, and the translation

goes as followed: “*najbolji*” (p. 73). Based on this, we can see that meaning between these two is not the same, and this has shown us and proven that superlative forms of adjectives have the highest standard. Since the adjective is taken from *The Caretaker* in order to be analysed, the whole context in which it occurs will be analysed, as well, in order to understand the meaning.

“*I’ve eaten my dinner off the best of plates.*” (p.5)

It is noticeable that we can translate *best* in this context as *najbolji* again. Still, since *best* share features with *good* there might be a raising question if the meaning will be changed if and when we switch these two words. Even though they share the same features, their meaning is not the same, as it has been discussed and proved before. It does not have to mean that words that share same features have the same meaning. Words, in this case adjectives, can have similar meaning, but with the help of dictionary and componential analysis, we have seen that this method can be very helpful in order to gain deeper meaning of the word, as well as the whole context.

Other adjectives that share same features in the Table 9 presented above are *bad* and *worse*. We have seen that these two share only one feature with *good* and *best*, and that is the “opinion”. However, the same question rises whether the meaning is the same when we talk about these two adjectives. Unlike the aforementioned adjectives, these two share features of “low standard” and “negative meaning”. Based on knowledge that we have *bad* is the base form of adjective comparison, while, on the other hand, *worse* is comparative form, so this immediately lead us to differentiate the meaning between these two. To confirm this statement, and to gain deeper meaning, Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary will help us once again. It offers a definition for *bad* and it goes as followed: “*of poor quality or low standard*” and “*unpleasant or unwelcome*” (p. 57). From these definitions, we can see that features that have been assigned to *bad* are correspondent to the meaning. On the other side, Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary offers the translation for the aforementioned definitions, and this one goes as followed: “*loš*” (p. 57). However, when a word occurs in a particular context, the meaning may change sometimes, so here will be used context from *The Caretaker* in order to see if the meaning changes or stays the same.

“*Not bad trim.*” (p. 14)

“*Not a bad pair of shoes.*” (p.15)

From the context which is given here, we can see that the meaning is just like the one that has been discussed before. However, in the first example, the adjective *bad* does not have pure negative meaning, since it has a negative word before not before it. In this case, we can see that the word can be defined and translated just as it has been discussed before, but still, the meaning of the whole context does not have negative meaning. This sentence could be translated as “*Nije tako loš oblik*”. So when we take a look at this sentence, we can see that the meaning is not purely negative, although the word itself has a negative meaning. The same can be applied to the other example, since the same negative word, i.e. *not* is used, and the corresponding translation would be similar to the one in the first example: “*Nije loš par cipela*”. Taking all into consideration regarding this particular adjective, we could say that meaning is not purely negative, so the feature of “negative meaning” and its symbol “+” that has been assigned to *bad* can be seen differently now, but it is only because of the environment in which it occurs. Instead of leaving just “+”, now it can be changed into “+/- “, and the Table would look differently now. However, it only applies to this context, and further analysis should be done, using different words that surround adjectives.

components	<i>good</i>	<i>best</i>	<i>bad</i>	<i>worse</i>
high standard	+	+	-	-
low standard	-	-	+	+
opinion	+	+	+	+
positive meaning	+	+	-	-
negative meaning	-	-	+/-	+

Table 10: Common and distinctive components of *good*, *best*, *bad* and *worse* after CA and discussion

The last adjective to analyse and discuss, along with its features and meanings, is *worse*. As it has already been mentioned *worse* is comparative form of the adjective *bad*, and the Table 10 shows

us that these two share the same features. On the other hand, deeper analysis will show us if they have the same meaning. As it has been shown in the Table 10, “low standard”, “opinion”, and “negative meaning” are features that have been assigned to this adjective. It is noticeable that “opinion” is feature that is shared with all the other components in the Table, while “low standard” and “negative meaning” are features that *worse* share with *bad*. The question that has been raised in the previous sections is raising again – since they share the same features, does it mean that they share the same meaning? Componential analysis, dictionary and context from Harold Pinter’s *The Caretaker* will help us to gain the meaning of the adjective given.

Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary offers a definition for *worse* and it goes as followed: “of poorer quality or lower standard; less good or desirable” (p. 886). From this single definition, we can see that the standard or quality are poorer or lower with regards to adjective *bad*. Hence, from this single definition, we can see that meaning is not the same, but further analysis will help us to confirm this. On the other side, the translation can be a next step to confirm the aforementioned statement. Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary gives us translation for *worse* and it is “*gori, lošiji*” (p. 886). It is apparent that the definition and its translation are corresponding to each other, and here we have another prove that meaning is not the same. Beside dictionaries, *The Caretaker*’s context will help us once again to gain deeper meaning of the given adjective.

“*Can’t wear shoes that don’t fit. Nothing worse.*” (p.14)

In this particular example, Pinter once again used word with potentially negative connotations next to the adjective which has a negative meaning. However, it is clear that meaning in this case has not been changed. Here, it expresses the feeling of dissatisfaction of a person who cannot wear shoes that do not fit. “*Ništa gore*” would be translation of the phrase given in the example above.

From the analysis and discussion, we have seen that some adjectives may change meaning based on the environment in which they occur. One single word can affect the meaning and change it completely. However, there are some adjectives whose meaning stay the same, even when the environment in which they occur may change. In order to analyse the meaning, we cannot just take a look at one word, but the whole context instead. Only then we can be able to differentiate the words or phrases, but their meaning as well.

5.3. Componential analysis of intensifiers

As their name suggests, intensifiers are usually used in order to intensify or strengthen the meaning of a particular word or expression, indicating an increase or decrease of the intensity with which a predication is expressed (Greenbaum & Quirk, p. 179). When we talk about intensification, we mention two types: *increased intensification* which is realised by amplifiers such as *fully, completely, very much*, etc., and *decreased intensification* which is realised by downtoners such as *rather, only, sort of*, etc. (Greenbaum & Quirk, p.179). In most cases, intensifiers are analysed as appositions, adverbs or adverbial and they mostly modify noun or a whole noun phrase (NP), but there is still a raising question about the contribution of a particular intensifiers on the whole sentence. (Siemund, 2000). However, in this paper, we will be able to see if intensifiers can really contribute to the meaning of the whole sentence occurring in the context of Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker*. First step to do the aforementioned is to present them in a Table and finding similar or same features that several intensifiers share.

components	<i>quite</i>	<i>bit</i>	<i>very</i>	<i>less</i>	<i>more</i>
larger amount of degree	+/-	-	+	-	+
smaller amount of degree	+/-	+	-	+	-
to a certain degree	+	+/-	-	-	-

Table 11: Common and distinctive components of *quite, bit, very, less* and *more*

From the Table above, we can see that there is not a single feature that all of the intensifiers share. As it has been stated above, their role is to strengthen the meaning of a particular word or expression, and with the use of componential analysis, we will see if this is they can contribute in a bigger way to the meaning of the word or expression. The first one to analyse and discuss is *quite*. In order to understand the meaning of the intensifier itself, Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary will help us. Being an adverb by its form, *quite* is usually used to emphasize something, and the definition that is given in the aforementioned goes as followed: “*to a certain or fairly significant extent or degree*” (p. 634). When we take a look at the Table, we can see that there are different

symbols for different features. Depending on the context in which this adverbial intensifier is given, it could carry the meaning to “larger or smaller amount of degree”, as well as to a “certain degree”, as it has been stated aforementioned. Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary gives a simple translation to this – *poprilično* (p. 634). In *The Caretaker* this intensifier is found in the following contexts:

“*Ceasing, he sits quite still, expressionless, looking out front.*” (p.1)

“*Yes, I quite like it. Picked it up in a... in a shop. Looked quite nice to me.*” (p.20)

In the first example, we can say that the feature of “larger amount of degree” is applied. If a person sits quite still, we say that he/she is not moving at all, and the corresponding translation would be “*sjedi nepomično*” in this case. Another example is similar, where we have the same intensifier and which strengthen the meaning of the word surrounding it. Word *like* has positive meaning, and as it has been stated before, this meaning is intensified by the intensifier *quite*. In order to gain better understanding, we can translate this phrase, where the literal meaning would be “*sviđa mi se*”. However, in the same paragraph, we have another use of the word *quite*, where it could have different meaning. *Looked quite nice to me* would have a corresponding translation as “*Izgleđalo mi je poprilično lijepo*”. Now, the question rises, whether *quite nice* has a positive or negative connotations. Sometimes, *quite* can carry negative connotations, as well as positive, and based on the context, the meaning of the whole sentence would be modified. In this case, we can say that the meaning carries positive connotations, and positive meaning also. However, another person could understand it in a negative sense, where they would see “*poprilično lijepo*” as a thing that is not that beautiful, and has more in common with negative connotations. Nevertheless, the interpretation varies based on the person’s experience and the knowledge that a person has. Based on the aforementioned, we can see that even though the meaning may remain unchanged, the interpretations may vary, since not everyone perceives things in the same manner.

Next intensifier to be discussed is *bit*. A definition that is offered in Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary goes as followed: “*a small piece, part or quantity of something*”, and the translation for the same word is “*malo; dio, djelić*” (p. 79). When we take a look at the Table 11, we can see that the only feature that is corresponding to the meaning fully is “smaller amount of degree”. Nevertheless, we can also see that feature “to a certain degree” is the one with two symbols (both + and -), so we can say that depending on the context and the surrounding, the feature and the

symbols are adjusting. The easiest way to see if the features are correspondent with the intensifier is to take a look at the context in which they occur. Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker* offers us the context in which we can see how this intensifier behaves and what would it do to the meaning of the whole sentence.

„*The blanket'll be a bit dusty.*“ (p. 22)

„*Oh well ... now, mister, if you want the truth ... I'm a bit short.*“ (p. 23)

When we take a look at the first example, we can see that the intensifier *bit* has strengthened the meaning of the word that it is surrounding. In this case, *a bit dusty* can be translated as „*malo prašnjavo*“, which means that it is correspondent to the feature that is given in the Table, i.e. it is interpreted as a smaller amount of degree. The same thing happens in the second example, where *a bit short* can be translated as „*malo kratak*“, meaning that a person does not have a lot of money, or no money at all, depending on the interpretation.

Another intensifier to be discussed here is *very*. From the knowledge that we have, *very* can be used in different surroundings, hence the meaning of the word can be changed based on the context. The first step here is to elaborate the definition and translation, and after that, we will look into *The Caretaker* in order to see how this intensifier behaves in different surroundings. Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary offers the following definition: „*in a high degree*“, and the corresponding translation goes as followed: „*veoma, vrlo*“ (p. 854). This adverbial intensifier is widely used in everyday English, and as it has been stated before the meaning would be different according to the surrounding in which it occurs. When we take a look at the Table, we can see that only one feature is correspondent to this intensifier, i.e. „larger amount of degree“. We are familiar with the fact that *very* is usually used to strengthen a particular adjective or adverb, and the following examples from *The Caretaker* will help us to understand it better and gain deeper meaning.

“*No. I got a very broad foot.*” (p. 16)

“*Thanks very much. The best of luck.*” (p. 33)

“*Ah, that's right. They're very handy.*” (p. 34)

From all three examples that are given here, we can see that the feature of “larger amount of degree” that has been assigned to the intensifier *very* is correspondent, hence, the meaning of *very* in each example is strengthened. This means that the intensifier gives deeper meaning to the words surrounding it, and in these examples none of them carries negative connotations. Each of them can be interpreted in a positive way. However, the first example might be a bit vague. If a person says that he or she has a broad foot, that may be a fact, but still, for some people that might not have positive connotation. Nevertheless, this is something that depends on a person’s interpretation. For some, that can be a good thing, while, on the other side, some people may see it as a negative thing; interpretations may vary since not everyone perceives things in the same manner.

The last two intensifiers that can be found in the Table 11 can be analysed and discussed together. Harold Pinter put both of these intensifiers in one sentence, hence, they will be analysed and discussed together. When we take a look at the Table, we can see that both of these intensifiers have only one symbol “+”, therefore, there is only one feature that is correspondent with their meaning. However, like before, the deeper meaning will be discussed using examples from *The Caretaker*. *Less* is assigned with “smaller amount of degree” feature, while, on the other hand, *more* is assigned with “larger amount of degree”. If we look into the Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary, we can find a following definition for *less*: “a smaller amount of; not as much”, and the corresponding translation goes as followed: “*manje*” (p. 459). The following definition for *more* can be found in the aforementioned Dictionary: „a greater or additional amount or degree of; to a greater extent“, and the corresponding translation is „*više, još*“ (p. 512). If we take a look at the context in which these two intensifiers are found, then we can continue with further analysis and discussion.

„Women? There's many a time they've come up to me and asked me more or less the same question.“ (p.35)

As it has been stated before, Pinter used both of the intensifiers in the same sentence. In most cases, these two usually stand together, hence they contribute to the meaning of the context. In this case, we can translate them as „*manje-više*“. When we take a look at this, it seems like they are contrastive, hence it would mean that one excludes the other. However, when used like this, they contribute to the meaning, and there raises a question if the features that have been assigned to

more and *less* are correspondent. As it had been discussed before, “larger amount of degree” is assigned to *more*, while “smaller amount of degree” is assigned to *less*. Hence, when used together, next to each other, we can say that these amounts of degree can be put somewhere in the middle, or “medium amount of degree”. Nevertheless, this still may be vague, and further analysis should be done for this particular example.

After a deep analysis and discussion, we can see that componential analysis in most cases can be very helpful in order to gain deeper meaning. Nonetheless, for some of the aforementioned examples, a further and more elaborate analysis needs to be done. It has been evident that for some of the adverbs and adjectives, and intensifiers as well, it has been easier to find corresponding features, and for some of them, there were many difficulties. There may be many reasons, but this is mostly due to lack of literature for these particular parts of speech. Further analysis and discussions can be done, not only on this particular example on Harold Pinter’s *The Caretaker*, but on the other ones, in order to contribute to this field of linguistics.

6. Conclusion

Although componential analysis has not been a part of linguistics for a long time, we have seen that its development and contribution made a huge impact on how we see and perceive different components of literary text. However, this paper encountered major problems due to the lack of literature and references, but either way, some points have been concluded. The important questions that were raised at the beginning of the paper were whether componential analysis can help us in gaining deeper meaning of particular semantic relations and whether componential analysis can be helpful in translating these relations into B/C/S? This paper and elaborate analysis which was done on adverbs and adjectives, as well as intensifiers, showed us that componential analysis can be a very helpful tool in gaining deeper meaning of literary text. In this case, we have seen how it has been done on Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker*. One of the most important thing is to find features to be assigned to different sets of components, which would in further help us to understand and discuss meaning of those components within and outside of the context. The aim of componential analysis is to reduce complex meaning, and make it simple and more understandable to everyone, and I believe that this thing has been done in this paper. Each person has different understanding when it comes to literary texts, especially when we talk about metaphors, but it has been proven that componential analysis can be a very helpful tool in that task.

In order to be able to discuss more about this topic, particularly about componential analysis of adjectives and adverbs, further analysis needs to be done, since, as it has been mentioned, there is still lack of literature regarding this topic.

References

- Ahmed, M.H. & Mohammed, M.Q. (2019). Theme of Loneliness and Isolation In The Caretaker By Harold Pinter (1930–2008). *International Journal Of Research In Social Sciences And Humanities*, 9(Iv), 9–15 retrieved from <https://www.ijrssh.com/admin/upload/02%20Mayada%20Hashim%20Ahmed.pdf>
- Babić, M., Tolomanoski D. & Lakić, Z. (2010). *Oxford English-Bosnian Dictionary*. Šahinpašić. Sarajevo.
- Bauer, L. (2007). *The Linguistics Student's handbook*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Belfarhi, Khadija. (2013). The componential analysis of literary meaning. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 15(2), 288-301. Retrieved February 16, 2021
- Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia (2020). Harold Pinter. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Harold-Pinter>
- Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia (2021). Theatre of the Absurd. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/art/Theatre-of-the-Absurd>
- Esslin, M. (1960). The Theatre of the Absurd. *The Tulane Drama Review*, 4(4), 3-15. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1124873?seq=1>
- Greenbaum, S. & Quirk, R. (1990) *A Student's Grammar of the English Language*. London: Pearson English Language Teaching.
- Huddleston, R. and Pullum, G. K. (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hurford, J. R., Heasley, B., & Smith, M. B. (2007). *Semantics: A Coursebook*. Cambridge University Press, from http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0123-46412013000200011&lng=en&tlng=en.
- Kemmerer, D., Tranel, D., & Zdanczyk, C. (2009). Knowledge of the semantic constraints on adjective order can be selectively impaired. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 22(1), 91–108.
- Kroeger, P. (2019). *Analyzing meaning: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Language Science Press.

- Lan, T. (2009). To Understand "Pinteresque": On Characteristics Of Harold Pinter's Plays. Retrieved May 29, 2021 from <https://www.globethesis.com/?t=2155360242974680>
- Lexico Dictionary (2021). *Pinteresque*. Retrieved May 31, 2021 from <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/pinteresque>
- Mahmoudi, N.; Azizmohammadi, F. & Kohzadi, H. (2013). Traces of guilt, identity, security, and existence in Harold Pinter's the Caretaker. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences* (148 – 155)
- Matulina-Jerak Željka. (1990). Komponencijalna analiza kao postupak utvrđivanja intralingvalne i interlingvalne srodnosti među glagolima. *Radovi. Razdio Filoloških Znanosti* 29 19 Str. 115-141.
- Michael Franke, Gregory Scontras, and Mihael Simonič. 2019. Subjectivity-based adjective ordering maximizes communicative success. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, pages 344–350.
- Mughal, A. Y. (n.d.). *Levels of language*. Scribd. Retrieved March 10, 2022, from <https://www.scribd.com/document/344873108/Levels-of-Language#>
- Nida, E. (2015). *A Componential Analysis of Meaning*. De Gruyter. Retrieved from <https://www.perlego.com/book/653843/a-componential-analysis-of-meaning-pdf>
- Patil, H. B. (2011). The Theme of Isolation in Harold Pinter's The Caretaker. *The Criterion: An International Journal in English*, 2(II). Retrieved from <https://the-criterion.com/V2/n3/Patil.pdf>
- Pinter, H. (1991). *The Caretaker*. Faber and Faber Limited. London.
- Rafaelli, Ida. (2015). *O značenju – uvod u semantiku*. Matica Hrvatska, Zagreb.
- Robson, M., & Stockwell, P. (2005). *Language in Theory: a Resource Book for Students*. (Routledge English language introductions series). Routledge.
- Russell, G., & Fara, D. G. (2014). *Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Language* (Routledge Philosophy Companions) (1st ed.) [E-book]. Routledge. London.
- Scontras, G., Degen, J., & Goodman, N. D. (2017). Subjectivity predicts adjective ordering preferences. *Open Mind: Discoveries in Cognitive Science*, 1(1), 53–65
- Siemund, P. (2000). *Intensifiers in English and German: A Comparison*. Routledge.

- Smajlović-Šabić, I. (2013). Konceptualizacijski pogled na metaforičko sevdisanje Bošnjaka. *Znakovi Vremena - Časopis Za Filozofiju, Religiju, Znanost i Društvenu Praksu*, (61-62), 325–338. Naučnoistraživački institut „Ibn-Sina“.
- Tiwari, C. S. (2012). Harold Pinter and The Theatre of the Absurd. *Lapis Lazuli -An International Literary Journal*, 2(2). Retrieved from <http://pintersociety.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Chandra-Shekhar-Tiwari-15.pdf>
- Uchman, J (2017). "Pinteresque Dialogue" Text Matters. vol.7, no.7, pp.386-401. Retrieved May 31, 2021 from <https://www.sciendo.com/article/10.1515/texmat-2017-0021>
- Zhang, F. (2003). *Componential Analysis Method*, Munich, GRIN Verlag, <https://www.grin.com/document/150583>