



## Implicit Negation in Tatar Phraseology

Farida Bizyanovna Sittikova<sup>1</sup>, Venera Nafikovna Khisamova<sup>2</sup> and  
Zuhra Aivazovna Mutigullina<sup>3</sup>

*Kazan Federal University, Department of Foreign Languages, Kazan, Russia*

*E-mail: <sup>1</sup><farida7777@yandex.ru>, <sup>2</sup><hisamovaven@yandex.ru>, <sup>3</sup><ZAMotygullina@kpfu.ru>*

**KEYWORDS** Implicit Negation. Language. Linguistics. Phraseological Unit. Semantics. Tatar Language

**ABSTRACT** This study considered implicit negation expressed using phraseology. Therefore, phraseological units of the Tatar language were used as the material for the study, which have no formal markers of negation, but still carry negative semantics. Implicit negation can be a component of the meaning of a word or a whole sentence. The relevance of the study is the fact that the issue of implicit negation in Tatar linguistics has not been examined so far. The main result of the study was the identification of several of the most characteristic semantic groups of phraseological units which implicitly contain negation. In fact, numerous phraseological units that convey a negative assessment of people or phenomena were identified. In most cases, the negative assessment in them is based on the lexical meanings of words. Thus, this study may be useful to researchers who seek for solving problems of implicitness and negation.

### INTRODUCTION

Based on the research, the issue of negation takes an important place in modern linguistics. In spite of multiple works conducted on this issue, it has not been studied in detail yet and still requires further elaboration and systematization. Actually, the category of negation, which reflects the interrelation of language and thinking, undoubtedly plays an important role in the perception of information. In addition, negation is one of the main thinking categories that describe the linguistic picture of the world and cannot be determined with the help of simpler concepts. In particular, the linguistic dictionary notes that negation is one of the “semantically indecomposable semantic categories that cannot be defined through simpler semantic elements” (Wansing 2010; De Haan 2013; Moffatt and Müller 2019). Therefore, in following many researchers consider negation as a category of thinking that is reflected in language (Olszewski 2018; Farshchi et al. 2019).

It should be mentioned that the category of negation is one of the widest and most fundamental concepts and has been studied by different sciences such as philosophy, logic, psychology, and linguistics. All these sciences view the phenomenon of the category of negation according to their inherent aspects. Therefore, it could be stated that the problem of denial is indeed diverse and multidimensional (Partee and

Borschev 2008; Zovko and Ilc 2017). In this regard, Bondarenko (1983) in his monograph “Negation as a logical-grammatical category” writes: “... negation is one of the key concepts in various branches of science: this is philosophy, and formal and mathematical logic, and, of course, linguistics. Therefore, by looking for its own approach to the study of negation, each science interprets this phenomenon according to its specific features” (Bondarenko 1983).

As demonstrated by the studies, negation plays an integral role in the communicative process and can be expressed explicitly or implicitly in discourse. As practice shows, the palette of linguistic means for expressing negation is very diverse and includes semantic, lexical, syntactic, morphological, and intonational means.

In particular, Bondarenko called the expression methods of negative particles, negative affixes, negative pronouns and adverbs, negative alliances and prepositions (in some languages, postpositions), and an implicit way of expressing negation in the above monograph (Bondarenko 1983; Strawson 2017).

Here, it is necessary to express a few words about the terms “implicit” and “explicit”. “Implicitness” is a term, which describes indirect way of saying something, the asymmetry between content and expression of this content by linguistic means. In fact, implicitness makes it possible to transfer an unlimited number of values through a limited language code. It is the property of all

natural languages to express the content that cannot be understood from the meaning of the utterance language units, but participants of the communicative act can easily comprehend on the basis of collective and individual life experience, background knowledge of the surrounding world, situations, context, intonation, and so forth. On the contrary, the term “explicit” means “explicitly expressed and easily understood” (Lunkova 2016).

Actually, explicit negation in each language has formal signs that easily allow us to identify negative constructions. For example, various negative affixes and suffixes (verb: -ма-мә, for adjectives: -сез-сыз), predicative words: юк, юкка, түгел, and so forth can be used in the Tatar languages. However, explicit negation is always clear and explicit, as opposed to implicit.

As for implicit negation, it is much less common than explicit one and is transmitted without using formal grammatical markers. Some authors accept that implicit modes of expressing negation are not sufficiently studied in contemporary linguistics, and the reason is quite simple, which refers to the complexity of the phenomenon (Lunkova 2016).

However, many authors who have studied implicit negation note that the statement may be interrogative or affirmative in its form, but nevertheless there are factors that enable communicants to understand an implicit negative meaning in the discourse. These factors include intonation, logical stress, word order in the sentence, and extra-linguistic factors such as communication situation and background knowledge of communicants (Ji 2016).

It should be noted that a pragmatic component is highly important in statements with implicit negation; that is, the speaker uses it to express their attitude to the phenomena of reality or people around him. Accordingly, age, gender, social status, cultural level of the participants, and, of course, context can also be important.

### Objectives

In the current study, it was tried to consider implicit negation expressed using phraseology. Therefore, phraseological units of the Tatar language were used as the material for the study, which have no formal markers of negation, but still carry negative semantics.

## METHODOLOGY

The topic of the present study is implicit negation that is expressed in language using phraseology. The material for the study was Tatar phraseological units (PU hereinafter), which were selected by semantic analysis, did not have any formal markers of negation and contained a negative meaning. The criterion for the presence of implicit negation and other implicit categories is the asymmetry between the content itself and the way of expressing this content, as well as the non-expression value of formal-grammatical indicators. It should be noted that all examples were provided by the source “Phraseological Dictionary of the Tatar language” by Safiullina (Safiullina 2001). Finally, the authors used component analyses and description methods apart from semantic analysis.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The relevance of this study refers to the fact that the issue of implicit negation has not been developed yet in Tatar linguistics. Therefore, the authors initiated studying ways of expressing negation in the Tatar language. Sitdikova et al. (2017) used the cognitive approach to examine cases of the transfer of implicit negation in the dialogical discourse (Sitdikova et al. 2017). Thus, the main results of the study consist of the description of the recognition mechanism of implicit meaning and identification of some typical cases of implicit negation in the statements of the dialogue, characterized by the asymmetry of the interrogative and response replicas. Finally, the study is a continuation of the work started in this field.

It is widely accepted that phraseology is a special field of knowledge, within which the language, culture, and worldview of one or another ethnos are most closely intertwined (Soboleva 2017).

In fact, phraseological units in all languages contain the age-old cultural and historical experience of the people, including material and spiritual culture. In addition, by reflecting and absorbing the differences in the phenomena and properties of the objective world, language has recorded various ways of expressing implicit negation with the help of phraseology.

Here giving the examples for the first case; when a negative meaning is included in the semantics of a word or phrase: ашадан баш тартты – did not eat, аяк терәп каршы тору – disagree, oppose; әлжә-мәлжә килү – to feel disoriented, бармак аша курау – not to notice (intentionally), to look through fingers, биттенә ак тиресе каплагана – not having shame, тәңкәгә тию/жанга тию/буынга төшү – to give no rest, be annoying, печән юлы белән бару/питрау күкесе булу – to say something wrong, inadvertently, тәртәне артка (кире) бору – refuse these promises (Safiullina 2001).

However, examples of when implicit negation is derived from the whole sentence are not as numerous as in the first case. Giving a few examples: Чабатасын башлаган, киндерә тагасы калгач ташлаган – did not complete the work begun. Абзарыннан саеткан оча (literally: A wagtail flies away from the barn) – having no wealth. Әзер кабер үлесе, әзер туйның тилесе – about a person who has no problems (Safiullina 2001).

Thus, it should be noted that negative semantics in all languages can often be identified when the phraseological units (PU) is translated to another language. Consider this example from English: to turn a blind eye to something; when translated into Russian or Tatar, it means not to pay attention to something. This is the case with Tatar phraseological units (PU) for instance: Кәбестә шулпасы әз ечкән/нужа калачын әз ашаган – he has no experience or he does not know life.

Considering the PU, which contains implicit negation, one can easily identify a group of phraseological units in all languages that are designed according to the paradox principle and asserting unreality, the impossibility of something. There are also special phrases of a comparative nature in Tatar (some researchers refer to them as a denying comparison).

For example, PU кәбестә кебек беркатлы means the opposite of simple and open, since a cabbage is a multi-layered vegetable. Therefore, when comparing a person with a cabbage, the authors mean his complicated nature and being cunning. Another example: the expression of әтлә-мәчелә тору (яшәү) – to get along like a cat with a dog, also unconditionally carries with it an implicit denial. Under this condition, background knowledge, as well as individual and collective

experiences that are present in native speakers, help to convey the correct implicit meaning.

Let us give some more examples of PU belonging to the same group and related to unrealistic events or phenomena: әтәч азан әйткәндә/әтәч күкәй салганда – when the rooster calls to azan (morning prayer)/when the rooster starts to lay eggs; мич башында өшен үлгән – lying on the stove froze to death (that is, not capable of anything); суга сәнәк белән язган – written with a pitchfork on the water, miracle up in the air (that is, something incomprehensible, indefinite, disappearing as quickly as circles on the water).

In any language, there is another type of implicit negation called intonational phraseological units (IPU), which is quite common. Under the IPU, the authors mean such phraseological units that have their own intonational pattern, owing to which native speakers comprehend their meaning (Hosseini and Ganbari-Erdi 2019). A sentence may be affirmative in form, but intonation and context indicate the opposite; for example: Кирәге бар (иде)! – literally: Need it very much, the meaning: Don't need it at all! Пычагыма кирәк – Why the hell is needed! (that is, Isn't needed at all). (Аның) койрыгын тотарсың – Look for the wind in the field (that is, You cannot find them). Эт белә – Dog knows! (that is, nobody knows). Әллә тагы! What are you talking about! (Safiullina 2001). Such PU are especially common in conversational speech, with its emotional richness.

Based on the analyses, IPU are always expressive and emotionally colored, and in spite of the affirmative form, they often carry the meanings of denial, refusal, disagreement, and disapproval. As a rule, they a) are stable in form, b) semantically non-segmented, and c) as the researchers note, the main characteristic of IPU is a certain intonation pattern. Moreover, it was stated that IPU with the meaning of denial, refusal, protest, and disapproval constitute the most numerous groups among all IPs (Hosseini and Ganbari-Erdi 2019).

It should be noted that IPU can be easily understood by native speakers, but can be difficult for those who have poor knowledge or who are just learning a language. However, in our earlier article on implicit negation, an anecdote was cited based on the meanings of IPU, where the

translator understood literally phrases like “I need them!”, “Hello, I am your aunt”, and so forth. In the context of a joke, these phraseological units were used to create a humorous effect.

Although it is more difficult to understand the hidden implicit denial in a statement, it can be used deliberately in speech for creating a humorous effect, as well as when speakers make hints, express irony, and so forth (Sitdikova et al. 2017). The following is an example of a negative utterance in a dialogic discourse containing an IPU:

- Мин хулиган малайга охшаганмы, апа?
- Auntie, do I look like a bully?
- What are you saying, sonny! You look handsome, and clothes are expensive.

As in any nation, there are many PU in Tatar phraseology that reflect religious concepts, in particular, the words Alla, Khodai, and Shaitan. Now, consider several phrases with implicit negation: Бер Ходай үзе генә белә – only God knows (the meaning is: nobody knows), Алла/Ходай сакласын – God save us, Ходай кунагы – unwanted, uninvited guest; Алла колы – off the world (one of the meanings), Шайтан белсен – the devil knows (that is, nobody knows), Шайтанга үлчим – God forbids, Шайтаннан иман алырсың – you won’t get a damn thing (Safiullina 2001). Unfortunately, the negative semantics sometimes is lost when these PU are translated into other languages.

Of course, there are quite many phraseological units in Tatar language that include the names of such folklore creatures as Peri (пәри), Jen (жен), and Shurale (шүрәле). In this regard, the authors could find examples with negative semantics: пәри башка, жен башка – don’t confuse important and minor things, жене кебек күрү – dislike very much; шүрәлегә су башы күрсәтү – to show the wrong way; пәри арбасы/шайтан арбасы – about a man with no principles (Safiullina 2001).

Analysis results showed that negation, including implicit one, is closely interrelated with negative assessment. Then, the authors identified a large number of phraseological units in the Tatar language, which express the subjective-emotional characteristics and implicitly contain negative assessment of people or phenomena: пешкән шалкан, төшөп калган – about a useless person, һәш дисәң ары, һәш дисәң бире — not having their own opinion,

поты бер тиен – worthless, чапан калыбы – an illiterate spiritual person; тәмуҗ кисәве – devil incarnate, an evil person, тар күңелле, тар холькылы – yellow-bellied soul, тәнкыйтьтән түбән – very poor, below the acceptable level, чәеннән Мәскәү юлы күрене – one can see Moscow though your tea (disapprovingly of liquid tea), шүрәле каргаган (авыл, йорт) – bad, damned (Safiullina 2001).

Of course, when the authors analyzed such phraseological units, it was found that in most cases, the negative assessment in them is based on the lexical meanings of the words: тар – narrow, түбән – low; that is, insufficiency of some characteristic, пәри – Peri, шүрәле – Satyr, тәмуҗ – Hell; that is, negative characters and concepts.

As stated by researchers, negation is a mental conceptual category that finds expression in language and can be found in all-natural languages. Moreover, it can be expressed both explicitly and implicitly at all language levels due to the inherent category of negation and the ability to use a set of means to express negative meaning (for example, lexical, morphological, syntactic, semantic, and prosodic).

As mentioned earlier, while explicit negation is always clear and understandable, implicit negation has no formal grammatical markers. Of course, the factors that enable to understand the hidden negative meaning can be context, intonation, logical stress, word order in the sentence, as well as extra-linguistic factors, such as communication situation and background knowledge of communicants.

For further research, it is recommended to compare implicit negation in Tatar phraseology with the same phenomenon in other languages, as, for example, the comparative analyses of English, Arabic, and Tatar phraseology made by a group of authors (Subich et al. 2016).

## CONCLUSION

1. Implicit negation can be identified using a particular language unit semantic analysis. Actually, it is asymmetrical; that is, the negative content does not correspond to the positive form of the sentence or word-combination.
2. Negative semantics is often identified when translating PUs from one language

to another. In fact, implicit means of negation can be found at the level of words, phrases, and sentences.

3. Like in all languages, there is a group of PUs in Tatar, which has been built on the paradox principle and stating the unreality, the impossibility of something. In addition, the background knowledge that the native speakers have, as well as individual and collective experience, help them to derive a negative implicit meaning.
4. In colloquial Tatar language, there is such type of implicit negation as IPU (intonation idioms). These IPUs have a certain intonation pattern, they are always expressive and emotionally colored. As a rule; they are stable in form, semantically non-segmented, and are found in discourse in the form of intonationally-stable replicas.
5. In Tatar phraseology, numerous phraseological units with negative semantics are found, including religious concepts and names of folklore and mythical characters.
6. Negation in its semantics has a close relationship to negative assessment. Therefore, numerous PUs has been identified that convey a negative assessment of people or phenomena, and in most cases, a negative assessment in them is based on the lexical meanings of words.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

This study considered implicit negation expressed using phraseology. Therefore, phraseological units of the Tatar language were used as the material for the study, which have no formal markers of negation, but still carry negative semantics. In order to obtain general results for future studies it is suggested to investigate the phraseological units of the Russian language and compare them.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was conducted according to the

Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

### REFERENCES

- Bondarenko VN 1983. *Negation is Logical and Grammatical Category*. Moscow, Russia: AST Publishing Group (In Russian).
- De Haan F 2013. *The Interaction of Modality and Negation: A Typological Study*. Routledge.
- Farshchi S, Andersson R, Weijer J, Paradis C 2019. Processing negation in a miniature artificial language. *Cognitive Science*, 43(3): e12720.
- Hosseini A, Ganbari-Erdi FS 2015. Young scientist, double negation in Russian and Persian. *Russian Language Journal*, 3: 983-987 (In Russian).
- Ji F 2016. The comparative analysis of implicit negation in Russian and Chinese. *Reports Scientific Society*, 3: 8-12.
- Lunkova LN 2016. Explicit and implicit negation in the natural language. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 1: 19-24.
- Moffatt NG, Müller N 2019. Developing a linguistic profile for Russian. *Grammatical Profiles: Further Languages of LARSP*, 8(3): 29-37.
- Olszewski A 2018. Negation in the language of theology-some issues. *Zagadnienia Filozoficzne w Nauce*, 65: 87-107.
- Partee BH, Borschev V 2008. Existential sentences, BE, and the genitive of negation in Russian. In: I Comorovski, K von Heusinger (Eds.): *Existence: Semantics and Syntax*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 147-190.
- Safiullina FS 2001. *Tatarcha-Ruscha Phraseologic Suslek*. Kazan: Magarif (In Russian).
- Sitdikova FB, Safina DR, Melnikova OK 2017. Implicitnoye otrizaniye I sposobi ego peredachi v viskazivaniyah dialoga. *Vestnik Vyatskogo Gos. Gumanitarnogo Universiteta*, 3: 66-71 (In Russian).
- Soboleva N 2017. *Linguoculturological Aspects of the Contextual Use of Phraseological Units in Advertising Slogans*. Chelyabinsk, Russia: Arkaim Publishing House (In Russian).
- Subich V, Mingazova N, Shamsutdinova E 2016. Comparative analysis of English, Arabic and Tatar national corpora. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(2): 150-154.
- Strawson PF 2017. *Subject and Predicate in Logic and Grammar*. Routledge.
- Wansing H 2010. *Negation: A Notion in Focus (Perspektiven der Analytischen Philosophie/Perspectives in Analytical Philosophy)*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Zovko DI, Ilc G 2017. Pleonastic negation from a cross-linguistic perspective. *Jezikoslovlje*, 18(1): 159-180.

Paper received for publication in October, 2019  
Paper accepted for publication in December 2019