

TÜRKÇE'DE ANLAM KARŞITLIĞI

*Burcu İlkay KARAMAN**

ÖZET

Mikro düzeyde zıt anlam ilişkilerinin ele alındığı kapsam dışı ve zıt anlam ilişkileri (yatay ilişkiler) diye de tanımlanan anlam karşıtlığı, bir sözlükbirimin en az iki anlamının birbirine ters düşmesi sonucu ortaya çıkar. Bu güne değin araştırmalar Almanca ve İngilizce dillerindeki anlam karşıtlığı olgusu üzerine yoğunlaşmış ve bu olgunun bu iki dilden başka dillerde de varolması gerektiğini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Çünkü araştırmalar bu olgunun bütün doğal dillere has bir üniversal dilbilimsel özellik olduğuna işaret etmektedir. Böylece, beş türü olan anlam karşıtlığının Türkçe'de varolup olmadığını araştırmak ilginç olacaktır. Dolayısıyla, bu makalenin temel amacı Türkçe'de anlam karşıtlığı ve uygun örneklerle değişik türlerini araştırmak olacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sözcüksel Anlambilim, Sözcüksel Muğlaklık, Sözcükbilim, Sözlükbilim.

CONTRONYMY IN TURKISH

ABSTRACT

Conronymy, which has often been described as paradigmatic sense-relations of opposition and exclusion (horizontal relations) at the micro-level, occurs when a minimum of two senses of a lexical unit contrast each other semantically. So far, studies have focussed on conronymy in German and English and have revealed that we may actually be dealing with a phenomenon which must be existing in many more languages as it seems that this is a universal linguistic feature of all

*Yrd.Doç.Dr., Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Dilbilim, burcu.karaman@deu.edu.tr

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 4/8 Fall 2009*

natural languages. Thus, it will be interesting to scrutinize whether or not cononymy exists also in Turkish with its five different types. Therefore, this paper mainly focuses on cononymy in Turkish and the different types with relevant examples.

Key Words: Lexical Semantics, Lexical Ambiguity, Lexicology, Lexicography.

1 Introduction

Cononymy, also known as the phenomenon of sense-opposition at the micro-level, occurs when a minimum of two senses of a polysemous lexical item contradict each other. A basic example in English demonstrates how at least two senses of a lexically simple expression are in opposition:

(1) S1: For now, he is the *apparent* winner of the contest.

(2) S2: The solution to the problem was *apparent* to all.

Example (1) clearly indicates that *apparent* means ‘not clear or certain’ whereas in example (2) *apparent* denotes ‘obvious’. Clearly, both senses of the lexeme *apparent* are in opposition since one of the senses (S1) implies ‘seeming real or true, but not necessarily so’ and the other sense (S2) implies ‘clearly seen or understood’ (OALD 1995, 46). Further examples from the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English (OALD) for each of the senses S1 and S2 would include:

S1: Her *apparent* indifference made him even more nervous.

Their affluence is more *apparent* than real (ie They are not as rich as they seem to be)

S2: Certain problems were *apparent* from the outset.

It became *apparent* that she was going to die.
Then, for no *apparent* reason, she began to dislike school.

There exist five different types of cononyms, namely, cononymy of incompatibility, cononymy of antonymy, cononymy of complementarity, cononymy of conversivity, and cononymy of reversivity. In this paper, I will investigate cononyms in Turkish and demonstrate that, just as in German and English (see Karaman 2008 &

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 4/8 Fall 2009*

Lutzeier 1997, 2001, 2002), Turkish also contains five different types of contronyms.

2 Paradigmatic Sense-Relations of Opposition and Exclusion (Horizontal Relations) at the Micro-Level.

Sense-relations demonstrate the relationship between elements of meaning. There are three different types of sense-relations: paradigmatic, syntagmatic, and derivational sense-relations (Cruse 2000, 143ff.). Paradigmatic sense-relations are of two kind: paradigmatic sense-relations of identity and inclusion (also known as vertical relations) and paradigmatic sense-relations of opposition and exclusion (also known as horizontal relations) (Lutzeier 1995, 73-80). Horizontal relations are divided into two types: horizontal relations at the macro-level and horizontal relations at the micro-level.

At the macro-level horizontal relations deal with opposites, such as incompatibility, antonymy, complementarity, conversivity, and reversivity.¹ It is possible to draw an analogy between horizontal relations at the macro-level and horizontal relations at the micro-level. They both contain characteristics of five different types of opposition. Of course, not all polysemous lexical items can be subject to contronymy, however, contronymy demonstrates a case of polysemy since senses in opposition (e.g. Sense 1 (S1) and Sense 2 (S2)), both operate within a general sense, known as *aspect* (A).

This paper will solely be dealing with paradigmatic sense-relations of opposition and exclusion (i.e. horizontal relations) at the micro-level. First, I will begin with contronymy of incompatibility as this is the most basic type of opposition, and then continue to discuss the other four types of contronymy.²

2.1 Contronymy of Incompatibility:

Contronymy of incompatibility is when a lexeme has two senses within one aspect (A), which contradict each other. In order to demonstrate this, the lexeme *avlanmak* in Turkish will be treated as an example:

- (3) S1: Birkaç avcı *avlanmaktaydı*.
a few hunter hunting were

¹ This occurs when two lexical items contradict each other at the semantic level, for example, *long-short*, *forwards-backwards*, *true-false*, *lend-borrow* and so on.

² Incompatibility forms the most basic type of opposition, that is, incompatibility is fundamental to any kind of opposition.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 4/8 Fall 2009*

‘A few hunters were *hunting*.’

(4) S2: Geyik, *avlanacağını* sezince kaçtı.

deer is going to be hunted realize escaped

‘The deer escaped when it realized that it was going to be *hunted*.’

Within the aspect A = ‘activity’ one of the senses of the lexeme *avlanmak* in Turkish denotes S1 = ‘to hunt’ and the other S2 = ‘to be hunted’. If we look up the senses of *avlanmak* from the *Türkçe Sözlük* by Püsküllüoğlu (1999, 161) the following information can be collected:

S1: ‘ava gitmek, av yapmak’

S2: ‘av olarak yakalanmak ya da vurularak ele geçmek’

Naturally, not all polysemous lexemes can be conronymous. A minimum of two senses must be in opposition if a polysemous lexeme is considered conronymous. Characteristics such as gradability as in antonymy, binarity as in complementarity, directional opposition as in conversivity, the beginning and end stages of an event as in reversivity (Karaman 2008, 182) should be investigated in order to find out which conronymy type the senses of a lexeme can be subscribed to.

2.2 Conronymy of Antonymy:

In conronymy of antonymy a lexical unit contains a minimum of two senses which are contradictory within one aspect (A). Moreover, this lexical unit should be subject to gradation. In Turkish we have the lexeme *son* within the aspect A = ‘temporal state’ and with the senses S1: ‘more recently than any other time; that is, just prior, latest or most recent’ and S2: ‘occurring at or forming an end or termination; thus, coming after all others in time or space or degree or being the only one remaining; that is, final’. Examples (5) and (6) illustrate a perfect case for conronymy of antonymy:

(5) S1: İspanyol futbol yorumcuları,
Fenerbahçe

Spanish football commentators, Fenerbahçe

formasını giyen son gol kralını

uniform wearing latest goal king

eleştirdiler.

criticized.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 4/8 Fall 2009*

‘The Spanish football commentators criticized the *latest/recent* goal king who is playing for Fenerbahçe.’

(6) S2: Atatürk’ün *son* dakikaları.
Atatürk’s last minutes
‘*Last/final* minutes of Atatürk.’

In example (5) *son* denotes S1 = ‘the latest or most recent’ and in example (6) the same lexeme denotes S2 = ‘last or final’. A further example where both senses, S1 and S2, can occur within a same syntagma is the following example (7):

S1 & S2: *Son* yazdığım kitap benim *son*
latest writing book my final
yayınım olacak.
publication will be
‘My *latest* book will be my *final* publication.’

In example (7) the former lexeme *son* denotes ‘the latest’ and the latter lexeme *son* denotes ‘final’. Since gradation is an important feature of antonymy, we can say that on a gradable scale *the latest* or *most recent* is one unit per time before it reaches the *final* state.

2.3 Contronymy of Complementarity:

Contronymy of complementarity is the most extreme type of sense-opposition at the micro-level which bears binarity in its purest form. So, for instance, the lexeme *çevre* in Turkish as in (6) occurs within the aspect A = ‘locative state’ with the senses S1 = ‘by a circular or circuitous route inside the pivotal object’ and S2 = ‘in a circle or circular motion outside the pivotal object’.

(7) S1 & S2: Bahçenin *çevresinde*
dolaşıyordu.
garden of around walking
‘S/he was walking *around* the garden.’

Thus, in short, the sentence ‘bahçenin *çevresinde* dolaşıyordu’ in (6) can imply either S1 = ‘*inside* the garden along the fence’ or S2 = ‘*outside* the garden along the fence’. Hence, the two senses of *çevre* are in opposition.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 4/8 Fall 2009*

2.4 Conronymy of Conversivity:

A lexeme can be classified as a conronym of conversivity if within one aspect at least two of its senses are relative in terms of their directional properties and contradict each other. The lexeme *taşınmak* in Turkish sets a good example for conronym of conversivity. Within the aspect A = ‘transference’ there are the senses S1 = ‘to move from a flat’ or ‘to move out’ and S2 = ‘to move into a flat’ or ‘to move in’.

S1 & S2: Bu hafta sonu taşınıyoruz.
this weekend moving we

‘We are *moving* this weekend.’

The directional properties in S1 and S2 are bipartite and can be explained as follows: in example (7), the lexeme *taşınmak* indicates *to move out* and *to move in* at the same time. Thus, it would be perfectly correct to say: *bu hafta sonu evden taşınıyoruz* (*we are moving out from the flat this weekend*) and/or *bu hafta sonu eve taşınıyoruz* (*we are moving into the flat this weekend*). However, since under normal circumstances, *moving out from a flat/house/etc* also requires *moving in(to) a flat/house/etc* it is quite common to say *bu hafta taşınıyoruz*, which implies that both actions, *moving out* and *moving in*, are directionally bipartite.

2.5 Conronymy of Reversivity:

A lexeme is of conronym of reversivity type if, within one aspect (A) a minimum of two senses are contradictory in as much as its senses clearly describe either the beginning or end stages of an event and can be used interchangeably to mean either (Lutzeier 1997, 392 Lutzeier 1999, 25, Lutzeier 2001, 78, Lutzeier 2002, 11). The lexeme *çıkılmak* provides a good example for conronymy of reversive kind within the aspect A = ‘dentistry’. So, for instance, in example (8) *çıkılmak* on the one hand means S1 = ‘to lose one’s tooth’ and on the other hand it means S2 = ‘to grow a tooth’:

(8) S1 & S2: Yirmilik dişim çıktı.
twentyhood tooth my lost/grew

‘I *have lost/grown* a wisdom tooth.’ In this section, I have provided information and examples on the different types of conronymy in Turkish. For reasons of comparison, I will also provide a table outlining horizontal relations at the macro- and micro-levels together with relevant examples (see table 1). On table 1, there are the different types of opposition at the macro- and micro-levels beginning with incompatibility as this is the most basic type of opposition. Table

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 4/8 Fall 2009*

I will continue with the remaining different types of opposition, such as antonymy, complementarity, conversivity, and reversivity.

3 Conclusion

In this paper, I have demonstrated that contronymy, with its five different types, exists also in Turkish besides in German and in English. Moreover, it was possible to draw an analogy between horizontal relations at the macro-level (e.g. incompatibility, antonymy, complementarity, conversivity, and reversivity) and horizontal relations at the micro-level (e.g. contronymy of incompatibility, contronymy of antonymy, contronymy of complementarity, contronymy of conversivity, and contronymy of reversivity). Opposition at both levels exists parallel to each other, that is, horizontal relations at the micro-level bear characteristics similar to horizontal relations at the macro-level.

Furthermore, it has been emphasized that the simplest form of opposition is incompatibility. Hence, any type of contronymy is fundamentally incompatible in its essence. If there exists characteristics, such as gradability (as in antonymy), binarity (as in complementarity), directional opposition (as in conversivity), and the beginning and end stages of an event (as in reversivity), these should be associated with the relevant type of contronymy.

REFERENCES

- CRUSE Alan D., **Meaning in Language – An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics**, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2000.
- KARAMAN Burcu I., “On Contronymy”, In **The International Journal of Lexicography**, ed. by Paul Bogaards, pp. 173 – 192. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2008.
- LUTZEIER Peter R., **Lexikologie – Ein Arbeitsbuch**, Stauffenburg Einführungen. Stauffenburg Verlag, Brigitte Narr GmbH, Tübingen 1995.
- LUTZEIER Peter R., “Gegensinn als besondere Form lexikalischer Ambiguität”, In **Linguistische Berichte 171**, ed. by Günther Grewendorf and Arnim von Stechow, Westdeutscher Verlag GmbH, Opladen 1997, pp. 381 – 395.
- LUTZEIER Peter R., “Das Gerüst des Lexikons - Überlegungen zu den organisierenden Prinzipien im Lexikon”. In **Akten des 32. Linguistischen Kolloquiums. Internationale**

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 4/8 Fall 2009*

Tendenzen der Syntaktik, Semantik und Pragmatik, ed. by Hans Otto Spillmann and Ingo Warnke, Peter Lang, Kassel 1999, pp. 15 – 30.

LUTZEIER Peter R., “Polysemie mit spezieller Berücksichtigung des Gegensinns”. In **Lexicographica 17**, ed. by Fredric F. M. Dolezal, Alain Rey, Thorsten Roelcke, Herbert Ernst Wiegand, Werner Wolski, Ladislav Zgusta, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen 2001, pp. 69 – 91.

LUTZEIER Peter R., “Each Spoken Word Evokes its Opposite Sense – Towards a Dictionary of Words with Opposite Senses”, Talk at the Surrey Linguistics Circle, University of Surrey, 25.04.2002 Guildford.

OALD = Hornby, Albert Sidney.. **Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English**, 5th Edition, ed. by Jonathan Crowther, Kathryn Kavanagh and Michael Ashby, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1995.

PÜSKÜLLÜOĞLU Ali, **Türkçe Sözlük**, Doğan Kitapçılık A.Ş., İstanbul 1999.

Notes:

Table 1
An Overview of Paradigmatic Sense Relations of Opposition and Exclusion.

Horizontal Relations			
Opposition at the macro-level	Example	Opposition at the micro-level	Example
Incompatibility	'araba' – 'kamyon' (n) A = 'vehicle'	Contronymy of Incompatibility	'avlanmak' (v) A = 'activity' S1: 'to hunt' (birkaç avcı avlanmaktaydı) S2: 'to be hunted' (geyik, avlanacağımı sezince kaçtı)
Antonymy	'iyi' – 'kötü' (adj) A = 'evaluative state'	Contronymy of Antonymy	'son' (adj/adv) A = 'temporal state' S1: 'more recently than any other time; that is, just prior, latest or most recent' (İspanyol futbol yorumcuları, Fenerbahçe forması giyen son gol kralının eleştirdiler.) S2: 'occurring at or forming an end or termination; thus, coming after all others in time or space or degree or being the only one remaining; that is, final' (Atatürk'ün son dakikaları.)
Complementarity	'içinde' – 'dışında' (adj) A = 'locative relation' or 'male' – 'female' (n) A = 'gender'	Contronymy of Complementarity	'çevre' (prep/adv) A = 'locative state' S1: 'by a circular or circuitous route (i.e. in a circle or circular motion at the interior of the pivotal object)' (bahçenin çevresinde dolaşıyordu) S2: (by a circular or circuitous route (i.e. in a circle or circular motion outside the pivotal object)' (bahçenin çevresinde dolaşıyordu)

(Continued)

Table 1 (Continued)
An Overview of Paradigmatic Sense Relations of Opposition and Exclusion.

Horizontal Relations			
Opposition at the macro-level	Example	Opposition at the micro-level	Example
Conversivity	‘ön’ – ‘arka’ (adj) A = ‘locative relation’ or ‘almak’ – ‘vermek’ (v) A = ‘transference’	Conronymy of Conversivity	‘taşınmak’ (v) A = ‘transference’ S1: ‘to move from a flat’ or ‘to move out’ (bu hafta sonu <i>taşınıyoruz</i>) S2: ‘to move into a flat’ or ‘to move in’ (bu hafta sonu <i>taşınıyoruz</i>)
Reversivity	‘girmek’ – ‘çıkılmak’ A = ‘act’ or ‘yukarı’ – ‘aşağı’ A = ‘bipartite direction’	Conronymy of Reversivity	‘çıkılmak’ (v) A = ‘dentistry’ S1: ‘to loose one’s tooth’ (yirmilik dişim <i>çıkı</i>) S2: ‘to grow a tooth’ (yirmilik dişim <i>çıkı</i>)

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 4/8 Fall 2009*