

Ways of Expressing Complementarity in English and Tatar Antonymy

Venera N. Khisamova , Dina R. Safina

Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russian Federations

Abstract

The article is aimed at studying the problem of complementaries in a comparative aspect. The article presents examples of this opposition type in English and Tatar languages and identifies the parts of speech forming it. As a result we can conclude that both in English and Tatar languages complementaries express binary opposition, refer to different persons or denotates, do not express the direction, denial of one concept means the presence of the second concept. Some pairs of complementary opposition may be gradual. They may have some degree of the feature. Complementarity in the given different structure languages can be expressed by nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs. Complementary opposition expressed by verbs can form triplets both in English and Tatar languages. The materials of the article can be useful for further theoretical study of the problem of antonymy on the basis of different structure languages, as well as in translation and lexicographic practice.

Key words: Complementarity, Binary opposition, Gradable complementaries, Lexical antonymy, Different structure languages

INTRODUCTION

As it is known, the typology of opposites that form the basis of antonymy is an unevenly studied question in English and Tatar linguistics [1]. In general, the classification of lexical antonyms in terms of the nature of the opposition in a comparative aspect based on the English and Tatar languages is a poorly understood area of linguistics [2]. As a result, in this article we will pay attention to one of the types of opposites, namely the complementary opposition based on the antonyms of the English and Tatar languages.

The complementary opposition was studied on the basis of English language by such authors as J. Lyons, A. Cruse, S. Jones, J. Katz, R. Kempson, R. Murphy, G. Leech, and others.

In the Tatar language this type of opposition is to some extent mentioned in the dissertational studies of

L.G.Khabibov [3], R.M. Zakirova [4], G.M. Polkina [5]. If one series of researchers of the Tatar language mentions the existence of a complementary opposition in foreign linguistics, others stop on a number of examples of this opposition in the Tatar language. In the textbook "Lexicology of the Tatar language" this type is called contradictory (complementary) antonyms. These are opposite words, complementary to each other, and the denial of one concept leads to the affirmation of the other. For example, *yalgantügel-chin* / not false- truth, *yumartügel-saran* / not generous- mean, *isäntügel-ülgän* / not alive- dead [6].

However, in Tatar linguistics this opposition type has not been studied in detail yet. Also, the characteristic features of this opposition have not been established. Moreover, the parts of speech participating in its formation have not been defined. For this reason, for the first time we will try to describe and systematize this opposition type on the basis of the Tatar language. We will also examine ways of expressing complementaries in a comparative aspect based on English and Tatar languages.

METHODS

There are some differences in the terminology used in English, Tatar and Russian linguistics. In English, you can

Access this article online



www.ijss-sn.com

Month of Submission : 04-2017
Month of Peer Review : 05-2017
Month of Acceptance : 06-2017
Month of Publishing : 09-2017

Corresponding Author: Venera N. Khisamova, Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russian Federation, Russia. E-mail: leila68@yandex.ru

find the names binary antonyms, binary taxonomy, non-gradual antonyms, complementary antonymy, in Russian linguistics, a contradictory contrast, complementarity (L.A. Novikov) [7], complementary antonyms (O.N. Likhacheva) [8].

Novikov L.A., analyzing the opposites in semantics, considers this type as a contradictory opposition [7], and also mentions it in the section of antonyms expressing complementarity. Likhacheva O.N., studying the antonyms of Russian and English languages, calls this type complementary antonyms [8].

According to L.A. Novikov, contradictory opposition in the Russian language corresponds to the formula X-not X. It lacks the middle (intermediate) member of the opposition. In contrast to the gradual opposition, such antonyms do not form comparative degrees, unlike the gradual antonyms. For example, можно- нельзя/ permitted-prohibited, живой- мертвый/ alive-dead, истинный- ложный/ true-false, влажный- сухой/ wet-dry, открыт- закрыт/ open-closed. It is impossible to say болееженатый/ more married, менееистинный/ less true. L.A. Novikov includes to these antonyms expressing complementarity the following nouns (мужчина –женщина/ man-woman, война-мир/ war-peace, истина-ложь/ truth-lie, свобода-зависимость/ freedom-dependence), adjectives (зрячий-слепой/ sighted-blind, верный-неверный, ошибочный (ответ)/ right-wrong (answer), влажный-сухой/ wet-dry, женатый-холостой/ married-single, здоровый-больной/ healthy-sick) and adverbs (вместе-врозь, внутри-снаружи/ inside-outside, нечаянно-умышленно/ accidentally- intentionally, постоянно-временно/ permanently- temporarily etc.) [7].

J. Lyons describes complementarity as one of the types of opposition along with antonymy, converses and directional opposition. For example, male-female, single-married [9]. We followed Lyons believe that in the Tatar language the complementary opposition also takes a special place among other kinds of opposition in antonymy.

In both English and Tatar, with the complementary opposite, the denial of the first member implies the assertion of the other and vice versa. For example, John is not married/Djonöylängäntügel means that John is single/Djonbuydak. And the sentence John is married/Djonöylängän means John is not single/Djonbuydaktügel (English examples of J. Lyons [9], Tatar examples of the authors). This is the main difference of complementarity from gradual antonyms, such as good-bad/yahshī –nachar, high-low/biek- täbänäk. For example, the statement John is good/Djonyahshī is equivalent to the statement John is not bad/Djonnachartügel. But John is not

good/Djonyahchitügel does not mean that John is bad/Djonnachar. Between good/yahchī and bad/nachar there are a lot of other qualities (English examples by J. Lyons [9], tatar examples of the authors).

A. Cruse considers complementarity the main form of lexical opposition. Between members of this opposition there is not and can not be a third link, because it is a binary opposition in the purest form [10]. For example, true-false/ chin- yalgan, dead-alive/ üle- tere, open-shut/ achik- yabik. Complementarity is found in the statements in which both concepts are denied. For example,

The door is neither open nor shut/ Isbekachik ta yabik ta tügel.

The hamster was neither dead nor alive/ Ärlänüledäteredätügel ide.

The statement that John has blue eyes is neither true nor false/ Djonningkäñ zlärezängärtöstädigänfikerdörestäyalgış ta tügel. (examples by A. Cruse [10], tatar examples of the authors).

Also in the Tatar language, the complementarity describes polar concepts, and there is no intermediate term between them. For example, dead- alive/ üle- tere, true- false/ chin – yalgan, obey- disobey/ tinglarga- tinglamaska, inside- outside/ echendä- tishinda, continuedoing - stopdoing/ bashlau- beterü, possible- impossible/ mömkinlek – mömkin tügellek, stationary- moving/ häräkät- häräkätsezlek, male- female/ ir-at - hatin-kış (English examples by Cruse, Tatar examples by F.S. Safullina [11]).

RESULTS

According to English researchers complementarity has a strict logical definition, which can be expressed by the formula: $F(X) \text{ entails and is entailed by } \text{not } \neg F(Y)$ [10].

S. Jones distinguishes two main classes of antonymy: non-gradual and gradual antonymy. According to him non-gradual antonymy is the same as complementarity. G. Leech calls this class a binary taxonomy. H. Jackson (1988), F. Palmer (1976) calls it complementarity. R. Kempson describes such binary opposition as real antonyms (true antonyms). In the classical sense, if X is not a woman, then X is man and vice versa [12].

According to G. Leech, the above formula is not sufficient to establish the complementarity. The author proposes to produce a component analysis of the antonymous pair. For example,

man: +adult, +human, +male

woman: +adult, +human, -male. [13]

According to this analysis, the man is first of all a human being, secondly, it is an adult, in the third, by gender, a man. A woman is a human, an adult and not a male. Thus, it can be seen that these pairs coincide in terms of the component, with the exception of a sex feature.

R. Kempson (1977), following G. Leech, proposes to address the component analysis, especially when analyzing the antonymous pairs relating to the topic of kinship. Tatar complementary antonyms concerning this subject can also be disassembled by component composition. For example, *ene- sengel/younger brother - younger sister, apa-abiy/ aunt-uncle.*

ene: + *keshe*/human, + *yäshbekechkenä*/young, + *malay*/boy

sengel: + *keshe*/human, + *yäshbe kechkenä*/young, - *malaytügel*/not a boy

apa: + *keshe*/human, + *tugan*/relative, + *olirak*/older, + *hatin- kız*/woman

abiy: + *keshe*/human, + *tugan*/relative, + *olirak*/older, - *hatin- kıztügel*/not a woman

It can be noted that complementarity is particularly evident in words opposing in sex and expressing kinship. For example, *ana-ata*/mother-father, *anakay-atakay*/mummy-daddy, *kız-ul*/daughter-son, *koda-kogogjy*/father-in-law - mother-in-law, *kilen-kjyüü*/daughter-in-law - son-in-law. But, on the other hand, antonyms expressing kinship can also express converses if they correspond to the formula $A \text{ Bning atası} = B \text{ Anıng balası}$. For example, *ata-bala*/father-child, *ana-bala*/mother-child, *ata-ul*/father-son are converses, not complementaries.

Some scholars of English linguistics believe that it is very difficult to draw a line between complementary antonyms and gradual antonyms. For example, Jackson generally doubts the existence of non-gradual antonymy because “any non-gradual antonym can be made gradual”. In his opinion, there is some reason to doubt the existence of male-female opposition, because it is possible to perform an operation and to change the sex. In the same way, A. Cruse says that there is no clear opposition between the alive-dead, because there is an intermediate link between them, when vampires and zombies can be on the verge of life and death. However, in our opinion, such examples are few, they are only exceptions.

M.L. Murphy also believes that complementarity does not always imply a binary opposition. The scientist cites whole sets as an example. For example, the suit of cards: *spade-heart-diamond-club*.

If the ace is a spade, then it is not a heart, diamond, or club.

If the ace is not a spade, then it is a heart, diamond, or club [14].

According to S. Jones, some complementary antonyms can become gradual, to have the degree of a characteristic. For example, the words *alive, male, pregnant* can be used in comparative and superlative degrees (*more alive, extremely male, very pregnant*). For example,

But I feel much more alive when I'm acting –the rest of life becomes much more interesting.

Josh Logan had noted he was all a director could hope for: tall, humorous, extremely male.

Margo at that time was very pregnant with Hector, and we had dinner and talked late into the night. [15]

Some scholars do not see a clear line between gradual and complementary antonyms. According to F. Palmer, there is no clear difference between complementary and gradual antonyms, because some complementary antonyms can be graded and have a degree [16]. For example, *male-female, married- single, alive-dead* may be also gradable. Someone may be *very male, more married, more dead than alive*. At the same time, some gradable antonyms may have a dichotomic pair. For example, *honest –dishonest/namusli- namussiz, obedient- disobedient/tinglauchan - tinglamauchan, open-shut/achik- yabik*. They are gradable as it is possible to use *more or less* in English or to add suffix *-rak/-rak* in Tatar language.

Bill is more honest than John/ *Bill Djonga Karaganda namuslirak.*

Bill isn't honest = Bill is dishonest/ *Bill namuslitügel = Bill namussiz;*

Bill isn't dishonest = Bill is honest/ *Bill namussiztügel = Bill namusli* (English examples by F. Palmer [16], translation by the authors).

As we see, some scientists take the gradation of non-gradual antonyms and the existence of boundary examples. In this connection, we would like to quote the work of J. Lyons, in which the author writes about the fact that such cases “do not mean the absence of a clear line between gradual and non-gradual antonyms.” [9].

In English and Tatar, the complementarity can be expressed by nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs.

For example, the complementary opposition, expressed by nouns: *liberty-restraint/irek-totkänlik; sympathy- antipathy/ simpatiya- antipatiya*. Complementary opposition among adjectives of English and Tatar languages: *independent-dependent/ azat - bähle; healthy- unhealthy/sälamät – aviru*. Complementary opposition, expressed by adverbs: *temporarily- permanently/ vakitlicha - daimi; daily- nightly/ köndež – tönlä*. Complementary

opposition expressed by verbs: *allow- prevent, forbid/ röhsätitü - tıyü;live- die/ yäshärgä- ülürgä and etc.*

Among the examples of complementary opposites expressed by the above-mentioned parts of speech, a number of nouns in English and Tatar have their distinctive features. Among them there are both universal examples (man-woman/ir-eget-hatın-kız, manly-womanly, masculine-feminine, male-female/hatın-kız (kieme) - irlär (kieme)) [17, 18, 11] and etc, and distinctive nouns that express kinship relationships(koda- kodagıy, kelen, käläsh - kiyäü, kart- karvıhik, äti- äni, babay- äbi etc.)([11]and animals in Tatar language. For example, *tana- ügeç, anakaç- atakaç, tavik-ätäch, bilbil- karga, bilbil-börketetc* [11].

As it can be seen from the examples, in the Tatar language there are a number of antonyms expressing animals - females and males, as well as species of the animal world. In English, on the contrary, there are no similar examples in the antonymic dictionaries. However, A. Cruse in his work mentions the antonyms lion and lioness, which are complementarity, within the species of lions[10].

DISCUSSIONS

The complementarity expressed by the verbs is of a complex nature, since to a certain extent borders on the directional opposition, especially with antonyms-reverses. A. Cruse in such cases suggests using the term reversible complementarity. According to the author, there are antonymous triplets, where there are three components. And there are three kinds of these triplets. For example, *beborn- live- die*. In this triplet, the ultimate members of the opposition *be born* and *die* are reverses. Thus, the first type of complementary opposition expressed by verbs the author calls reversible complementarity. This type of complementarity can also be found in the example of Tatar antonyms. For example, *tuu- yäshäü- ülü*. In this triplet *tuu- ülü* are reverses, *yäshäü- ülü* - complementary opposition. The following examples can also be attributed to this type of opposition: *learn - remember - forget/ öyränü - iskäälü- onıtu; arrive- stay -leave/ kilü - kalu- kitüetc* [11,17,18].

The second type - interactives - arises when a pair of antonyms is a response to a command or stimulus word. For example, *command/ kushu* is an interactive to *obey-disobey/ buysınu-buysınmau*. Other interactive triplets include: *request -grant -refuse/ sorau, taläp itü- kire kagu- rıza bulu; greet -acknowledge -snub/ sälamläü- rähmätlebulu - sangasuk.maüetc* [11,17,18].

The third type is satisfactives, a weak form of opposition. In this triplet, the first word means trying to do

something, and a pair of antonyms express the outcome of the event. For example, *compete - win- lose/ yarışu- otu- ottıru; try - succeed -fail/ tırışu - unğıshka ireshü - ottıru, unğıshsızlık kicherü; aim - hit - miss/ tözäü- elägü -eläkemü etc.* [11,17,18].

The fourth type - counteractives - means that the first word is an aggressive action, the second word is an attempt to counteract, the third component is an unsuccessful attempt to resist. For example, *attack -defend -submit/ höjüm itü- saklanu - buysınu; charge -refute -admit/ gaepläü - kire kagu- kabul itü etc.*

However, some scholars, S. Jones for example, doubted the classification of A. Cruse because there are not enough examples that can be illustrated in these triplets. In some cases, *not winning* does not mean *losing*, as it may be *drawing*.

We recognize that not all verbs can be part of an antonymous triplet, but this does not doubt the existence of a complementary antithesis expressed by verbs, both in English and Tatar.

On the one hand, A. Cruse says that opposites that are not complementary can not be used in a certain context. For example, gradual antonyms such as *good- bad, rising-falling*. But at the same time, A. Cruse recognizes the existence of some borderline examples, when complementary antonyms may have a gradation of a feature. So they can have a minimum or maximum degree of a quality. These adjectives can take the form of more or less: *accurate- inaccurate/ tögäl- yalgış, pure- impure/ chista- pıchrak, satisfactory-unsatisfactory/ kanägatle - kanägat bulmagan, smooth- rough/ shoma- kätırshü, drunk- sober/ iserek - ayek etc* [11,17,18].

CONCLUSION

Analyzing the literature concerning the description of the complementary opposite in English and Tatar linguistics, by making a selection of examples from the antonymic dictionaries of English and Tatar, the following conclusion can be drawn. In English and Tatar, the complementarity expresses binary opposition, refers to different persons (denotes), does not express the direction, denial of one concept means the presence of the second concept. Some pairs of complementary opposition are gradual. So they may have some degree of the feature. The complementaries in these different structure languages can be expressed by nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs. Complementary opposition expressed by verbs can form triplets both in English and Tatar languages.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

1. Safina D.R. Problems of classification of antonyms of different structure languages (on the base of English and Tatar)//Actual problems of the humanities and natural sciences. -2016. №12-5.-P.31-34
2. Khisamova V.N., Safina D.R. B.H. Hisamova V.N., Safina D.R. Typological features of antonyms-reverses formation in English and Tatar languages// Philological Sciences. Questions of theory and practice. 2017. № 5-2 (71). C. 153-156.
3. Khabibov L.G. Structural and semantic features of antonyms in the Tatar language: diss./L.G. Habibov. - Ufa, 1984.
4. Zakirova R.M. Antonyms in the Tatar language (lexico-grammatical, semantic and stylistic features of usage): diss./R.M. Zakirova -Kazan, 2001.
5. Polkina G.M. Comparative analysis of phraseological units with antonymic components in English and Tatar: diss./G.M. Polkina.-Kazan,2002.
6. Tatar lexicology: in three volumes/Zakiev M.Z., Galiullina G.R. –Kazan, Tahsi, 2015. –V.I. C. 176
7. Novikov L.A. Antonymy in Russian Language. 1973
8. Likhacheva O.N. Comparative-typological structural-semantic analysis of antonyms in Russian and English: diss./O.H. Likhacheva.- Maykop, 2006.
9. Lyons J. Introduction to theoretical linguistics.1968
10. Cruse D.A. Meaning in language. An introduction to semantics and pragmatics. Oxford university press. 2000. P.168
11. Safiullina F.S. Tatar-Russian, Russian-Tatar antonymic dictionary. Kazan: Publisher of Republic of Tatarstan (TARIH), 2003. 128p.
12. Kempson R.U. Semantic theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1977. P.84
13. Leech G. Semantics. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 1974. C.109
14. Murhy M.L. Semantic relations and the lexicon. Antonymy, synonymy, and other paradigms. 2003. C.194-195
15. Jones S. Antonymy. A corpus based perspective. 2002. 193 p.
16. Palmer F. Semantics. A new outline. Cambridge university press. 1976. P.81
17. The Oxford Dictionary of Synonyms and Antonyms. Third edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2014
18. The Merriam-Webster Dictionary of Synonyms and Antonyms. Massachusetts: Publishers Springfield, 2016. 443 p.

How to cite this article: Khisamova VN, Safina DR. Ways of Expressing Complementarity in English and Tatar Antonymy. It J Sci Stud 2017;5(6):151-155.

Source of Support: Nil, **Conflict of Interest:** None declared.