Antonymous Relations in Lexicography

Sarekenova K. K[a] , G.S. Rainbekova[b]* , G. Sagidolda[c] , G. Abdimaulen[d] ,
L. Beisenbayeva[e] G. Bekenova[f]

[a] *L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.*
Email: sareke.kk@gmail.com
[b] *L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.*
Email: g.rainbekova@mail.ru
[c] *L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.*
Email: sagidolda_g@enu.kz
[d] *L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.*
Email: abdimaulen.gulmira@yandex.ru
[e] *L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.*
Email: tancopan@gmail.com
[f] *A. K. Kussayinov Eurasian Humanities Institute, Astana, Kazakhstan.*
Email: gulnar68_koks@mail.ru

Abstract
Antonymy is a kind of lexical opposition formed by a relational pair of words that refer to a relationship from the opposite point of view. This study attempts to explore the problems of antonymy with respect to theoretical and practical lexicography. The data was collected from dictionaries, published works of scientists and lexicographers. The data was analyzed by qualitative means of a historical-analytical approach to explore the application of antonyms as a lexical phenomenon. This approach helped researchers to compile relevant information, classify them into types, make comparisons and attempt to understand their meaning. Besides, the foundational aspect of antonymy was also analyzed and distinguished by stylistic options based on opposites. This approach resulted in finding concepts of usual antonymic opposition and contextual antonymic opposition. Findings also revealed that antonymy is relatively a new term, a late entrant into Kazakh lexicography, although modern lexicography is known as a scientific discipline distinguished by its historical-philological, semantic-lexicological aspects within the framework of modeling the content plan of a language. In addition, antonymous relations are considered in lexicography. The study implies that antonymy has become a means of expressing conceptually opposite phenomena of science and technology. Antonyms not only program the exchange of information, but, on the contrary, maintain the consistency of terminology, help to accurately perform its communicative function.

Keywords: Lexicography, Lexical Opposition, Antonyms, Semantic, Antonymy.

Introduction

Antonym plays an important role in several fields of study, such as linguistics, psychology, literature and psycholinguistics. It is used to express binary opposition in all modalities and communication methods,

in facts as well as fiction, in standard as well as unofficial use of language. The very introduction of the linguistic term 'antonym' into linguistics is much later than the term 'synonym' is relatively late in linguistics. For this reason, antonymy is one of the least studied phenomena in the lexical system of a language than in other systemic categories such as synonymy. Ivanova (2021) calls it 'penetration' of antonyms into linguistics. The practical importance of antonyms relies on their use in everyday life communicational situations. Even though their linguistic application is important and fundamental, antonyms can be used in any other discipline, situations and circumstances, particularly, antonyms from native speakers are used intuitively in all walks of life. Their misuse however can cause a lot of ambiguity and cultural conflicts, since like any other lexeme, antonyms have more powerful relationship between lexicon-semantic relations.

Antonymy is a kind of relationship of lexical opposition which is generally considered to involve a measurable scale which can be graded, e.g., high or low, big or small, strong or weak, long or short, and hence such gradability of each corresponding lexical item defines antonymy. This kind of antonymy is formed by a relational antonym, made of a pair of words that refer to a relationship from opposite points of view. For instance, there is no lexical opposite of 'teacher', or 'master' but 'teacher' and 'pupil' and 'master, or 'servant are opposite within the context of their relationship. This makes them relational antonyms. A relational antonym is also a pair of words that describe a relationship from opposite point of view. Such an antonymy is also known as a semantic relation that defines the actual or real nature of opposite meanings of a pair of words. Some examples of relational antonyms are teacher and pupil, husband and wife, doctor and patient, servant and master, parent and child, and so on.

Lexicography influences innovative changes in a language. Complex lexicography attaches importance to these changes. The creation of mixed types of dictionaries can solve a whole set of heterogeneous problems, to understand language units in different theoretical and methodological contexts. Antonyms serve as a source of enrichment in lexicography through word formation, such as the establishment of antonymic couples (relational antonyms) with the same root; or by prefixes like 'un' or 'dis' to create new grammar units; or to create some stylistic antonyms through suffixes like -less.' Besides, there are psychological antonyms that can be linked with lexicography through word associations, which can detect how the human mind functions in relation to antonymy. In practical applications of lexicography, we believe that lexicography can be divided into several independent disciplines, each of which has its own concepts, dictionary typology, apparatus, methods of compiling a dictionary and ways to describe dictionary articles, as well as its own card index and databases.

Antonymy also plays a significant role in the process of language acquisition in Kazakh language (Sagidolda & Rainbekova, 2024). Antonyms are stored in the memory of individuals since early childhood. They are documented in the minds of children from an early age, as they learn to perceive the concept of opposites by learning antonyms in pairs e.g. "up" and "down" or "good" and "bad." These may also be termed as related antonyms, what Murphy (2006) calls "the tendency to dichotomy," a learning strategy or a part of a general mechanism in language acquisition. However, Jones (2003) stresses that such "pairs of words" make children learn antonyms. Antonyms thus occupy an important place in lexicography as well as lexicographic works centered on language learning. Studies have explored modern lexicographical aspects which makes it possible to single out the study of antonymy in any dictionary or under any branch of lexicography. General lexicography though determines the common features of antonymy through typology, their common patterns, functions, internal structure and methods of its creation.

However, there is a dearth of studies that could have examined the antonymous relations between words, or lexical opposites. There is also a need to explore antonyms to check how they differ in type or class; and how lexicography has the ability to better explain the meaning of explicitly analogous words. With these objectives, this study attempts to fill the gaps by exploring the stages of development and the history of formation of antonyms in the Kazakh language from the philological side. The study also identifies linguistic and logical opposition and develop classification of antonyms in the Kazakh and Russian languages and distinguish features of the concepts of usual antonymic opposition and contextual antonymic opposition. Besides, the study also examines the foundational aspect of antonymy and distinguish its stylistic options based on opposites.

Literature Review

Antonymy as a Lexical Phenomenon

Antonyms began to be studied as a lexical phenomenon in the Russian language only at the end of the 19th century, since it is a late entry into this domain (Shkhapatseva & Pazova, 2015). Despite the fact that the problem of antonyms began to be studied in Russian linguistic science much later, there had already existed the antonymy phenomenon from the point of view of language development. This dichotomy has been explained differently as there are multiple definitions of the term antonym. For instance, while some studies define antonyms as opposite words (Jones, 2007; Murphy, 2006), others say that not all words can be

antonyms, e.g., there are no antonyms for nouns (Shkhapatseva & Pazova, 2015). For example, when we say, "a beautiful girl," the adjective 'beautiful' is the quality, antonym of which could be "ugly." Both these adjectives do refer to the girl, but in this noun-adjective relationship, the antonyms relate to the quality of the girl, and not the girl. Hence, nouns like boy or girl, pen, paper, book and shoes do not have any antonyms. Similarly, when we say that the color we use every day is 'black' and 'white', which could be seen as relation antonyms; or, similarly, if we say that "red" and "green" are an antonym pair of colors at traffic lights, it does not mean that it will be an antonym pair if we use "red" and "green" color in other life matters. Shansky (1972) argues that the study of antonyms originated for the first time in lexicography in late 19th and early 20th centuries, primarily in linguistics and literature. However, since 1930s, the term "antonym" also began to be actively used in scientific and teaching writings as well. However, the stylistic use of antonyms started in the 1950s (Ivanova, 2021).

Lexicographic Classifications

The vocabulary of a language has several lexicographic classifications. A lexicographic class is a group of lexemes that have certain common properties, to which the same grammatical and other general linguistic rules apply, including semantic, pragmatic, communicative, principles of coherence (Rashaad, 2022). The concept of a lexicographic class differs from traditional concepts such as semantic field, semantic class and lexicosemantic group of words in three aspects. First of all, the basis for determining the lexicographic type is any general properties of lexemes, and not just semantic ones. Secondly, a lexicographic class, as defined, has meaning only in the framework of integrative description of the language, in the harmonious description of grammar and word. In an integrative dictionary, lexemes are assigned properties that are required by linguistic rules, while the division into a semantic class is determined only by ideographic reasons. Thirdly, the lexicographic class, in contrast to semantic classes, forms not a hierarchy, as, for example, in an ideographic dictionary, but many times overlapping classes, since the same vocabulary can enter different classes in its different properties and lexicographic interests (Paradis & Willners, 2007).

Apresyan (1995) calls lexicography as a synthetic science. A feature of modern lexicography is the combination of philology and culture in a broad sense. Today, lexicography is faced with addicts related to various areas of human practice. These include translation, teaching native and foreign languages, computer information search systems, cultural studies, ethnography, problems of professional communication, sociology, psychology and many other areas. Systematic lexicography is the concept of active-type dictionaries. An active-type dictionary should contain complete information not only for the correct understanding of the lexeme, but also for the correct use of it by its speakers in their speech. The volume of the vocabulary of such dictionaries is noticeably small compared to traditional passive dictionaries but should significantly overtake them in terms of the volume of information about the lexeme and the accuracy of its analysis. Therefore, the concept of lexicographic type is only one of the most important pillars of systemic lexicography.

The content of the concept of lexicography includes theoretical lexicography, that is the theory and history of the creation of dictionaries, as well as practical lexicography, which deals with the direct creation of dictionaries or source dictionary materials. According to Gorodetsky (1983), lexicography is characterized as a scientific discipline. Its historical and philological aspect is associated with a constant interest in the typology of dictionaries and their relationship with culture. Its epistemological aspect is determined by the value of dictionaries as a way of organizing and presenting the knowledge collected by society. The semantic-lexical aspect, if any, is associated with the general relationship of dictionaries with the modernization of the language content plan (Dubichinsky, 1998; Lobanova, Van der Kleij, & Spenader, 2010).

Lexical units Denoting Antonyms

Lexical units denoting antonyms are characterized by a general quality, that is, the presence in the meanings of antonyms of properties that deny each other to the most finite limit: lie-true, (here: lie is not true; denies truth, truth to the most finite limit, just as true is not a lie; denies truth to the most finite limit). Antonymy units find a connection through common abstract SEMAS. For example, antonyms related to weight words: *heavy-light*, antonyms related to time: *past tense-future*. Antonyms are contrasted with each other with the help of special semas: heavy-volume in the sleeve row, large or small, small mass; past tense-in the future row-the previous and subsequent tense, the term, and so on. The opposite of antonyms, the choice of equivalent, the alternation, and their other functions are carried out in specific contexts for antonyms. Antonyms are such lexical items, that are often called LexAntonyms, suggesting that antonyms have opposite or contrasting meanings (Paradis & Willners, 2007).

Two main factors can be distinguished that determine the specificity of lexicographic classes for a given antonym. The first factor is antonyms being a formal grammatical feature of the language. The second factor is the image of the real or linguistic world represented by antonyms inherent in the language. Both of these factors should be fully taken into account when compiling dictionaries, because the main goal of the lexicographer is to characterize the vocabulary of the language as a system, including every component, with antonymy no exception. Additionally, the composition of lexicographic classes of antonymy in a language is determined by a

special disclosure of the conceptual material inherent in it, because the basic principle of systematic lexicography is to describe each lexeme as an element of the lexicographic class, to identify repeating features of lexical units and to present them in a uniform way in the dictionary (Apresyan, 1995). In the interpretation of lexical meanings of antonyms, therefore, it is important to gradually reduce complex meanings to simple, even elementary, that is, semantic primitives. Such an interpretation strategy makes it possible to clearly show all the semantic connections between individual lexemes and large groups of lexemes.

Methodology

Research Design

The study adopted a historical-analytical approach to explore the application of antonyms as a lexical phenomenon. This approach is ideally suitable for studying the stages of their development and the history of their formation from the philological side. Moreover, the history of lexicography is evidence of historical and philological evolution that contributed to the creation of the first dictionaries. It also takes a theoretical underpinning in its methodology to study lexicography as a separate discipline, as propounded by the German scientist E. Mann, and to propose how dictionaries have been the object of lexicographic practice and the subject of study of lexicographic theory (Paradis & Willners, 2007).

Data Collection

The data of the study was collected from secondary sources including works of researchers like (Apresyan, 1995; Bulakhovsky, 1949; Dubichinsky, 1998; Ivanova, 2021; Jones, 2003; Lehrer & Lehrer, 1982; Murphy, 2006) and others. The secondary material of these scientists historically determined the formation, change of antonym words, and the origin of each antonym.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed by qualitative means of compiling the relevant information, classifying them into types, making comparisons and attempting to understand their meaning. In the course of the study, linguistic and logical oppositions were identified, a classification of antonyms in the Kazakh and Russian languages was developed according to single distinctions, as well as the distinguishing features of the concepts of usual antonymic opposition and contextual antonymic opposition were determined. Besides, the foundational aspect of antonymy was also analyzed and distinguished by stylistic options based on opposites.

Results

Antonyms began to be studied not only in Russian language, but also in other language materials in the 21st century. During this this time, several dictionaries of antonyms were published (Oztopçu et al., 2016; Yusupova, 2014). In addition, Tukeshova, Tarasova, & Luzenina (2019) performed a lexical-grammatical analysis of the phraseological units with antonymous components in the Kazakh language; while Paradis & Willners (2007) studied the methodological aspects of antonyms in dictionary entries. A wave of studies could be seen on various domains like dynamics of language shift in Kazakhstan (Terlikbayeva & Menlibekova, 2021); phraseological paradigms of antonyms in Kazakh and English languages; and semantic analysis of phraseological units with antonymous components in English and Kazakh (Tukeshova & Tarasova, 2024). These studies created a synonym-antonym paradigm, opening the gap of antonymic relations between linguistic units consisting of several words or sentences, tried to identify stylistic figures based on opposites, and find their names. In the Turkic language, there are also many opinions about antonyms. For instance, antonyms in the Crimean-Tatar language were studied by Yusupova (2014), who found antonyms have different roots and one productive form of formation of antonyms in the Crimean-Tatar language is those that are formed by affixes that require additional, special study, for example – *акъыллы – акъылсыз; юрекли – юрексіз* [wise – unwise; heartless – heartless].

A few Kazakh studies have also claimed that antonyms are monosyllabic and therefore distinct in form, structure and use (Aref'ev, 2014; Kappassova et al., 2024; Sultaniyazova & Zhumabekova, 2015; Terlikbayeva & Menlibekova, 2021; Tukeshova et al., 2019). In Kazakh linguistics, antonyms are mentioned in special sections of textbooks on lexicology and Linguistics. In these textbooks, antonyms are described as "words with opposite meanings". as early as the middle of the 20th century, studies about antonyms had begun to be published. Sagidolda & Rainbekova (2024) divided antonyms into three types: 1) expressing the quality of things, criticism (e.g., *strong-weak, black-white*); 2) expressing the character, qualities of a person and relationships between people (*joy-resentment, love-sadness*); 3) words that give time and Soviet meaning (*winter-summer, day-night*). Boynazarov (2024) divides antonym contexts into four parts: 1) the use of antonyms in one sentence in parallel; 2) the use of antonyms in adjacent sentences; 3) the subsequent transfer of one syllable of several antonym words; 4) the combined use of antonyms.

Likewise, Bolganbaev (1988) grouped antonym contexts in person and meaning in seven classes: 1)

antonym contexts that have a common meaning, when antonyms are often used side by side within the same sentence. Here, in the opposite sense, words serve as a single member of the sentence and are connected by conjunctions; 2) antonym contexts which are opposite is in essence, where antonyms serve as a single member of a sentence, and are connected by words of value of opposition conjunctions or negation; 3) antonym contexts that have an alternative value, where words with opposite meanings serve as a single member of the sentence and are connected by argumentative or convenient conjunctions; 4) antonym contexts, which are philosophical points of thought, conclusions, opinions. Antonyms in such contexts often serve as the narrator of a sentence; 5) contexts in which individual, singular antonyms are used in one language; 6) contexts in which antonyms show subject – predicate relations and represent different personalities. The contrast of meanings between them is not as obvious as in other contexts; 7) antonyms are used in a value directly opposite to their main meaning, i.e., the word becomes its own antonym. This is usually done as a result of deliberately using the word in the opposite sense for the purpose of sarcasm, censure, and becomes an indispensable tool for creating irony. For example, when you see someone's bad behavior, instead of saying cowardly, we ridiculed him as '*hero'*, instead of clumsy, we say '*master'*, black man as '*white'*, snub-nosed man as '*with a humpy nose'*. When used in this way, negative words will have a positive value.

Zhumabekova (2024), in a recent study, has widely considered and comprehensively studied the theoretical principles of the phenomenon of antonym in the comparative-typological aspect. The scientist divided antonyms into three types: graded, privative and equipollent, considering antonymy as a linguistic phenomenon and studied in comparison with the principles of psychology, *philolosia*. In the course of the study, the linguistic and logical opposite relationship was identified, and the distinguishing features of the concepts of *uzual antonyphic* opposition and contextual *antonyphic* opposition were shown. In the course of this study, the scientist compared the use of antonyms in other languages with the Russian language and found that several laws are common with those of the Russian language.

Bazarbayeva et al. (2023) compiled a corpus of Kazakh Language with special attention given to antonyms markers in the Kazakh language. This corpus made a great contribution to the development of the theory of antonyms in Kazakh linguistics and comprehensively studied the relations of antonyms at various levels (lexical, word-forming morphological, phraseological, and stylistic). The content of the research work and the proposed theoretical conclusions prove that the problem of antonyms is analyzed in this work on a logical basis. For example, the words *good* luck-*misfortune*, *water-dry* have a direct connection between opposite concepts and antonyms. At the same time, words like *watery-waterless*, *happy-unhappy*, *black and white*, are opposite concepts and carry a category of negativity. It helped in drawing conclusion that there are no single-root antonyms in the Kazakh language. This statement is entrenched in modern textbooks on lexicology. Here –syz, -siz suffixes, -ma/me, -pa/pe, -ba/be negative suffixes and -emes, were compiled into one group denoting the category of negation with an auxiliary verb combination. The order of the given examples in the dictionary of antonyms of the Kazakh language can also be controversial. In a Kazakh dictionary, examples of antonyms are given in the form of sentences where an antonym pair occurs. The author contends that one of the most necessary conditions for identifying antonyms is to use them in sentences, opposing each other.

Zhumabekova (2024) studied the application of theoretical principles of the phenomenon of antonym in comparative-typological aspect. He tried to formulate in detail the problem of antonyms as a universal linguistic phenomenon and compared it with the data of the teachings of philosophy, logic, and psychology, carrying them out in a complex way. According to Zhumabekova (2024), the psychological basis of antonymy is the connection of opposite concepts in a person's mind. In this regard, antonyms are used in parallel speech. For the same reason, they should be used as they are, without separating them from each other. For example, *far-near*, *hungry-full, run away-catching up*. For the first time, antonyms were seen as not words with different meanings, but words with meanings that are similar and different in some respect, such as referring to opposite ends of the same scale for measuring the same property. For instance, the antonym of "king" cannot be a "queen" or "beggar" or "president." Each word has various dimensions of meaning in terms of gender, social status, etc. Each of these dimensions (domains) defines its own set of antonyms, follows its principle of "oppositeness" as "logical incompatibility" in such a manner that a word can be taken as one of the members of an antonym pair. For example, if a person is alive, he is also not dead.

Kempson (1977) defines opposites as word-pairs with a "binary incompatible relation", in such a manner that the meaning of one word covers the absence of the other. To explain this further, *giant* and *dwarf* can be seen as good opposites, but *giant* and *man* are not. There are also manually created antonym lexicons, such as *hot* and *cold,* which may not lexically and explicitly form word pairs of two opposites, but yet they have some degree of contrast in meaning. They can also be termed as contrast hypothesis: if one pair of A and B words has contrasting meaning (e.g. *hot* and *cold*, and if there is another pair of opposites, C and D (e.g., *tropical* and *freezing),* it can be assumed that A and C and B and D are strongly related. Hence, *hot* can be assumed to be related to *tropical* and *freezing* with *cold*. Since *tropical* and *freezing* are also contrasting words, this is called the contrast hypothesis.

Agrawal & Agrawal (2014) classified antonyms as complementary and relational. The complementary

antonyms have no middle ground such as [boy-girl], [off-on], [night-day], [entrance-exit], [exterior-interior], [true-false], [dead-alive], [push-pull], and [pass-fail]. The relational antonyms are similar to complementary antonyms, except that both must exist for them to be antonyms of each other. Examples include: [above-below], [doctor-patient], [husband-wife],[servant-master], [borrow-lend], [give-receive], [predator-prey], [buy-sell], and [instructor-pupil]. There is no lexical opposite of *teacher*, but *teacher* and *pupil* are opposite within the context of their relationship. This makes them relational antonyms. There is another classification of graded (scalar - polarity) antonyms (Paradis & Willners, 2007) and good or bad (canonicity) antonyms. The graded comparisons can be two words on the same scale, or they may be relative terms being interpreted differently by different people. Examples of graded antonyms are [young-elderly], [hard-easy], [happy-wistful], [wise-foolish], [fat-slim], [warm-cool], [early late], [fast-slow], [dark-pale], and [long-short]. The good or bad antonyms (canonicity) (Murphy, 2006) can further be divided as canonical and non-canonical. The canonical antonym pairs are contrasted, opposable pairs, members of which express opposite properties on the basic dimensions (domains) like color, space, temperature, wealth, etc. Examples include [black white]-color; [hot-cold]-temperature; [dead-alive]-existence; [short-long]-length; [slow-fast]-speed; [slow-quick]-time, and so on. The non-canonical antonyms are less clearly opposable pairs, whose dimensions relate to more specific nominal meaning domains. For example, the use of adjective "dark" as an antonym of "white" cannot be acceptable unless related to an object, say "chocolate", but then this relation may not be the same when speaking about "coffee". Examples are [white-dark], [hot-iced], [dry-fleshy], etc.

In addition, there are bounded and unbounded antonymous adjectives (Paradis & Willners, 2007), based on their meaning and context (Jones, 2007). The bounded antonyms are absolute and can be considered "scalar" but are limited to the very end of the bounded extreme of the scale, such as (absolutely) *terrific* and (totally) *disgusting*. Examples include [dead-alive], [false-true], [closed-open], [wrong-right], and [empty-full]. Unbounded antonyms combine with scalar degree modifiers such as *very/fairly* resulting in a change in meaning. They occupy the opposite poles of a scale, hence called unbounded. Examples include [long-short], [narrow-wide], [light-dark], [low-high], [sad-happy], [rich-poor] etc. Table 1 summarizes this classification with examples and applications.

Table 1: *Classification of Antonyms.*

Type	Examples	Application
Complementary antonyms	[boy-girl], [off-on], [night-day], [entrance-exit], [exterior-interior], [true-false], [dead-alive], [push-pull], [pass-fail],	They have no middle ground, and complement in opposite meanings
Relational antonyms	[above-below], [doctor-patient], [husband-wife], [servant-master], [borrow-lend], [give-receive], [predator-prey], [buy-sell], [instructor-pupil], [teach and learn], [parent-child]	They are called relational because each word in the antonym pair must exist for the other word. This pair refers to a relationship from opposite point of view.
Graded scalar - polarity	[young-elderly], [hard-easy], [happy-wistful], [wise-foolish], [fat-slim], [warm-cool], [early-late], [fast-slow], [dark-pale], [long-short], [dead-alive], [false-true], [closed-open], [wrong-right], [empty-full]	On levels of comparison, there can be two words on the same scale. This type has many relative terms, which can be interpreted differently by different people, in different contexts
Canonical antonyms	[black-white]-color, [hot-cold]-temperature, [dead-alive]-existence, [short-long]-length, [slow-fast]-speed, [slow-quick]-time.	Pairs are contrasted, clearly opposable pairs. The members of those pair express opposite properties on the dimensions (domains) or contexts such as temperature, time, speed, etc.
Non-canonical antonyms	[white-dark], [hot-iced], [dry-fleshy]	They are less clearly opposable pairs, since dimensions (domains) are more specific.
Bounded adjectives	[dead-alive], [false-true], [closed-open], [wrong-right], [empty-full].	They are absolute and can be considered "scalar" but are limited to the very end of the bounded extreme of the scale.
Unbounded antonymous	[narrow-wide], [light-dark], [low-high], [sad-happy], [rich-poor], [long-short]	These antonyms typically combine with scalar degree modifiers, such as very/fairly. They occupy the opposite poles of a scale; hence unbounded.

Discussion

Over the past decade, lexicography has shown that linguistics is a rapidly developing, rapidly changing field. Already to a certain extent, certain trends in the development of verbal activity can be predicted. Of course, at present, only the directions in which lexicography follows can be predicted, only the relevant, promising paths in the development of vocabulary science can be predicted, but this cannot be a mandatory guide to the research activities of lexicographers. In fact, the dictionary is a product of this era, a late entrant into lexicography. Its creation largely depends on specific cultural and historical conditions, the

state of theoretical linguistics and other sciences, and the text materials used by dictionaries. Given the variability of these and many of the situations that make up the era, it is possible to predict the emergence of increasingly new dictionaries and, as a result, a fundamentally unlimited future for lexicography. At the same time translated bilingual lexicography is constantly at a high level of interest. This is consistent with the study by Zhumabekova (2024), who recommended translating linguistic terms from English into Kazakh though direct and indirect ways. Antonyms have proven to be a good lexicographical subject of inclusion in dictionaries due to their application as tools for forming antithesis in writings and providing metaphorical and figurative meanings. Antonyms have also been seen having the word-formation linguistic ability which significantly enriches the language and its vocabulary. This concurs with the study, Murphy (2006) which consider antonyms as lexical and paradigmatic construction.

The significance of antonyms is also observed in the acquisition of the mother language as well as of second language. The English language antonyms, particularly, are an essential component of daily communication in different contexts. Each of the antonyms cited in this study are different in context, structure and meanings, and their use in sentences is a source of new method of communication. Antonyms can be linguistically explained, but it is true that every L2 learner of English language must know their meaning, context and structure prior to their application in a particular discipline. For example, their use in journalism or media communication, antonyms are good rhetorical source of learning a second language. They can be utilized for different modifications of expressions.

Conclusion

To conclude, it is now proven that antonyms rely on their understanding in use of everyday life communicational situations. Even though the linguistic explanation is important and fundamental, it helps other disciplines to understand better situations and circumstances when antonyms are used. Their misuse can cause a lot of misunderstandings and cultural clashes. Hence, theoretically antonyms are significant tools of discourse. The indicator of antonym pairs included in the dictionary of antonyms of the Kazakh language is an alphabetical list of all antonym pairs. One of the features of the dictionary is that each pair of links to an article in the main part of the dictionary has a number, that is, the main ones are marked in bold. For convenience, each of the antonyms is listed twice in alphabetical order. The opposite value of antonyms is clearly expressed when used simultaneously in the same sentence. It is especially emphasized that such antonyms are the opposite. In addition, the peculiarity of antonyms is that they are used selectively, in combination with any word. Significantly, antonyms, *good-bad*, continue to be combined with any noun due to the main semantic function of adjectives, expressing the criticism and quality of an object, phenomenon. The antonyms of the adjective *narrow-wide* are combined only with nouns depending on the place and context. When working with the language of a work of art, as well as when working with an antonym dictionary for people and explaining the ways and specifics of Word formation through the same dictionary, we find that the help of a dictionary is special.

The dictionary is an important tool that summarizes the richness of language, words and their meanings. It reflects the definitions, features of Use and syntactic forms of words. Dictionaries are necessary for the development of reading, writing and language skills. By working with the dictionary, you can increase the vocabulary, understand the basic meaning of words, and enrich the language and culture. Vocabulary is the basis of linguistics, which allows you to study the structure, history and ways of development of a complex language. The history of lexicography in Turkish languages is closely related to the history of the development of the language. The development of digital technologies has brought lexicography to a new level. Online dictionaries and mobile applications have made language resources available.

References

Agrawal, P. K., & Agrawal, A. (2014). Opinion Analysis Using Domain Ontology for Implementing Natural Language Based Feedback System. *I.J. Information Technology and Computer Science, 6*, 61-69. doi: https://doi.org/10.5815/ijitcs.2014.03.08

Apresyan, Y. D. (1995). Image of the Person According to Language: Attempt of the System Description. *Linguistics Questions,* (1), 37-67. Retrieved from https://issuesinlinguistics.ru/pubfiles/1995-1_37-67.pdf

Aref'ev, A. L. (2014). The Russian language in the world: Past, present, and future. *Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 84*(5), 357-364. doi: https://doi.org/10.1134/S1019331614050050

Bazarbayeva, Z. M., Zharkynbekova, S. K., Amanbayeva, A. Z., Zhumabayeva, Z. T., & Karshygayeva, A. A. (2023). The National Corpus of Kazakh Language: Development of Phonetic and Prosodic Markers. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences, 16*(8), 1256-1270. Retrieved from https://elib.sfu-kras.ru/handle/2311/150845

Bolganbaev, A. (1988). Lexicology in Kazakh language. *Almaty Mektep*, 14-23.

Boynazarov, I. (2024). Conceptual Antonymy in Philosophical Terms the English Language. *Proceedings of International Educators Conference, 3*(6), 24-26.

Bulakhovsky, L. A. (1949). *The Course of the Russian Literary Language*. Kiev.

Dubichinsky, V. V. (1998). *Theoretical and Practical Lexicography*. Vienna, Kharkov.

Gorodetsky, B. Y. (1983). Problems and Methods of Modern Lexicography. *New in Foreign Linguistics,* (14), 5-22.

Ivanova, E. V. (2021). On the Basic Lines of Proverbial Studies in Russian Paremiology. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Language and Literature, 18*(4), 875-892. doi: https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu09.2021.415

Jones, S. (2003). *Antonymy: A Corpus-Based Perspective*. Routledge. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203166253

Jones, S. (2007). 'Opposites' in Discourse: A Comparison of Antonym Use Across Four Domains. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*(6), 1105-1119. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.11.019

Kappassova, A. S., Adilova, A., Zeinulina, A., Khamzina, K., Umirbekova, A., & Zhaldybayeva, A. Z. (2024). Intertextuality in Kazakh, Russian, and English-language Media. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(3), 22-32. Retrieved from https://ejal.info/menuscript/index.php/ejal/article/view/862

Kempson, R. M. (1977). *Semantic Theory*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://philpapers.org/rec/KEMST

Lehrer, A., & Lehrer, K. (1982). Antonymy. *Linguistics and Philosophy, 5*(4), 483-501. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00355584

Lobanova, A., Van der Kleij, T., & Spenader, J. (2010). Defining Antonymy: A Corpus-based Study of Opposites by Lexico-syntactic Patterns. *International Journal of Lexicography, 23*(1), 19-53. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecp039

Murphy, M. L. (2006). Antonyms as Lexical Constructions: or, Why Paradigmatic Construction is Not an Oxymoron. *Constructions*. doi: https://doi.org/10.24338/cons-449

Oztopçu, K., Abouv, Z., Kambarov, N., & Azemoun, Y. (2016). *Dictionary of Turkic Languages*. Routledge. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203195239

Paradis, C., & Willners, C. (2007). Antonyms in Dictionary Entries: Methodological Aspects. *Studia Linguistica, 61*(3), 261-277. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9582.2007.00136.x

Rashaad, R. D. (2022). A Literature Review on Antonymy in English. *Journal of Anbar University for Languages & Literature/Magallat Gami'at Al-Anbar Li-Lugat Wa-al-Adabl,* (35). Retrieved from https://www.iasj.net/iasj/article/239503

Sagidolda, G., & Rainbekova, G. (2024). On Lexicography of Antonyms in the Kazakh Language. *Bulletin of the Eurasian Humanitarian Institute,* (4), 130-137. Retrieved from https://ojs.egi.kz/BULLETIN/article/view/585

Shansky, N. M. (1972). *Lexicology of the Modern Russian Language*. Russia: Education.

Shkhapatseva, M. H., & Pazova, L. M. (2015). Antonyms, Antonymy, Antonymic Paradigmatics in Russian. *Bulletin of the Adygean State University. Series 2: Philology and Art History,* (3 (164)), 88-94. Retrieved from https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=24729655

Sultaniyazova, I. S., & Zhumabekova, A. K. (2015). Antonymic Opposition as a Reflection of the Universal and National Linguistic Picture of the World (On the Material of Kazakh Language). *Mediterranean Journal os Social Sciences, 6*(4), 448-455. doi: https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n4s2p448

Terlikbayeva, N., & Menlibekova, G. (2021). The Dynamics of Language Shift in Kazakhstan: Review Article. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 3*(2), 12-22. doi: https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.2.2

Tukeshova, N. M., & Tarasova, F. H. (2024). Semantic Analysis of Phraseological Units with Antonymous Components, Characterizing a Person in English and Kazakh. *"Bulletin of the Kazakh State Technical University named after Abylai Khan, Philological Sciences Series", 73*(2). doi: https://doi.org/10.48371/PHILS.2024.73.2.012

Tukeshova, N. M., Tarasova, F. H., & Luzenina, I. N. (2019). Lexical-grammatical Analysis of the Phraseological Units with Antonymous Components in the Kazakh Language. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics, 10*(SP), 1066-1074. doi: https://doi.org/10.22055/rals.2019.15187

Yusupova, A. S. (2014). Tatar Language Dictionaries of XIX Century as a Unified Historical and Cultural Phenomenon. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 30*(2), 186-190. doi: https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2014.30.02.14003

Zhumabekova, A. K. (2024). Translating Linguistic Terms from English into Kazakh: Direct and Indirect Ways. *Journal of Siberian Federal University.Humanities & Social Sciences, 17*(8), 1477-1493. Retrieved from https://elib.sfu-kras.ru/handle/2311/153245