

**MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIALIZED
EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN
ANDIJAN STATE UNIVERSITY NAMED AFTER ZAHIRIDDIN
MUHAMMAD BOBUR
FACULTY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH PHONETICS**

Yakubov Umar

Group 402 c

“National Cultural Specification of Synonyms in English and Russian”

GRADUATE QUALIFICATION PAPER

5111400-Foreign languages and literature

(The English language and literature)

Supervisor: assistant M. Inamova

Andijan – 2018

Theme: National cultural specification of synonyms in English and Russian

Content

Introduction.....2

CHAPTER I Lexicology as a branch of linguistics.....8

1.1 Aims and methods of scientific research of lexicology.....8

1.2 Semasiology and semantic structure of language units.....11

1.3 Problem of classification of synonyms.....16

CHAPTER II National cultural specification of synonymy in English and Russian

2.1 The notion of synonymy in Modern English.....21

2.1.1 The peculiarities of synonyms in English.....21

2.1.2The peculiar use of synonyms and their oppositions.....32

2.2 Comparative study of the synonymy of lexical units in Modern English and Russian	51
Conclusion.....	63
Literature	67

Introduction

It is very important for the country to have a good educational system and educated people because it helps us to be healthy, save many lives, boosts economic growth, earn money, raise quality crop, promote peace in the society, eradicate poverty, remove gender discrimination and inequality, promote women and children rights, bring good governance, remove corruption, make aware about fundamental rights and so many. Good education does not mean to study hard and get good results however it is to conquer new things for the betterment of whole mankind.

Proper higher education makes us more civilized to live in the society. One cannot make his/her good image in the society and live prosperous and happy life without getting appropriate education. It makes us able to maintain the healthy surroundings. Nowadays, unlike ancient time, getting proper education has become

easy and simple because of the online system and correspondence facility in all the big universities. There are a lot of huge efforts and plan strategies by the government to maintain the quality of education all over Uzbekistan.

Today, in the Republic of Uzbekistan great attention is given to the radical reorganization of the educational system that will give an opportunity to raise it to the level of modern standards. In order to realize the aims and tasks put forward by the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Education" (1997) and the "National Programme of Personnel Training" (1997) the complex system of reorganizing the structure and the content of personnel training, proceeding from perspectives of the social, economic development of the society, contemporary achievements of science, culture, technique and technology are being created in the country. The National Programme for Personnel Training is being implemented in the country step by step. Within the framework of this Programme the system of continuous education is being developed, a system which starts with pre-school provision. The material and technical base of the education sector is strengthening, basic textbooks in the languages of peoples, living in the country are being published, the physical learning environment are improved, modern information technology are being used in the process of education. New approaches in the system of education also influenced on the learning and teaching of foreign languages, as language is the major factor of person's development.

Besides of the importance of education in Uzbekistan and in general it was also mentioned about learning foreign languages and how it is vital for the people and country development.

As we know that learning a foreign language is not an easy thing. It is a long and slow process that takes a lot of time and efforts. Nowadays it is especially important to know foreign languages.

The reasons for learning a new language are varied, but the importance of learning foreign languages is universal: it will always benefit you in one way or another.

Foreign languages are also important to those working in business, communications and nearly every other career track. Even if your potential clientele speak English, there isn't a better way to understand their needs and cultural desires than to learn their language. It helps make a great first impression, and it shows that you are willing to go above and beyond to maintain the relationship. In many cultures, attempting to speak the language is viewed as a sign of respect and has the potential to open doors in the future.

Thus, the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov highlighted the organization of a complex system of learning and teaching foreign languages in the country, focused on the upbringing of comprehensively developed, educated and intellectual young generation of people, who can meet the requirements of the time.

On December 10, 2012 President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov signed a decree "On measures to further improve foreign language learning system".[1; 1-2]

It is noted that in the framework of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On education" and the National Programme for Training in the country, a comprehensive foreign languages' teaching system, aimed at creating harmoniously developed, highly educated, modern-thinking young generation, further integration of the country to the world community, has been created. During the years of independence, over 51.7 thousand teachers of foreign languages graduated from universities, English, German and French multimedia tutorials and textbooks for 5-9 grades of secondary schools, electronic resources for learning English in primary schools were created, more than 5000 secondary schools, professional colleges and academic lyceums were equipped with language laboratories.

However, analysis of the current system of organizing language learning shows that learning standards, curricula and textbooks do not fully meet the current requirements, particularly in the use of advanced information and media technologies. Education is mainly conducted in traditional methods. Further development of a continuum of foreign languages learning at all levels of education;

improving skills of teachers and provision of modern teaching materials are required.

According to the decree, starting from 2013/2014 school year foreign languages, mainly English, gradually throughout the country will be taught from the first year of schooling in the form of lesson-games and speaking games, continuing to learning the alphabet, reading and spelling in the second year (grade).

Also it is envisaged that university modules, especially in technical and international areas, will be offered in English and other foreign languages at higher education institutions.

The State Testing Centre, along with other relevant agencies, is tasked with preparing draft proposals on introducing foreign languages testing to the entrance examinations for all higher educational institutions.

In order to increase teaching standards in distant rural areas, the higher educational institutions are allowed targeted admission of people living in distant areas to foreign language programs on the condition that they will oblige themselves to work in the acquired specialty at their residence area for at least 5 years after graduation. The decree also envisages 30% salary increase for foreign language teachers in rural areas, 15% increase for those in other areas.

The National Teleradio Company, State Committee for communications, informatisation and telecommunication technologies, Agency for Press and Information of the Republic of Uzbekistan are tasked to prepare and broadcast language-learning programs, significantly increase access to international educational resources via “Ziyonet” educational network, promote publication of foreign language textbooks, magazines and other materials.

As we know, the government has been entrusted with developing a package of measures for development of science and supporting the young people in their scientific activities. And as our president mentioned: “...the extremely important factor of the current reforms is the extremely qualified workforce.”[1: 4]

More ever we are all becoming aware of one more true fact. Only a well educated person is able to value human dignity, preserve national values, raise

national awareness , fight self-sacrificingly the right to live in a free society , so that our independent stat could win a decent and respectable place in the world community.

In the field of higher education it is necessary to draw your attention to the implementation of the test system , the reorganization of the pedagogical Institutes in regional centers into Universities, giving regional educational institutions higher status, sending students and specialists abroad to study and exchange experience on the account of newly established national organizations and international funds , carrying out concrete work intended to retrain specialists and teachers in the field of business and economics and economic training of more than 2000 students and specialists abroad in the transitional period , attracting more than 200 foreign specialists to educational institution of our republic .

Nowadays English is worth not just knowing, but it is worth really knowing. There is a great importance to understand up-to-date English. English is the chief language of international business and academic conferences, and the leading language of international tourism. English is the main language of popular music, advertising, home computers and video games. Most of the scientific, technological and academic information in the world is expressed in English. International communication expends very fast. The English language becomes the means of international communication, the language of trade, education, politics, and economics. People have to communicate with each other. It is very important for them to understand foreigners and be understood by them. In this case the English language comes to be one but very serious problem. A word comes to be a very powerful means of communication but also can be a cause of a great misunderstanding if it is not clearly understood by one of the speakers.

The understanding of the native speakers' language is the international problem for our students. Our secondary schools teach the students only the bases of the English language. They do not prepare them to the British streets, and accommodations.

Synonyms come to be a very numerous part of English. Synonyms cover a lot of drawbacks of the English language and it is one-third part of the colloquial speech.

The object of the research is thorough investigation of synonyms in English and Russian.

The subject of the research is synonymy.

The goal of the work is to study

To achieve the goal of the work the **following tasks** have been set:

- to study linguistic peculiarities of synonyms;
- to specify general characteristics of different types of synonyms;
- to compare synonyms in English and Russian;

The methods of the research used to solve the tasks are as follows:

- descriptive - to systematize and describe the material and to elucidate some notions.

- comparative - to compare synonyms in English and Russian.

The theoretical basis of our research is presented by works of such prominent linguists and books of paramount importance written by American and English writers, scientific research of foreign and home linguists, Internet explorations defining dictionaries, articles from methodical journals. The basic works are the following: 1968, Арнольд И. В. Лексикология современного английского языка. М.: 1959. Ginzburg R.S. A course in modern English lexicology

The theoretical value of the investigation is that its findings shall be of certain interest for lexicologists and translators and can be used as a starting point in the research of synonyms and their correct translation in a text.

The practical value of the work is that the findings of the investigation can be used in writing research papers and thesis projects. In addition, the findings of the research may be interesting for learners of English at different levels.

The research work consists of an introduction, two chapters, a conclusion and list of used literature.

The introduction describes the importance of the given topic and education in general.

The first chapter is devoted to subject matters of lexicology in Modern English.

The second chapter includes information on peculiarities of synonyms in English and Russian.

CHAPTER I Lexicology as a branch of linguistics

Lexicology is a branch of linguistics, the science of language. The term Lexicology is composed of two Greek morphemes: lexis meaning ‘word, phrase’ (hence lexicos ‘having to do with words’) and logos which denotes ‘learning, a department of knowledge’. Thus, the literal meaning of the term Lexicology is ‘the science of the word’. The literal meaning, however, gives only a general notion of the aims and the subject-matter of this branch of linguistic science, since all its other branches also take account of words in one way or another approaching them from different angles. Phonetics, for instance, investigating the phonetic structure of

language, i.e. its system of phonemes and intonation patterns, is concerned with the study of the outer sound form of the word. Grammar, which is inseparably bound up with Lexicology, is the study of the grammatical structure of language. It is concerned with the various means of expressing grammatical relations between words and with the patterns after which words are combined into word-groups and sentences.

Aims and methods of scientific research of lexicology

Lexicology as a branch of linguistics has its own aims and methods of scientific research, its basic task being a study and systematic description of vocabulary in respect to its origin, development and current use. Lexicology is concerned with words, variable word-groups, phraseological units, and with morphemes which make up words.

Distinction is naturally made between General Lexicology and Special Lexicology. General Lexicology is part of General Linguistics; it is concerned with the study of vocabulary irrespective of the specific features of any particular language. Special Lexicology is the Lexicology of a particular language (e.g. English, Russian, etc.), i.e. the study and description of its vocabulary and vocabulary units, primarily words as the main units of language. Needless to say that every Special Lexicology is based on the principles worked out and laid down by General Lexicology, a general theory of vocabulary.

There is also a close relationship between Lexicology and Stylistics or, to be more exact, Linguo-Stylistics. Linguo-Stylistics is concerned with the study of the nature, functions and structure of stylistic devices, on the one hand, and with the investigation of each style of language, on the other, i.e. with its aim, its structure, its characteristic features and the effect it produces as well as its interrelation with the other styles of language.

There are two principal approaches in linguistic science to the study of language material, namely the synchronic (*Gr.* *syn* — ‘together, with’ and *chronos* — ‘time’) and the diachronic (*Gr.* *dia* — ‘through’) approach. With regard to

Special Lexicology the synchronic approach is concerned with the vocabulary of a language as it exists at a given time, for instance, at the present time. It is special.

The diachronic approach in terms of Special Lexicology deals with the changes and the development of vocabulary in the course of time. It is special Historical Lexicology that deals with the evolution of the vocabulary units of a language as time goes by. An English Historical Lexicology would be concerned, therefore, with the origin of English vocabulary units, their change and development, the linguistic and extralinguistic factors modifying their structure, meaning and usage within the history of the English language.

It should be emphatically stressed that the distinction between the synchronic and the diachronic study is merely a difference of approach separating for the purposes of investigation what in real language is inseparable. The two approaches should not be contrasted, or set one against the other; in fact, they are intrinsically interconnected and interdependent: every linguistic structure and system actually exists in a state of constant development so that the synchronic state of a language system is a result of a long process of linguistic evolution, of its historical development.

A good example illustrating both the distinction between the two approaches and their interconnection is furnished by the words to beg and beggar.

Synchronically, the words to beg and beggar are related as a simple and a derived word, the noun beggar being the derived member of the pair, for the derivative correlation between the two is the same as in the case of to sing — singer, to teach — teacher, etc. When we approach the problem diachronically, however, we learn that the noun beggar was borrowed from Old French and only presumed to have been derived from a shorter word, namely the verb to beg, as in the English language agent nouns are commonly derived from verbs with the help of the agent suffix -er.

Closely connected with Historical Lexicology is Contrastive and Comparative Lexicology whose aims are to study the correlation between the vocabularies of two or more languages, and find out the correspondences between the vocabulary units

of the languages under comparison. Needless to say, one can hardly overestimate the importance of Contrastive Lexicology as well as of Comparative Linguistics in general for the purpose of class-room teaching of foreign languages. Of primary importance in this respect is the comparison of the foreign language with the mother tongue. As it was pointed out above that Lexicology studies various lexical units: morphemes, words, variable word-groups and phraseological units. We proceed from the assumption that the word is the basic unit of language system, the largest on the morphologic and the smallest on the syntactic plane of linguistic analysis. The word is a structural and semantic entity within the language system.

It should be pointed out that there is another approach to the concept of the basic language unit. The criticism of this viewpoint cannot be discussed within the framework of the present study. Suffice it to say that here we consistently proceed from the concept of the word as the basic unit in all the branches of Lexicology. Both words and phraseological units are names for things, namely the names of actions, objects, qualities, etc. Unlike words proper, however, phraseological units are word groups consisting of two or more words whose combination is integrated as a unit with a specialised meaning of the whole.

1.2 Semasiology and semantic structure of language units

The branch of the study of language concerned with the meaning of words is called *semasiology*. The name comes from the Greek *semasia* ‘signification’ (from *sema* ‘sign’ and *semantikos* ‘significant’). As semasiology deals not with every kind of linguistic meaning but with lexical meaning only, it may be regarded as a branch of lexicology. This does not mean that the semasiologist needn’t pay attention to grammatical meaning. On the contrary, grammatical meaning must be taken into consideration in so far as it bears a specific influence upon lexical meaning. This influence is manifold and will be discussed at length later. At this

stage it will suffice to point out that a certain basic component of the word meaning is described when one identifies the word morphologically, i. e. states to what grammatical word class it belongs. If treated diachronically, semasiology studies the change in meaning, which words undergo. Descriptive synchronic approach demands a study not of individual words but of semantic structures typical of the language studied, and of its general semantic system.

We will have noticed that two terms, “semasiology” and “semantics”, have so far been used indiscriminately as if synonymous.

In fact, they are synonyms but not equally appropriate for our purpose. The first term is preferable because it is less ambiguous. The term “semantics” on the other hand, is used to cover several different meanings. It is also used to denote the phenomena studied i. e. the meaning of words and phrases. Had this been all, it might have been tolerated, because the same double purpose is served by the terms “phonetics” and “grammar”. In the case of “semantics”, however, there are other meanings, not sufficiently divorced from linguistics and apt to create confusion.

These famous lines reflect one of the fundamental problems of linguistic research: what is in a name, in a word? Is there any direct connection between a word and the object it represents? Could rose have been called by “any other name” as Juliet says? These and similar questions are answered by lexicological research. Lexicology, a branch of linguistics, is the study of words. For some people studying words may seem uninteresting. But if studied properly, it may well prove just as exciting and novel as unearthing the mysteries of Outer Space.

It is significant that many scholars have attempted to define the word as a linguistic phenomenon. Yet none of the definitions can be considered totally satisfactory in all aspects. It is equally surprising that, despite all the achievements of modern science, certain essential aspects of the nature of the word still escape us. Nor do we fully understand the phenomenon called “language”, of which the word is a fundamental unit. We know nothing- or almost nothing – about the mechanism by which a speaker’s mental process is converted into sound groups called “ words”, nor about the reverse process whereby a listener’s brain converts the acoustic

phenomena into concepts and ideas, thus establishing a two - way process of communication. We know very little about the nature of relations between the word and the referent (i.e. object, phenomenon, quality, action, etc. denoted by the word). If we assume that there is a direct relation between the word and the referent - which seems logical- it gives rise to another question: how should we explain the fact that the same referent is designated by quite different sound groups in different languages.

We *do* know by now - though with vague uncertainty- that there is nothing accidental about the vocabulary of the language; that each word is a small unit within a vast, efficient and perfectly balanced system. But we do not know why it possesses these qualities, nor do we know much about the processes by which it has acquired them. The list of unknowns could be extended, but it is probably high time to look at the brighter side and register some of the things we *do* know about the nature of the word. [2, 10]

First, we do know that a word is a unit of speech, which, as such, serves the purposes of human communication. Thus, the word can be defined as a unit of communication.

Secondly, the word can be perceived as the total of the sounds, which comprise it.

Third, the word, viewed structurally, possesses several characteristics.

The modern approach to word studies is based on distinguishing between the external and internal structures of the word. [2, 8]

By external structure of the word we mean its morphological structure. For example, in the word *post-impressionists* the following morphemes can be distinguished: the prefixes *post-*, *im-*, the root *press*, the noun- forming suffixes – *ion*, *-ist*, and the grammatical suffix of plurality –*s*. All these morphemes constitute the external structure of the word *post-impressionists*. [13, 35]

The internal structure of the word, or its *meaning*, is nowadays commonly referred to as the word's *semantic structure*. This is certainly the word's main aspect. Words can serve the purposes the human communication solely due to their

meanings, and it is most unfortunate when this fact is ignored by some contemporary scholars who, in their obsession with the fetish of structure tend to elude mathematical analysis. And this is exactly what meaning, with its subtle variations and shifts are apt to do. [13, 35]

Conceptual semantics is a framework for semantic analysis developed mainly by Ray Jackendoff. Its aim is to provide a characterization of the conceptual elements by which a person understands words and sentences, and thus to provide *an explanatory semantic representation*. [42, 283]

Explanatory in this sense refers to the ability of a given linguistic theory to describe how a component of language is acquired by a child.

Recently, conceptual semantics in particular and lexical semantics in general, have taken on increasing importance in linguistics and psycholinguistics. Many contemporary theories of syntax (how sentences are constructed from individual words) rely on elements that are idiosyncratic to words themselves. As a result, a sound theory accounting for the properties of the meanings of words is required.

Like many semantic theories, Jackendoff claims that a decompositional method is necessary to explore conceptualization. Just as one of the ways a physical scientist tries to understand matter is by breaking it down into progressively smaller parts, so a scientific study of conceptualization proceeds by breaking down, or decomposing, meanings into smaller parts. Clearly, however, this decomposition cannot go on forever: we must ‘reach bottom’ at some stage. This is the level of conceptual structure, the level of mental representations which encode the human understanding of the world, containing the primitive conceptual elements out of which meanings are built, plus their rules of combination. Just as generative syntax posits a finite set of syntactic categories and rules for combining them, so Conceptual Semantics posits ‘a finite set of mental primitives and a finite set of principles of mental combination’ governing their interaction.[42, 284]

Jackendoff refers to this set of primitives and the rules governing them as the ‘grammar of sentential concepts’. His starting point is a close analysis of the meanings of lexemes dedicated to bringing out parallelisms and contrasts which

reveal the nature of the conceptual structures underlying them. What his method shows, he says, is that the psychological organization on which meaning rests ‘lies a very short distance below the surface of everyday lexical items – and that progress can be made in exploring it’. Jackendoff claims that a decompositional method is necessary to explore conceptual structure, in which the concepts underlying word meaning are broken down into their smallest elements: conceptual primitives envisaged as the semantic equivalents of phonological features. Conceptual Semantics posits ‘a finite set of mental primitives and a finite set of principles of mental combination’ governing their interaction. The conceptual structure of a lexical item is an element with zero or more open argument slots, which are filled by the syntactic complements of the lexical item. Jackendoff’s system permits interesting connections to be made between apparently unrelated meanings, but can be criticized for the apparently somewhat arbitrary nature of the conceptual constituents it recognizes.

Semantic investigation operates at two levels: word level and sentence level. The first explores the relationships words have with each other within a language system, their *sense* that can be defined in terms of *synonymy*, *antonymy*, *polysemy*, *homonymy* and *hyponymy*.

As we remember from Saussure’s theory, since the relationship between words and their *referents* is merely symbolic – they are *signs* – each word derives a meaning not from the real world but from its existence within a *semantic field* of related signs.

At the word level, *Componential analysis* breaks down the meaning of a word into components. For example the components of the word *man* would be: +*human* + *adult* + *male*. Using these components semanticists build grids which define the words of a particular field according to the presence or absence of a particular component.

Of course, grammatical words such as *and*, *but*, *for* do not lend themselves to this analysis. But, above all, the components mentioned could be endlessly broken

down into smaller ones. So this method can be useful as a means of classification but not as a theory of meaning.

At the sentence level, semanticists are mainly concerned with the *truth value* of linguistic expressions.

They frequently distinguish between *analytic* and *synthetic* truth. A synthetically true statement is true because it is an accurate representation of reality. An analytically true statement is true because it follows from the meaning relations within the sentence.

Logical semantics or *Truth conditional semantics* draws mainly on propositional logic and is interested above all in the *logical connectives* of English.

This kind of analysis implies a *correspondence* between language and reality, but some semanticists do not believe in this correspondence and argue that language *creates* reality.

1.3 Problem of classification of synonyms

There are several classification systems for synonyms which were established by different scientists, such as: Academician V.V Vinogradov, the famous Russian scholar or Russian philologist A.I. Smirnitsky. In Vinogradov's classification system there are three types of synonyms: ideographic (which he defined as words conveying the same concept but differing in shades of meaning), stylistic (differing in stylistic characteristics) and absolute (coinciding in all their shades of meaning and in all their stylistic characteristics).

However, the following aspects of his classification system are open to question.

Firstly, absolute synonyms are rare in the vocabulary and, on the diachronic level; as to professor Hoshimov: "the phenomenon of absolute synonymy is anomalous and the vocabulary system invariably tends to abolish it either by rejecting one of the absolute synonyms or by developing differentiation characteristics in one or both (or all) of them". Therefore, it does not seem necessary to include absolute synonyms, which are a temporary exception, in the system of classification.

There seems to be right no rigid demarcation line between synonyms differing in their shades of meaning and in stylistic characteristics. There are numerous synonyms which are distinguished by both shades of meaning and stylistic coloring. Therefore, even the subdivision of synonyms into ideographic and stylistic is open question.

According to the criterion of interchangeability in context synonyms are classified into total, relative and contextual.

Total synonyms are those members of synonymic group which can replace each other in any given context, without the slightest alteration in denoting meaning or emotional meaning and connotation. They are very rare. Examples can be found mostly in special literature among technical terms and others:

Fatherland - motherland;

Suslik - gopher;

Noun - substantive;

Functional affix - flection, inflection;

Scarlet fever - scarlatina.

Cruse claims that a scale of synonymity can be established. The scale which he has set up consists of absolute synonymy, cognitive synonymy and near-synonymy. For Cruse, synonyms are "certain pairs of groups of lexical items" that "bear a special sort of semantic resemblance to one another". At the same time, Cruse suggests that some synonyms are more synonymous than the other: settee and sofa

are more synonymous than die and kick the bucket. It leads him to establish a scale of synonymy.[35,265]

At one end of his scale of synonymy there is absolute synonymy which means practically the same thing to Cruse as to Lyons: "two lexical units would be absolute synonyms (i.e. would have identical meanings) if and only if all their contextual relations were identical". But Cruse doubts the existence of absolute synonyms. He says that "natural languages abhor absolute synonyms just as nature abhors vacuum". [36, 270]

At the opposite end of the scale, there is zero synonymy, which undoubtedly exists in languages of the world but it is not a coherent concept, and not interesting either. What comes in between the both ends is more interesting. Another stage after absolute synonymy is cognitive synonymy. It occurs when the synonyms substituted in a sentence preserve the truth-conditions of the sentence. The cognitive synonyms typically differ in their expressive meanings. For Cruse, fiddle and violin are cognitive synonyms. Foggy and misty belong to another type of synonymy. Cruse calls them **plesionyms** because they yield sentences with distinct truth-conditions. This theory closely resembles Lyons's view on synonymy, but Cruse attempted to define his types more rigorously.

As there are no two lexemes with absolutely the same meaning and no real synonyms, cognitive synonymy is what most semanticists would regard as synonymy. Lyons claims that many theories of semantics would restrict the notion of synonymy to what he calls descriptive or cognitive synonymy, which is the identity of descriptive meaning. [49, 63]

Near-synonyms are lexemes whose meaning is relatively close or more or less similar (mist/fog, stream/brook, dive/plunge). However, the given definition of near-synonymy is vague, because there isn't a precise correlation between synonymy and semantic similarity. Near-synonymy is associated with overlapping of meaning and senses. The senses of near-synonyms overlap to a great degree, but not completely. [52,155]

Moreover, unlike cognitive synonyms, near-synonyms can contrast in certain contexts: He was killed, but I can assure you he was NOT murdered, madam. [36, 159]

Near-synonymy is regularly found in dictionaries of synonyms or thesauri where most of the terms listed under a single dictionary entry are not considered to be cognitive synonyms (e.g. govern - direct, control, determine, require).

The scale presented by Cruse is the most general. There also are other views. Lyons claims that there are absolute synonymy, complete synonymy, descriptive synonymy and near-synonymy. According to him, complete synonyms have identical descriptive, expressive and social meaning in the range of the given contexts. [48,148]

Since most lexemes are polysemous (have different senses in different contexts), Murphy introduces logical synonyms (which include full synonyms and sense synonyms) and near-synonyms. Denotationally equivalent words whose all senses are identical (toilet/john) are called full synonyms, whereas sense synonyms share one or more senses, but differ in others, i.e. they have at least one identical sense (sofa/couch). Near-synonyms, as words with similar senses, are context-dependent. Cognitive synonyms are arguably what Murphy regards as sense synonyms. [52,146]

Cruse draws the conclusion that the border between cognitive synonymy and near-synonymy is in principle clear, even though difficult cases may arise, but it is much harder to draw a distinction between near-synonymy and non-synonymy. There are two possible solutions. Firstly, since speakers of a language can judge synonymy as language users, they should intuitively know whether or not certain lexemes are synonymous. Secondly, in order to consider lexemes as synonymous, they shouldn't stand in contrast with one another, i.e. it is necessary for the level of their contrastiveness to be explicitly low. [36,159]

Some authors class groups like ask - beg - implore, or like - love - adore, gift - talent - genius, famous - celebrate - eminent as relative synonyms, as they denote different degree of the same notion or different degree of the same notion or different

shades of meanings and can be substituted only in some contexts. Contextual or context-dependent synonyms are similar in meaning only under some specific distributional conditions. It may happen that the difference between the meanings of two words is contextually neutralized, e.g. buy and get would not generally be taken as synonymous, but they are synonyms in the following examples: I'll go to the shop and buy some bread. I'll go to the shop and get some bread.

The verbs bear, suffer, stand are *semantically* different and not interchangeable except when used in the negative form: I can't stand it, I can't bear it. According to weather the difference is in denotational or connotational component synonyms are classified into ideographic and stylistic.

Ideographic synonyms denote different shades of meaning or different degrees of a giving quality. They are nearly identical in one or more denotational meanings and interchangeable at least in some contexts, e.g. beautiful - fine - handsome - pretty. Beautiful conveys, for instance, the strongest meaning; it marks the possession of that quality in its fullest extent, while the other terms denote the possession of it in part only. Fineness, handsomeness and prettiness are to beauty as parts to a whole.

We have already commented on some of the causes of the appearance of synonyms. Among them the logical reasons of the development of language as a means of human intercourse, the development of abstract thinking, of a finer differentiation between various sides of one and the same concept should be considered predominant. Any extra touch of emotional coloring may create a synonym. The change in words is often a change in style and the effect is quite different.

CHAPTER II National cultural specification of synonymy in English and Russian

2.1 The notion of synonymy in Modern English

2.1.1 The peculiarities of synonyms in English

To begin with, let us clarify what synonyms are: Synonyms (in ancient Greek syn ‘συν’ plus and onoma ‘ὄνομα’ name) are different words with similar or identical meanings and are interchangeable. Synonyms are words belonging to the same part of speech, differing in sound form, and possessing one or more identical or nearly identical (similar) denotational meanings. According to Oxford Dictionary

a synonym is a word or expression that has the same or nearly the same meaning as another in the same language.

An example of synonyms is the words *cat* and *feline*. Each describes any member of the family *Felidae*. Similarly, if we talk about a long time or an extended time, *long* and *extended* become synonyms. In the figurative sense, two words are often said to be synonymous if they have the same connotation:

“a widespread impression that ... Hollywood was synonymous with immorality”
(Doris Kearns Goodwin)

Synonyms can be nouns, adverbs or adjectives, as long as both members of the pair are the same part of speech.

More examples of English synonyms:

baby and infant (noun)

student and pupil (noun)

pretty and attractive (adjective)

sick and ill (adjective)

interesting and fascinating (adjective)

quickly and speedily (adverb)

Note that the synonyms are defined with respect to certain senses of words; for instance, *pupil* as the “aperture in the iris of the eye” is not synonymous with *student*. Similarly, *expired* as “having lost validity” (as in grocery goods) it doesn’t necessarily mean death.

Some lexicographers claim that no synonyms have exactly the same meaning (in all contexts or social levels of language) because etymology, orthography, phonic qualities, ambiguous meanings, usage, etc. make them unique. However, many people feel that the synonyms they use are identical in meaning for all practical purposes. Different words that are similar in meaning usually differ for a reason: *feline* is more formal than *cat*; *long* and *extended* are only synonyms in one usage and not in others, such as a long arm and an extended arm. Synonyms are also a source of euphemisms.

The purpose of a thesaurus is to offer the user a listing of similar or related words; these are often, but not always, synonyms. In a way, hyponyms are similar to synonyms.

In contrast, antonyms (an opposite pair) would be:

dead and alive (compare to synonyms: dead and deceased)

near and far (compare to synonyms: near and close)

war and peace (compare to synonyms: war and armed conflict)

tremendous and awful (compare to synonyms: tremendous and remarkable).

Synonyms are words different in their outer aspects, but identical or similar in their inner aspects. In English there are a lot of synonyms, because there are many borrowings, e.g. hearty / native/ - cordial/ borrowing/. After a word is borrowed it undergoes desynonymization, because absolute synonyms are unnecessary for a language. However, there are some **absolute synonyms** in the language, which have exactly the same meaning and belong to the same style, e.g. to moan, to groan; homeland, motherland etc. In cases of desynonymization one of the absolute synonyms can specialize in its meaning and we get semantic synonyms, e.g. «city» /borrowed/, «town» /native/. The French borrowing «city» is specialized. In other cases native words can be specialized in their meanings, e.g. «stool» /native/, «chair» /French/.

Sometimes one of the absolute synonyms is specialized in its usage and we get stylistic synonyms, e.g. «to begin»/ native/, «to commence» /borrowing/. Here the French word is specialized. In some cases the native word is specialized, e.g. «welkin» /bookish/, «sky» /neutral/.

Stylistic synonyms can also appear by means of abbreviation. In most cases the abbreviated form belongs to the colloquial style, and the full form to the neutral style, e.g. «examination», «exam».

Among stylistic synonyms we can point out a special group of words which are called euphemisms. These are words used to substitute some unpleasant or offensive words, e.g. «the late» instead of «dead», «to perspire» instead of «to sweat» etc.

There are also phraseological synonyms, these words are identical in their meanings and styles but different in their combining with other words in the sentence, e.g. «to be late for a lecture» but «to miss the train», «to visit museums» but «to attend lectures» etc.

In each group of synonyms there is a word with the most general meaning, which can substitute any word in the group, e.g. «piece» is the synonymic dominant in the group «slice», «lump», «morsel». The verb «to look at» is the synonymic dominant in the group «to stare», «to glance», «to peep». The adjective “red” is the synonymic dominant in the group «purple», «scarlet», «crimson».

When speaking about the sources of synonyms, besides desynonymization and abbreviation, we can also mention the formation of phrasal verbs, e.g. «to give up» - «to abandon», «to cut down» - «to diminish». Grouping of words is based upon similarities and contrasts and is usually called as synonymic row. Taking up similarity of meaning and contrasts of phonetic shape we observe that every language has in its vocabulary a variety of words, kindred in meaning but distinct in morphemic composition, phonemic shape and usage, ensuring the expression of the most delicate shades of thought, feeling and imagination. The more developed the language, the richer the diversity and therefore the greater the possibilities of lexical choice enhancing the effectiveness and precision of speech.

The way synonyms function may be seen from the following example:
Already in this half-hour of bombardment hundreds upon hundreds of men would have been violently slain, smashed, torn, gouged, crusted, and mutilated.
(ALDINGTON)

The synonymous words smash and crush are semantically very close; they combine to give a forceful representation of the atrocities of war. Richness and clearness of language are of paramount importance in so far as they promote precision of thought. Even this preliminary example makes it obvious that the still very common definitions of synonyms as words of the same language having the same meaning or as different words that stand for the same notion are by no means accurate and even in a way misleading. By the very nature of language every word

has its own history, its own peculiar motivation, and its own typical contexts. And besides there is always some hidden possibility of different connotation and which is feeling in each of them. Moreover, words of the same meaning would be useless for communication: they would encumber the language, not enrich it.

If two words exactly coincide in meaning and use, the natural tendency is for one of them to change its meaning or drop out of the language. Thus synonyms are words only similar but not identical in meaning. This definition is correct but vague. A more precise linguistic definition should be based on a workable notion of the semantic structure of the word and of the complex nature of every separate meaning in a polysemantic word. Each separate lexical meaning of a word has been described in the following chapters as consisting of a denotational component identifying the notion or the object and reflecting the essential features of the notion named, shades of meaning reflecting its secondary features, additional connotations resulting from typical contexts in which the word is used, its emotional component and stylistic coloring; connotations are not necessarily present in every word. The basis of a synonymic opposition is formed by the first of the above named components, i.e. the denotational component. It will be remembered that the term opposition means the relationship of partial difference between two partially similar elements of a language. A common denotational component brings the words together into a synonymic group. All the other components can vary and thus form the distinctive features of the synonymic oppositions.

Synonyms can therefore be defined in terms of linguistics as two or more words of the same language, belonging to the same part of speech and possessing one or more identical or nearly identical denotational meanings, interchangeable, at least in some contexts, without any considerable alteration in denotational meaning, but differing in morphemic composition, phonemic shape, shades of meaning, connotations, affective value, style, valence and idiomatic use. Additional characteristics of style, emotional coloring and valence peculiar to one of the elements in a synonymic group may be absent in one or all of the others.

The definition is of necessity very bulky and needs some commenting upon. By pointing out the fact that synonyms belong to the same part of speech the definition makes it clear that synonymic grouping is really a special case of lexicogrammatical grouping based on semantic proximity of words.

To have something tangible to work upon it is convenient to compare some synonyms within their group, so as to make obvious the reasons of the definition. The verbs *experience*, *undergo*, *sustain* and *suffer*, for example, come together because all four render the notion of experiencing something. The verb and the noun *experience* indicate actual living through something and coming to know it first hand rather than from hearsay. *Undergo* applies chiefly to what someone or something bears or is subjected to, as in *to undergo an operation*, *to undergo changes*. Compare also the following example from L. P. Smith: The French language has undergone considerable and more recent changes since the date when the Normans brought it into England. In the above example the verb *undergo* can be replaced by its synonyms without any change of the sentence meaning. This may be easily proved if a similar context is found for some other synonym in the same group. For instance: These Latin words suffered many transformations in becoming French.

The denotational meaning is obviously the same. Synonyms, then, are interchangeable under certain conditions specific to each group. This seems to call forth an analogy with phonological neutralization. Now, it will be remembered that neutralization is the absence in some contexts of a phonetic contrast found elsewhere or formerly in the language, as the absence of contrast between final [s] and [z] after [t]. It appears we are justified in calling semantic neutralization the suspension of an otherwise functioning semantic opposition that occurs in some lexical contexts. And yet *suffer* in this meaning ('to undergo'), but not in the example above, is characterized by connotations implying wrong or injury. No semantic neutralization occurs in phrases like *to suffer atrocities*, *to suffer heavy losses*. The implication is of course caused by the existence of the main intransitive meaning of the same word, not synonymous with the group, i. e. 'feel pain'. *Sustain* as an element of this group

differs from both in shade of meaning and style. It is an official word and it suggests undergoing affliction without giving way.

A further illustration will be supplied by a group of synonymous nouns: hope, expectation, and anticipation. They are considered to be synonymous because they all three mean 'having something in mind which is likely to happen'. They are, however, much less interchangeable than the previous group because of more strongly pronounced difference in shades of meaning. Expectation may be either of good or of evil. Anticipation, as a rule, is a pleasurable expectation of something good. Hope is not only a belief but a desire that some event would happen. The stylistic difference is also quite marked. The Romance words anticipation and expectation are formal literary words used only by educated speakers, whereas the native monosyllabic hope is stylistically neutral. Moreover, they differ in idiomatic usage. Only hope is possible in such set expressions as: to hope against, hope, to lose hope, to pin one's hopes on smth. Neither expectation nor anticipation could be substituted into the following quotation from T. S. Eliot: You do not know what hope is until you have lost it.

Taking into consideration the corresponding series of synonymous verbs and verbal set expressions: to hope, for anticipate, to expect, to look forward to, we shall see that separate words may be compared to whole set expressions. To look forward also worthy of note because it forms a definitely colloquial counterpart to the rest. It can easily be shown, on the evidence of examples, that each synonymic group comprises a dominant element. This synonymic dominant is the most general term of its kind potentially containing the specific features rendered by all the other members' of the group, as, for instance, undergo and hope in the above.

In the series leave, depart, quit, retire, clear out the verb leave, being general and both stylistically and emotionally neutral, can stand for each of the other four terms. The other four can replace leave only when some specific semantic component must prevail over the general notion. When we want to stress the idea of giving up employment and stopping work quit is preferable because in this word this particular notion dominates over the more general idea common to the whole group.

Some of these verbs may be used transitively, e. g. He has left me... Abandoned me! Quitted me! (BENNETT). In this synonymic series therefore the dominant term is leave. Other dominants are, for instance, get, a verb that can stand for the verbs obtain, acquire, gain, win, earn; also ask, the most general term of its group, viz. inquire, question or interrogate. The synonymic dominant should not be confused with a generic term. A generic term is relative. It serves as the name for the notion of the genus as distinguished from the names of the species. For instance, animal is a generic term as compared to the specific names wolf, dog or mouse (which are not synonymous). Dog, in its turn, may serve as a generic term for different breeds such as bull-dog, collie, poodle, etc.

Some above mentioned authors state that synonyms possess one or more identical or nearly identical meanings. To realize the significance of this, one must bear in mind that the majority of frequent words are polysemantic, and that it is precisely the frequent words that have many synonyms. The result is that one and the same word may belong in its various meanings to several different synonymic groups. The verb appear in ...an old brown cat without a tail appeared from nowhere (MANSFIELD) is synonymous with come into sight, emerge. On the other hand, when Gr. Greene depicts the far-off figures of the parachutists who ...appeared stationary, appeared is synonymous with look or seem, their common component being 'give the impression of. Appear, then, often applies to erroneous impressions. Compare the following .groups synonymous to five different meanings of the adjective fresh, as revealed by characteristic contexts: To begin a fresh paragraph—fresh:: another :: different :: new.

Fresh air —fresh:: pure :: invigorating.

A freshman —fresh:: inexperienced :: green :: raw.

To be fresh with smb —fresh:: impertinent :: rude.

The semantic structures of two polysemantic words sometimes coincide in more than one meaning, but never completely.

Synonyms may also differ in emotional coloring which may be present in one element of the group and absent in all or some of the others. Lonely as compared

with alone is emotional as is easily seen from the following examples: ...a very lonely boy lost between them and aware at ten that his mother had no interest in him, and that his father was a stranger. (ALDEIDGE) Shall be alone as my secretary doesn't come today (M. DICKENS). Both words denote being apart from others, but lonely besides the general meaning implies longing for company, feeling sad because of the lack of sympathy and companionship. Alone does not necessarily suggest any sadness at being by oneself.

If the difference in the meaning of synonyms concerns the notion or the emotion expressed, as was the case in the groups discussed above, the synonyms are classed as ideographic synonyms, and the opposition created in contrasting them may be called an ideographic opposition. The opposition is formulated with the help of a clear definitive statement of the semantic component present in all the members of the group. The analysis proceeds as a definition by comparison with the standard that is thus settled. "It is not enough to tell something about each word. The thing to tell is how each word is related to others in this particular group." 3 The establishment of differential features proves very helpful, whereas sliding from one synonym to another with no definite point of departure creates a haphazard approach with no chance of tracing the system. In analyzing the group consisting of the words glance n, look n and glimpse n we state that all three denote a conscious and direct endeavor to see, the distinctive feature is based on the time and quickness of the action. A glance is 'a look which is quick and sudden' and a glimpse is quicker still, implying only momentary sight.

In a stylistic opposition of synonyms the basis of comparison is again the denotational meaning and the distinctive feature is the presence or absence of a stylistic coloring which may also be accompanied a difference in emotional coloring. It has become quite a tradition with linguists : when discussing synonyms to quote a passage from "As You Like It" (Act V, Scene I) to illustrate the social differentiation of vocabulary and the stylistic relationship existing¹ in the English language between simple, mostly native, words and their dignified and elaborate synonyms borrowed from the French. We shall keep to this time-honored

convention, Speaking to a country fellow William, the jester Touchstone says: Therefore, you clown, abandon, — which is in the vulgar leave, — the society, — which in the boorish is company, — of this female, — which in the common is woman; which together is abandon the society of this female, or, clown, thou perishes t; or to thy better understanding diets; or, to wit, I kill thee, make thee away, translate thy life into death.

Synonyms may also differ in emotional coloring which may be present in one element of the group and absent in all or some of the others. Lonely as compared with alone is emotional as is easily seen from the following examples: ...a very lonely boy lost between them and aware at ten that his mother had no interest in him, and that his father was a stranger. (ALDEIDGE) Shall be alone as my secretary doesn't come today (M. DICKENS). Both words denote being apart from others, but lonely besides the general meaning implies longing for company, feeling sad because of the lack of sympathy and companionship. Alone does not necessarily suggest any sadness at being by oneself.

If the difference in the meaning of synonyms concerns the notion or the emotion expressed, as was the case in the groups discussed above, the synonyms are classed as ideographic synonyms, and the opposition created in contrasting them may be called an ideographic opposition. The opposition is formulated with the help of a clear definitive statement of the semantic component present in all the members of the group. The analysis proceeds as a definition by comparison with the standard that is thus settled. "It is not enough to tell something about each word. The thing to tell is how each word is related to others in this particular group." 3 The establishment of differential features proves very helpful, whereas sliding from one synonym to another with no definite point of departure creates a haphazard approach with no chance of tracing the system. In analyzing the group consisting of the words glance n, look n and glimpse n we state that all three denote a conscious and direct endeavor to see, the distinctive feature is based on the time and quickness of the action. A glance is 'a look which is quick and sudden' and a glimpse is quicker still, implying only momentary sight.

In a stylistic opposition of synonyms the basis of comparison is again the denotational meaning and the distinctive feature is the presence or absence of a stylistic coloring which may also be accompanied a difference in emotional coloring. It has become quite a tradition with linguists : when discussing synonyms to quote a passage from “As You Like It” (Act V, Scene I) to illustrate the social differentiation of vocabulary and the stylistic relationship existing¹ in the English language between simple, mostly native, words and their dignified and elaborate synonyms borrowed from the French. We shall keep to this time-honored convention, Speaking to a country fellow William, the jester Touchstone says: Therefore, you clown, abandon, — which is in the vulgar leave, — the society, — which in the boorish is company, — of this female, — which in the common is woman; which together is abandon the society of this female, or, clown, thou perishes t; or to thy better understanding diets; or, to wit, I kill thee, make thee away, translate thy life into death.

The general effect of poetic or learned synonyms when used in prose or in everyday speech is that of creating alit elevated tone. The point may be proved by the very first example in this chapter where the poetic and archaic verb slays is substituted for the neutral kill. We must be on our guard too against the idea that the stylistic effect may exist without influencing the meaning: in fact, it never does. The verb slay not only lends to the whole a poetical and solemn ring, it also shows the writer’s and his hero’s attitude to the fact, their horror and repugnance of war and their feeling for its victims.

The phrases they are killed, they are slain, they are made away with may refer to the same event hut they are different ill meaning, in so far as they reveal a different attitude to the subject in question on the part of the speaker.

2.1.1 The peculiar use of synonyms and their oppositions

The study of synonyms is a borderline province between semantics and stylistics on the one hand and semantics and phraseology on the other because of the synonymic collocations serving as a means of emphasis. The following example from “A Taste of Honey”, remarkable for the truthfulness of its dialogue, shows how they are used in modern speech;

Helen: ...”The devil looks after his own,” - they say.

Since the exact meaning of each synonym is delimited by its interrelatedness with the other elements of the same group, comparison plays an important part in synonymic research. It has already been tentatively examined in the opening

paragraph of this chapter; now we offer a slightly different angle of the same problem. The interchangeability and possible neutralization are tested by means of substitution, a procedure also profitably borrowed by semasiology from phonology.

1. The values of words
2. Can best be defined by substituting them for one another and observing the resulting changes.

When the landlady in John Waif's "Hurry on down" says to the main personage: And where do you work? I've asked you that two or three times, Mr. Lumley, but you've never given me any answer, the verb ask has a very general meaning of seeking information. Substituting its synonyms, question or interrogate, will require a change in the structure of the sentence (the omission of that), which shows the distributional opposition between these words, and also ushers in a change in meaning. These words will heighten the implication that the landlady has her doubts about Lumley and confesses that she finds his character suspicious. The verb question would mean that she is constantly asking her lodger searching questions. The substitution of interrogate would suggest systematic and thorough questioning by a person authorized to do so; the landlady could have used it only ironically and irony would have been completely out of keeping with her mentality and habits. Observations of this sort can be supported by statistical data. Most frequent combinations such as teachers question their pupils, fudges interrogate witnesses and the like also throw light on the semantic difference between synonyms.

Synonyms have certain common ground within which they are interchangeable without alteration of meaning or with a very slight loss in effectiveness. Ask and inquire, for instance, may be used indiscriminately when not followed by any object 3 as in the following: "And where do you live now, Mr. Gillespie?" Mrs. Pearson inquired rather archly and with her head on one side. (PRIESTLEY)

To this connection some more examples may be cited. The words strange, odd, queer, though different in connotations, are often interchangeable because they can be applied to define the same words or words naming similar notions: strange

feeling (glance, business)', queer feeling (glance, business), odd feeling (glance, business). E. g.: It seems the queerest set-up I ever heard of. (WYNDHAM) Compare also: she agreed to stay :: she consented to stay; she seems annoyed :: she appears annoyed :: she looks annoyed; to discharge an employee :: to sack an employee :: to fire an employee (a servant, etc.).

It should be borne in mind that substitution in different contexts has for its object not only probing interchangeability but bringing into relief the difference in intellectual, emotional and stylistic value of each word. An additional procedure suggested by Ch. Bally consists in assigning to the words suitable antonyms. The difference between firm and hard, for example, is explained if we point out that firm contrasts with hose and flabby (firm ground:: loose ground, firm chin :: flabby chin), whereas the opposite of hard is soft (hard ground :: soft ground).

The meaning of each word is conditioned the meaning of other words forming part of the same vocabulary system, and especially of those in semantic proximity. High and tall, for instance, could be defined not only from the point of view of their valence (tall is used about people) but also in relation to each other by stating how far they are interchangeable and what their respective antonyms are. A building may be high and it may be (all. High is a relative term signifying 'greatly raised above the surface or the base', in comparison with what is usual for objects of the same kind. A table is high if it exceeds 75 cm; a hill of a hundred meters is not high. The same relativity is characteristic of its antonym low. As to the word tall, it is used about objects whose height is greatly in excess of their breadth or diameter and whose actual height is great for an object of its kind: a tall man, a tall tree. The antonym is short.

The area where substitution is possible is very limited and outside it all replacement either destroys the beauty and precision, or, more often, makes the utterance vague, ungrammatical and even unintelligible. This makes the knowledge of where each synonym differs from another of paramount importance for correctness of speech.

The distinctions between words similar in meaning are often very fine and elusive, so that some special instruction on the use of synonyms is necessary even for native speakers. This accounts for the great number of books of synonyms that serve as guides for those who aim at good style and precision and wish to choose the most appropriate terms from the varied stock of the English vocabulary. The study of synonyms is especially indispensable for those who learn English as a foreign language because what is the right word in one situation will be wrong in many other, apparently similar, contexts.

It is often convenient to explain the meaning of a new word with the help of its previously learned synonym. This forms additional associations in the student's mind, and the new word is better remembered. Moreover, it eliminates the necessity of bringing in a native word. And yet the discrimination of synonyms and words which may be confused is more important. -The teacher must show that synonyms are not identical in meaning or use and explain the difference between them by comparing and contrasting them, as well as by showing in what contexts one or the other may be most fitly used.

Translation cannot serve as a criterion of synonymy; there are cases when several English words of different distribution and valence are translated into Russian by one and the same word. Such words as also, too and as well, all translated by the Russian word *mooted*, are never interchangeable. A teacher of English should always stress the necessity of being on one's guard against mistakes of this kind.

Contextual synonyms are similar in meaning only under some specific distributional conditions. The verbs bear, suffer and stand are semantically different and not interchangeable except when used in the negative form; can't stand is equal to can't bear in the following words of an officer: Gas. I've swallowed too much of the beastly stuff: I can't stand it any longer. I'm going to the dressing-station. (ALDINGTON)

There are some other distinctions to be made with respect to different kinds of semantic similarity. Some authors, for instance, class groups like ask :: beg :: implore or like :: love :: adore, gift :: talent :: genius as synonymous, calling them

relative synonyms. This attitude is open to discussion. In fact the difference in denotative meaning is unmistakable: the words name different notions, not various degrees of the same notion, and cannot substitute one another. An entirely different type of opposition is involved. Formerly we had oppositions based on the relationships between the members of the opposition, here we deal with proportional oppositions characterized by their relationship with the whole vocabulary system and based on a different degree of intensity of the relevant distinctive features. We shall not call such words synonymous as they do not fit the definition of synonyms given in the beginning of the chapter.

Total synonymy, i.e. synonymy where the members of a synonymic group can replace each other in any given context, without the slightest alteration in denotative or emotional meaning and connotations, is an extremely rare occurrence. Examples of this type can be found in special literature among technical terms peculiar to this or that branch of knowledge. Thus, in linguistics the terms noun and substantive, functional affix, flections and inflection are identical in meaning. What is not generally realized, however, is that terms are a peculiar type of words, totally devoid of connotations or emotional coloring, and that their stylistic characterization does not vary? That is why this is a very special kind of synonymy: neither ideographic nor stylistic oppositions are possible here. As to the distributional opposition, it is less marked because the great majority of terms are nouns. Their irater change ability is also in a way deceptive. Every writer has to make up his mind right from the start as to which of the possible synonyms he prefers and stick to it throughout his text to avoid ambiguity. Thus, the interchangeability is, as it were, theoretical and cannot be materialized in an actual text.

The same misunderstood conception of interchangeability lies at the bottom of considering different dialect names for the same plant, animal or agricultural implement and the like as total (absolute) synonyms. Thus a perennial plant with long clusters of dotted whitish or purple tubular flowers that the botanists refer to as genus *Digitalis* has several dialectal names such as foxglove, fairy bell, finger/lower, finger root, dead men's bells, ladies' fingers. But the names are not interchangeable

in any particular speaker's idiolect. 1 The same is true about the cornflower (Centauries yeans), so called because it grows in cornfields; some people call it bluebottle according to the shape and color of its petals. Compare also gorse, furze and whim, different names used in different places for the same prickly yellow-flowered shrub.

The distinction between synchronistic and dichromatic treatment is so fundamental that it cannot be overemphasized, but the two aspects are interdependent and cannot be understood without one another. It is therefore essential after the descriptive analysis synonymy in present-day English to take up the historical line of approach and discuss the origin of synonyms and the causes of either abundance in English.

The majority of those who studied synonymy in the past have been cultivating both lines of approach without keeping them scrupulously apart, and focused their attention on the prominent part of foreign loan words in English synonymy, e. g. freedom :: liberty or heaven :: sky, where the first elements are native and the second, French and Scandinavian respectively. O. Jazzperson and many others used to stress that the English language is peculiarly rich in synonyms because Britons, Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans fighting and settling upon the soil of the British Isles could not but influence each other's speech. British scholars studied Greek and Latin and for centuries used Latin as a medium for communication on scholarly topics. Words borrowed from Latin to interrogate abdomen to collect vacuous to complete to ascend instruction Native English words to ask belly to gather empty to end to raise teaching Synonymy has its characteristic patterns in each language. Its peculiar feature in English is the contrast between simple native words stylistically neutral, literary words borrowed from French and learned words of Greco-Latin origin. This results in a sort of stylistically conditioned triple "keyboard" that can be illustrated by the following: Words borrowed from French to question stomach to assemble devoid to finish to mount guidance English also uses many pairs of synonymous derivatives, the one Hellenic and the other Romance, e. g.: periphery ::

circumference', hypothesis :: supposition; sympathy :: compassion; synthesis :: composition.

The pattern of stylistic relationship represented in the above table, although typical, is by no means universal. For example, the native words *dale*, *deed*, *fair* are the poetic equivalents of their much more frequent borrowed synonyms *valley*, *act* or the hybrid *beautiful*.

This subject of stylistic differentiation has been one of much controversy in recent years. It is universally accepted, however, that semantic and stylistic properties may change and synonyms which at one time formed a stylistic opposition only, may in the course of time become ideographically contrasted as well, and vice versa.

It would be linguistically naive to maintain that borrowing results only in quantitative changes or those qualitative changes are purely stylistically. The introduction of a borrowed word almost invariably starts some alteration both in the newcomer and in the semantic structure of existing words that are close to it in meaning. When in the 13th century the word *soil* (from *soil*, *soil*) was borrowed into English its meaning was 'a strip of land'. The upper layer of earth in which plants grow had been denoted since Old English by one of the synonyms: *elpe*, *land*, *fold*. All these words had other central meanings so (that the meaning in question was with them secondary. As a result, if two words coincide in meaning and use, the tendency is for one of them to drop out of the language. *fold* had the same function and meaning as *elpe* and in the fight for survival the latter won. The polysemantic word *land* underwent an intense semantic development in a different direction and so dropped out of this synonymic series. In this way it became quite natural for *soil* to fill the obvious lexical gap, receive its present meaning and become the main name for the corresponding notion, i.e. 'the mould in which plants grow'. The noun *earth* retained (its meaning throughout its history, whereas the word *ground* in which this meaning was formerly absent, developed it. As a result this synonymic group comprises at present *soil*, *earth* and *ground*.

The fate of the word *folder* is not at all infrequent. Many other words now marked in the dictionaries as “archaic” or “obsolete” have dropped out in the same competition of synonyms: others survived with a meaning more or less removed from the original one. The process is called *synonymic differentiation* and is so current that M. Boreal regarded it as an inherent law of language development. It must be noted that -synonyms may influence each other semantically in two diametrically opposite ways: one of them is *dissimilation*, the other the reverse process, i. e. *assimilation*. The assimilation of synonyms consists in parallel development. An example of this is furnished by the sense development of Middle English adverbs meaning ‘swiftly’, and subsequently ‘immediately’. This law was discovered and described by G. Stern. H. A. Treble and G. H. Villains give as examples the pejorative meanings acquired by the nouns *wench*, *knave* and *churl* which originally meant ‘girl’, ‘boy’ and ‘laborer’ respectively, and point out that this loss of old dignity became linguistically possible because there were so many synonymous terms to hand. The important thing to remember is that it is not only borrowings from foreign languages but, other sources as well that; have made increasing contributions to the stock of English synonyms. There are for instance words that come from dialects, and, in the last hundred years, from American English in particular. As a result speakers of British English may make use of both elements of the following pairs, the first element in each pair coming from the USA: *gimmick* :: *trick*, *dues* :: *subscription*, *long distance (telephone) call* :: *trunk call*, *radio* :: *wireless*. There are also synonyms that originate in numerous other dialects as, for instance, *clover*:: *shamrock*, *liquor* :: *whiskey* (from Irish), *girl* :: *lass*, *lassie* or *charm* :: *glamour* (from Scottish).

The role of borrowings should not be overestimated. Synonyms are also created by means of all word-forming processes productive in the language at a given time of its history. The words already existing in the language develop new meanings. New words may be formed by affixation, or loss of affixes, conversion, compounding, shortening and so on, and being coined, form synonyms to those already in use.

Of special importance for those who are interested in the present-day trends and characteristic peculiarities of the English vocabulary are the synonymic oppositions due to shift of meaning, new combinations of verbs with postpositive and compound nouns formed from them, shortenings, set expressions and conversion.

Set expressions consisting of a verb with a postpositive are widely used in present-day English and may be called one of its characteristic features. Many verbal synonymic groups contain such combinations as one of their elements. A few examples will illustrate this statement: to choose :: to pick out; to abandon :: to give up; to continue :: to go on; to enter :: to come in; to lift :: to pick up; to postpone :: to put off; to quarrel :: to fall out; to return :: to bring back. E.g. By the way, Toby has quite given up the idea of doing those animal cartoons. (PLOMER)

The vitality of these expressions is proved by the fact that they really supply material for further word-formation. Very many compound nouns denoting abstract notions, persons and events are correlated with them, also giving ways of expressing notions hitherto named by somewhat lengthy borrowed terms. There are, for instance, such synonymic pairs as arrangement :: layout; conscription :: call-up; precipitation :: fall-out; regeneration :: feedback; reproduction :: playback; resistance :: fight-back; treachery :: sell-out.

An even more frequent type of new formations is that in which a noun with a verbal stem is combined with a verb of generic meaning (have, give, take, get, make] into a set expression which differs from the simple verb in aspect or emphasis: to laugh:: to give a laugh; to sigh:: to give a sigh; to walk:: to take a walk; to smoke:: to have a smoke; to love:: to fall in love. E.g. now we can all have a good read with our coffee. (SIMPSON).

N. N. Amosova stresses the patterned character of the phrases in question, the regularity of connection between the structure of the phrase and the resulting semantic effect. She also points out that there may be cases when phrases of this pattern have undergone a shift of meaning and turned into phraseological units quite

different in meaning from, and not synonymical with, the verbs of the same root. This is the case with to give a lift, to give somebody quite a turn, etc.

Quite frequently synonyms, mostly stylistically, but sometimes ideographic as well, are due to shortening, e. g. memorandum :: memo; vegetables :: vegs; margarine :: merge; microphone :: mike; popular (song) :: pop (song).

One should not overlook the fact that conversion may also be a source of synonymy; it accounts for such pairs as commandment:: ceriman, laughter :: laugh. The problem in this connection is whether such cases should be regarded as synonyms or as lexical variants of one and the same word. It seems more logical to consider them, as lexical variants. Cf. also cases of different affixation: anxiety :: anxiousness, effectively :: effectiveness, and loss of affixes: amongst :: among or await :: wait.

Essence of synonymy, synonymous relations between words more attracted and still attracts the attention of linguists, who develop the problems of semasiology, since decision of the problems of synonymy is closely connected with antonym and polysemy and the studying of synonyms is important not only for semasiology, but as well as for lexicography, literature studying, methodic of teaching the English language, etc.

In spite of the existence of relatively large numbers of the studies, devoted to the opening of the different sides to synonymy, hitherto there is no a unity glance in respect to determinations of the synonyms, methods of their study, principles of the separation and categorizations of the synonyms, and borders of the synonymous row. The majority of scholars share the opinion that synonymy presents by itself the "microcircuit" of the language, which is characterized by their own relations and that it falls into quality of the component part in lexical system of the language as a whole.

As it concerns the determinations of synonymy, there is no existence of the unity among the scholars' opinions: one researchers come from the generality of the meaning of synonyms, while the others - from the correlation of semantic and subject - logical begin in a word, while the thirds try to prove that synonyms are defined on

the base of generality of the structured model of the use and alike combinability of the words.

Such kind of analysis of these determinations happens to in the works of Russian philologists V.A. Pautynskaya, "Review of the literature on question of the synonymy", V.A. Zvegintsev "Semasiology", "Questions to theories and histories of the language", "Theoretical and applied linguistics" and V.T. Valium "About determinations of the synonymy and their synonymy in modern English.

Considering the semantic generality of the lexical units and their partial interchangeability as the features of synonyms, that is to say, the compatibility of words in one contextual meaning and the inconsistency in others, we hereunder may confirm that two words interchangeable in all contexts are not synonyms, because when two words are used with no difference, there is no a problem of the choice between them

Now let us analyze this problem from the viewpoint of the Russian scholar S. Ulman. Citing on Aristotel, S. Uliman emphasizes that synonymy of the words - a stylistic category and the style always expects the choice between two words, at least, which are compatible or incompatible. Hence it follows that where there are no grounds for choice between two or more words, there are no grounds for speaking about synonymy of these words.

Amongst the judgments about correlation of meanings in synonymy and their interchangeable character, there are such, which reduce the synonymy to unlimited interchange. For instance, A. Cherch writes that if two names (the question is about the names presented as combinations of the words) are synonyms (that is they have one and the same content), it is always possible for a linguist to change one of them into another. However, example, which A. Cherch gives on this cause, shows that the interchangeable character of synonyms is limited. This example looks as follows: e.g. Sir Valiter Scott is the author of "Veverley"

In this example we can see that though Sir Walter Scott is not a Veverley by its semantic content but Sir Walter Scott is Sir Walter Scott, though when we say a word "Veverley" we may mention Walter Scott as the author of the former.

In the linguistic literature on synonymy we can read that the interchangeable character of lexical units is considered as the effect to generalities of their lexical and grammatical importance. For support of this idea we can take the works of A.L. Demidova, who, concerning with synonymical pretext, comes to conclusion that some synonyms differ in their semantically meaning and cannot be interchanged to each other, while the others are of stylistic shade and can be interchanged into each other. I agree with A.L. Demidova's idea is that there also exists the third group of synonyms, which combines in itself the features of the first two previous groups. And, consequently, such synonyms are interchangeable in one case and not interchangeable in another.

According to concepts accepted by me , the synonymy exists only under the two above mentioned conditions of semantic generality, while the words which correspond only to one of these conditions, are not of synonymic character.

Semantic fields are the answer to the problem / question of structuring the lexicon of a language. Those who defend the existence of semantic fields believe that the language is structured. They say that the words can be classified in sets, which are related to conceptual fields and these words divide the semantic space / domain in different ways. It's to be preferred that the label to use here is field rather than theory because theories are supposed to be complete and have explicit definitions of the matter in question, and this isn't what happens in the semantic field approach. We just have ideas of how things seem to be. Moreover, the semantic field approach isn't formalized and it was born on the basis of just a handful of ideas of how words work.

The basic notion behind any semantic field approach is the notion of association: words are associated in different words. We also have the idea of a mosaic. The words form it in such a way that for it to be complete you need all the words in their correct place. We also have to distinguish between lexical and semantic fields. Semantic fields have something to do with prototypically. One of the main difficulties in the semantic field approach is to establish the exact number

of words that are part of a set. Here is where Prototype Theory enters because it defines the basic features of a category.

Model of focal points.

Martin and Key concluded that the basic words of a category are very easy to identify by a native speaker but they say that the interesting point is the area a native speaker doubts whether to call something A or B. There are concepts which cannot be expressed in words. From the psychological point of view there are concepts which cannot be verbalized but that really exist in the mind. The aim of this model is to identify the relationship between the lexical fields and the semantic fields. And there are fields where the relationship doesn't exist.

The idea behind semantic fields is the arrangement of words in sets depending on the organizing concepts. Many semantic linguists say that it's difficult to think of a word outside a semantic field because if you say that a word is outside a semantic field, you say it's outside the lexicon. The problem with this is what happens with words which don't evoke a concept. Many words in English are meaningful but don't have a concept

Ex: Even / only

These words clearly make a semantic contribution to the sentence. It's not the same to say: Only John drinks milk. Than: Even John drinks milk.

This chapter is devoted to the analysis of semantic and functional relationships and words and their synonymy in modern English. V.G. Vilyuman, in detail analyzing all signs of synonymy, comes to conclusion that necessary and sufficient for confession of the words as the synonymical ones features are general for the analyzed words semantic and functional signs, but, however, the problem of synonymy according to Volume's opinion is being lead to the discovering of resemblances and differences of the meanings and functions of the words on the base of their combinability. This idea might be truly supported by the investigations of other linguists such as A.V.Smirnitsky and G.Khidekel.

We must also notion here that the understanding of the essence of the synonymous relations is closely connected with the understanding of the essence

and structures of the semantic structure of a word. We know different ways of interpretations of the semantic structure of the word in theories of lexicology. Let us give some of these suggestions below.

V.G. Viluman defines the semantic structure of the word as a set of semantic signs, which are revealed at the determination of semantic adjacency of the synonymical words. According to his opinion, one of the possible ways of the determination of semantic adequacy of the words is offered by the analysis of the description of meanings for these words in explanatory dictionaries. Two words are considered as semantically correspondent to each other if their vocabulary meaning is explained one through another. The relationship between two words can also be direct and mediated. For example, having studied the semantic relationship between verbs which are united by the semantic meaning of “to look”, V.G. Vilyuman builds the matrix of the semantic structures of the synonymical verbs analyzed. The matrix presentation of the semantic structures serves not only as a demonstrative depiction of the material, but it also creates the picture a unit systems in a language - we mean synonymy, since the semantic structure of each word in the matrix is represented by itself as a ranked ensemble of importance's interconnected and opposed to each other.

The deep penetration to the essence of language phenomena, their nature and laws of the development is promoted by the collation of these phenomena in two and more languages.

The problems of the comparative study of lexicon in different languages have found their reflected images in the works of such kind famous lexicologists as A.V. Scherba, R.A. Budagov, V.G. Gak, B.A. Uspensky, V.N. Yartseva, Sh. Balley, S. Uliman, U. Veinrich, A.V.Smirnitsky and the others.

Many linguists consider as expedient to match the small systems between themselves, the members of which are semantically bound between itself. This enables us to define the lexical elements of each system by means of investigation, and to note the moments of the coincidences between them, as well as to explain

why the semantic sidebars of each word or words, which have the alike subject reference in compared languages, are turned out to be different.

The comparative studies also serve as the base for typological investigations, the production of typological universals, since, as a result of such correspondences, are identically and non-identically fixed with the determined standpoint elements. For example, the Russian linguist M.M. Makovskiy in his article “Typology of Lexical-Semantic Systems” emphasizes that the typological analysis of lexicon must not only be reduced to the external, mostly available establishments, which are often available for observation, but often casual in coincidences in their lexical and semantically meanings. In the course of studies we must necessary realize, if there general structured lexical-semantic models, common for many languages (Russian and Uzbek are included) exist, and if yes, what kind of peculiarities and laws are observed for this.

Thereby, we see that the problem of synonymy was studied and is being studied, but, regrettably, the majority of the studies in this area belong to the foreign lexicologists, especially by the Russian ones. In Uzbekistan the studding of the problem of synonymy is investigated by a relatively small quantity of lexicologists, except for Prof. Buranov and Prof. Muminov.

Lexical difference in distribution is based on the difference in valence. An example of this is offered by the verbs win and gain. Both may be used in combination with the noun victory: to win a victory, to gain a victory. But with the word war only win is possible: to win a war. We are here trespassing on the domain of set expressions, a problem that has already been treated in an earlier chapter. Here it will suffice to point out that the phraseological combining possibilities of words are extremely varied.

It has been repeatedly stated that synonyms cannot be substituted into set expressions; as a general rule each synonym has its own peculiarities of phraseological connections. The statement is only approximately correct. A. V. Koenig has shown that set expressions have special properties as regards synonymy,

different from those observed in free phrases. Some set expressions may vary in their lexical components without changing their meaning, e. g. cast (fling or throw] smth in smb's teeth. Moreover, the meaning may remain unchanged even if the interchangeable components are not synonymous: to hang on by one's eyelashes (eyelids, eyebrows),-to bear or show a resemblance. The nouns glance, look and glimpse are indiscriminately used with the verbs give and have: to give a look (a glance, a glimpse), to have a look (a glance, a glimpse). With the verbs "cast and take the word glimpse is not used, so that only the expressions to cast a glance (a look) or to take a glance (a look) are possible. With the verbs steal, shoot, throw the combining possibilities are further restricted, so that only the noun glance will occur in combination with these. It goes without saying that phraseological interchangeability is not frequent.

The verbs which fall into one synonymous row, can possess the miscellaneous character of composing restrictions. The composing restrictions can be of lexical, semantic or referring character.

The lexical restriction reveals in the following fact: a synonym can be used only with determined circle of words. However, the verbal synonyms practically do not possess such type of restrictions, though there are some examples which might be suitable, to some degree, to the given type of restrictions:

For example, if we analyze the two synonyms - «to creep» and «to crawl», the latter, is more preferable in usage with the names of animals who are deprived with limbs (e.g. Snakes, gophers, etc.)

Cf: The snakes crawled around the tree.

Contrary to the above mentioned character, the semantic restriction is assigned by denotation of determined semantic feature, which a synonym must possess when correlating in syntactical relationship with the given word.

For instance, in the synonymic row «to escape», «to flee», «to fly», «to abscond», «to decamp» in the meaning of «избегать» the first three synonyms possess a broad combinability, than the last twos. That is, in the case of semantic combinability the subject of the corresponding actions are both people and animals.

Cf. :His best tow dogs escaped from the camp, the dog fled into the forest.

Meanwhile, the subject action of the verbs “to abscond” and “to decamp” are only people.

More complicated than the previously mentioned groups are the synonyms with the referring combinability restrictions. The example of such restrictions can be shown on the following synonymic row: “to reach” - “to achieve” - “to gain” - “to attain” in the meaning of “добавляться” The following noun expressions which denote the purpose or the result of the action are of typical character for these three synonyms:

To reach / to achieve, to gain, to attain /one’s aim (e.g. the abject of one’s desires, success, fame, glory), “to reach (an understanding, agreement), “to achieve the reputation for being rude”, “to achieve the realization of a dream”, “to gain / to attain / the attention of the clerk [the confidence of the mountain people]. It should be borne in the mind that the last examples the verbs “to gain” and “to attain” mustn’t be substituted onto the verbs “to reach”, or “to achieve”, because the noun expression “to reach / to achieve / the attention of the clerk [the confidence of the mountain people] are wrong (and not only somewhat different in the meaning).

Supervising more attentively to the nouns “attention” and “confidence”, which are capable to enter in the place of the direct object in the sentences with the verbs “to gain” and “to attain”, but not as the direct object to the verbs “to reach” and “ to achieve, we may notice the following interesting peculiar feature of the studied synonymical phrases: the subject for the state, marked by the words “attention” or “confidence”, do not correspond to the subject of the action, marked by the verbs “to gain” and “ to attain”, i.e. the attention of the clerk is attracted not by the clerk himself , but by the other person, and the confidence of highlanders is achieved by someone different from highlanders.

However, the verbs “to gain” and “to attain” are capable to match with the nouns, marking such conditions (the characteristics, situations), the subjects of which coincide with the subjects of actions corresponding to these subjects: that is

in the case of the verbs “to gain / to attain / one’s aim [success, glory]” the subject of the action of “to gain / attain” is one and the same person.

So now we can formulate the referring restriction for the verbs “to reach” and “to achieve”: they cannot be combined with the names of conditions, the subjects of which do not coincide with the subject of the action marked by these conditions.

The similar difference is presented in the pair of the synonyms “to condescend” - “to deign” (in the meaning of “снисходить”): the first of them is combined both with the name of the action or property, the subject of which coincides with the subject for the verb “to condescend” (e.g. he condescend smile); and with the name or state the subject of which does not coincide with the subject for the verb “to condescend” (cf.: to condescend to smb’s folly). Meantime, the verb “to deign” can be combined in its meaning only with the names of the proper actions or the characteristics of the subject:

Cf.: He didn’t deign to smile, he didn’t deign to their folly.

The differences in combinability between the synonyms can, like constructive differences, be motivated or non-motivated.

Let us take into consideration, for instance, the synonyms “to surprise” - “удивлять” and “to amaze”, “to astound” - изумлять”, ”поражать”. They differ, in particular, on the feature of degree of a feeling. All the three synonyms can be combined with the adverbial modifiers of measure, but the verb “to surprise” can be combined with any circumstance of this class (cf.: he was a little [not a little, very much] sup), while “to amaze” and “to astound” can be combined only with those adverbial modifiers of measure, which mark the super high or the maximal degree of property, condition or feeling.

At least once unusual unless absolutely anomalous, word-combinations.

In the above mentioned case the differences in combinability are naturally removed from the differences in the meanings of synonyms. However, even the differences in combinability can be semantically non-motivated.

Below we shall take into consideration some more several examples of differences in combinability between the synonyms.

The verb “gather” “собираться” differs from their synonyms “to assemble” and “to congregate” by the following: the subject for the verbs “to assemble” and “to congregate” can only be (in stylistically neutral text) only the living beings, but the subject for the verb “to gather” - can be expressed by any moving things: e.g. The clouds are gathering, it will rain.

The verbs “to ponder”, “to meditate» and “to ruminate” in the meaning of “размышлять” are combinable with the names of situation, characteristic, products of thoughts as object (the theme) of reflections:

cf.: to ponder / to meditate/ upon the course of actions; to ruminate over the past; to ponder / to meditate, to ruminate/ the point.

The verbs “to ponder” and “to meditate” are combinable with the names of the person as object for reflections; the latter is characterized for the verb “to ruminate”:
cf.: to ponder on modern young men, he meditated on all those people and the things they represented in his life.

The verbs “to depress”, “to oppress” and “to weigh down (upon)” in the meaning of “угнетать” can be combined with the names of feelings, actions, characteristics, etc. as the reasons for the oppressed condition:

cf.: a feeling of isolation depressed / oppressed / her, she was oppressed by fear, oppressed / weighed down / by the heat. Besides, the verbs “to depress” and “to oppress” can be combined with the names of the concrete things and living beings in same meaning, which is not characteristic for the phrasal verb “to weigh down (upon)”:

Cf.: the dim room depressed / oppressed / her, she depressed me.¹

Words are felt to be synonymous independently of their contextual relations. Leech makes the distinction between synonymy and conceptual synonymy. The equivalence of meaning of synonymy has to adhere to the equivalence of concepts, independently from the stylistic overtones.

Ex: Steed (poetic) Horse (general) Nag (slang) Gee-gee (baby language)²

¹ Abayev V.I. Synonyms and their Semantical Features T. O'qituvchi 1981 pp. 4-5, 8, 26-29

² “World Book Encyclopedia S part” Macmillan Publisher 1996 p 134

The concept 'horse' is evoked by these words. So these words are synonymous although they are different in their stylistic overtones. This has been strongly criticized because to prove that we all have the same concept is very doubted. Our system of conceptualization may be different from one speaker to other. The most evident example of this is baby language. When a baby says gee-gee he may be saying it to any animal that moves.

So conceptual synonymy is alright but it has faults and objections.

Warwick says that it isn't possible to distinguish semantic meaning and factual meaning. Her lexicographic descriptions are very lengthy because she has into account all knowledge of the world that is, the habitat, size, appearance, behavior, and relation to people...

2.2 Comparative study of the synonymy of lexical units in Modern English and Russian

Synonymy is the relation that holds between bound morphemes, lexemes, lexical units, phrases, clauses, sentences and propositions. Thus, synonymy can be classified either into lexical and propositional synonymy.

In both languages lexical synonyms have to do with bound morphemes, lexemes, lexical units and phrases in both languages. Lexical synonymy is a sense relation that holds between two or more lexical units with the same sense in the given contexts in which they are interchangeable. For example: *finish – to complete – to conclude*; in Russian: *завершать–заканчивать–кончать*

There are also phraseological synonyms in both languages, these words are identical in their meanings and styles but different in their combining with other words in the sentence, e.g. «to be late for a lecture» but «to miss the train», «to visit museums» but «to attend lectures» etc.

Having analyzed a great number of articles and internet resources, we came to conclusion that there are not full amount of works in English where we can find such a concept as structural classification of synonyms. But in Russian we have structural classification of synonyms. Structurally synonyms are divided into:

- a) monoroot synonyms (general root and different affixes): *ругать, обругать, выругать; мыслить, думать, размышлять, раздумывать, помышлять.*
- b) polyroot synonyms : *парадный, пышный, помпезный, торжественный; красивый, обаятельный, очаровательный, неотразимый.*

The modern approach to word studies is based on distinguishing between the external and internal structures of the word.

The internal structure of the word, or its *meaning*, is nowadays commonly referred to as the word's *semantic structure*. This is certainly the word's main aspect. Words can serve the purposes the human communication solely due to their meanings, and it is most unfortunate when this fact is ignored by some contemporary scholars who, in their obsession with the fetish of structure tend eludes mathematical analysis. And this is exactly what meaning, with its subtle variations and shifts is apt to do.

By external structure of the word we mean its morphological structure. For example, in the word *post-impressionists* the following morphemes can be distinguished: the prefixes *post-*, *im-*, the root *press*, the noun- forming suffixes – *ion*, *-ist*, and the grammatical suffix of plurality – *s*. All these morphemes constitute the external structure of the word *post-impressionists*.

In English and Russian the word can be:

- simple
- derivative

- composite

On such classification we can give the following structural classification of synonyms in English and Russian:

English		Russian	
Control	1. Arrest	Контроль	1.задержание
	2. Check		2.проверка
	3. Circumscribe		3.ограничивать
	4. Confine		4.граница
	5. Constrain		5.заставлять
	6. Curb		6.сдерживание
	7. Detain		7.арестовать
	8. Gag		8.затычка
	9. Govern		9.править
	10. Hinder		10.---
	11. Impede		11.мешать
	12. Inhibit		12.---
	13. Limit		13.предел
	14. Measure		14.мера
	15. Obstruct		15.заграждать
	16. Quell		16. контролирование
	17. Regulate		17.регулировать
	18. Restrain		18.сдерживать
	19.ограничивать		

	19. Restrict 20. Rule 21. Stop 22. Supervision 23. Tame 24. Inspection		20. править 21. задержка 22. наблюдение 23. приручать 24. инспектирование
Old	1. Aged 2. Aging 3. Ancient 4. Anile 5. Archaic 6. Decrepit 7. Long-lived 8. Medieval 9. Overage 10. Prehistoric 11. Retro 12. Rusty 13. Senescent 14. Senile 15. Senior 16. Superannuated	Старый	1. пожилой 2. старение 3. древний 4. старушечий 5. архаичный 6. дряхлый 7. долголетний 8. средневековый 9. устарелый 10. древний 11. ретро 12. ржавый 13. застарелый 14. старческий 15. старший 16. престарелый

	17. Tottery 18. Obsolete 19. Battered 20. Staled		17. потрепанный 18. отживший 19. потрепанный 20. зачерствелый
Leader	1. Administrator 2. Archon 3. Autocrat 4. Boss 5. Captain 6. Coach 7. Chairman 8. Chief 9. Chieftain 10. Commandant 11. Commander 12. Commanding officer 13. Commissioner 14. Conductor 15. Dean 16. Demagogue 17. Director 18. Dictator	Лидер	1. администратор 2. архонт 3. деспот 4. шеф 5. капитан 6. тренер 7. председатель 8. правитель 9. вождь 10. командир 11. начальник 12. военный начальник 13. комиссар 14. кондуктор 15. декан 16. демагог 17. директор 18. диктатор

19. Doyen	19.старейшина
20. Figurehead	20.глава
21. General	21.полководец
22. Generalissimo	22.генералиссимус
23. Governor	23.управленец
24. Guide	24.гид
25. Headman	25.руководитель
26. Manager	26.менеджер
27. Master	27.хозяин
28. Mentor	28.наставник
29. Minister	29.министер
30. Moderator	30. арбитр
31. Officer	31. офицер
32. Potentate	32.властелин
33. President	33.президент
34. Principal	34.патрон
35. Prolocutor	35.председатель
36. Rector	36.ректор
37. Ringleader	37.главарь
38. Ruler	38.владыка
39. Shepherd	39.пастух
40. Skipper	40.шкипер

	<p>41. Spearhead</p> <p>42. Standard-bearer</p> <p>43. Superintendent</p> <p>44. Supervisor</p> <p>45. Tyrant</p> <p>46. Conductor</p>		<p>41.---</p> <p>42.знаменосец</p> <p>43.глава</p> <p>44.надзиратель</p> <p>45.тиран</p> <p>46.дирижер</p>
Different	<p>1. Alternate</p> <p>2. Alternative</p> <p>3. Assorted</p> <p>4. Differing</p> <p>5. Discernible</p> <p>6. Discrete</p> <p>7. Disparate</p> <p>8. Dissimilar</p> <p>9. Distant</p> <p>10. Distinct</p> <p>11. Divergent</p> <p>12. Divers</p> <p>13. Diverse</p> <p>14. Eclectic</p> <p>15. Heterogeneous</p> <p>16. Idiosyncratic</p>	Различный	<p>1.вариант</p> <p>2.альтернатива</p> <p>3.разнородный</p> <p>4.отличающийся</p> <p>5.различимый</p> <p>6.---</p> <p>7.другой</p> <p>8.различающиеся</p> <p>9.дальний</p> <p>10.отдельный</p> <p>11.расходящийся</p> <p>12.разный</p> <p>13.неодинаковый</p> <p>14.электичный</p> <p>15.неодродный</p> <p>16.разнотипный</p>

	17. Indiscriminate 18. Individual 19. Manifold 20. Miscellaneous 21. Mixed 22. Motley 23. Multifarious 24. Particular 25. Peculiar 26. Piebald 27. Promiscuous 28. Separate 29. Variant 30. Varied		17.разноликий 18.индивидуальный 19.разнообразный 20.смешанный 21.перемешанный 22.разноцветный 23.разный 24.специфический 25.необычный 26.различествующий 27.всякий 28.отдельный 29.вариант 30.разнообразный
Old-Fashioned	1. Antiquated 2. Dated 3. Démodé 4. Demoded 5. Elderly 6. Fossilized 7. Geriatric 8. Kaput	Старомодный	1.несовременный 2.устарелый 3.допотопный 4.устарелый 5.устаревший 6.отживший 7.гериатрический 8.уничтоженный

	9. Neolithic 10. Obsolete 11. Outmoded 12. Outworn 13. Quaint 14. Retrograde		9.неолитический 10.--- 11.--- 12.изношенный 13. чудной 14. ---
Freedom-loving	1.Fond of liberty	Свободолюбивый	1.вольнoлюбивый

Having analyzed several works we came to such a conclusion that both languages have syntactic synonyms. And they are generally identified on the basis of three main criteria:

- 1) similarity or identity of meaning
- 2) formal characteristics
- 3) functional interchangeability of synonyms

Similarity of meaning:

- ✓ initial definitions focused on grammatical meaning
 - grammatical synonyms - forms “showing full grammatical parallelism and differing only in the elements expressing the given grammatical meaning”
- ✓ denotational meaning
 - “homogeneous relations and connections of real-life phenomena”
 - conceptual similarity of sentences and their parts; this depends on the degree to which certain extra linguistic events can serve as indicators of time, cause, condition, etc. of other events and situations.

Complex relationships that extra linguistic phenomena establish are reflected by complex signification.

The meaning of syntactic structures - defined in terms of a 'proposition' and its structural-semantic organization as explained on the basis of predicate-argument approach, each argument characterized by a semantic role in relation to the predicate.

The notion of synonymy in the language is derived from lexicology, where this linguistic phenomenon was studied in detail. However, recently this term has been used in phonetics, grammar and syntax. Though, the term *syntactic synonymy* was accepted in linguistic literature, it is interpreted differently.

The investigations were made in the works of such scholars as E.I. Shendels, E.M. Galkina, Fedoruk, G.I. Richter, A.I. Gvozde, I.M. Kovtunova, V.P. Suchotin, V.N. Yartseva and others. Summing up the definitions and view points, it is reasonable to agree with the definition of I.M. Zhilin: "*Syntactic synonyms are the models of such syntactic constructions (sentences, constructions, word-combinations), which have identical or close semantic meaning, possess adequate grammatical meaning, express similar syntactic relations, and are able in certain conditions of the text to replace each other*". [37, 68-69]

Syntactic constructions:

✓ active and passive constructions if the same arguments are present

1. "Who was it that invented religion, and sin and all that? And why?"

John laughed. "It was invented by Adam" he said...

Adam invented it...

Active construction with the subject expressed by an indefinite pronoun (they, you, one) and the corresponding passive construction without a prepositional object.

2. "They tell me there's a man called Freud, an Austrian I believe-"

I'm told there's a man....

3. One never does anything if one does not try.

Nothing is ever done...

4. If you wake a man up, he can't go to sleep again because he is told to.

If a man is woken, he can't go to sleep again because he is told to/ because you tell him to.

Active and passive constructions cannot be considered synonymous if the agent is lost in the passive however clearly it may be identified in the immediate linguistic context.

5. "I tried to tell them, and my father gave me my first thrashing for telling lies... Then everyone was forbidden to listen to me... My father belonged to the old school."

- sentences with and without introducers *it* and *there*

6. There is a good film on tonight.

A good film is on tonight.

7. It's her damned virtue that caused the whole trouble.

Her damned virtue caused the whole trouble.

'it + to be + noun + relative clause' it introduces direct or indirect object, adverbials of time, place, etc

Complex or compound sentences and corresponding to simple sentences containing nominalized propositional constructions.

The relationship of synonymy holds between complex sentences and simple sentences containing non-finite clauses on the grounds that they both:

- ✓ have polipropositional structure as they refer to (nominate) two or more extra linguistic events;
- ✓ convey temporal, causal, conditional, etc. relations between the events of objective reality;
- ✓ may be considered as syntactic variants of the same semantic invariant.

Simple sentences containing non-finite clauses can be viewed as a marked member of the opposition whereas complex (or compound) sentence is unmarked.

Synonymy of polipropositional constructions:

1. A simple sentence with direct word order and similar sentence with an inverted subject (infinitive or gerund) replaced by expletive *it*:

8. Refusing invitations is not always easy.

It is not always easy to refuse invitations

2. Complex sentence with a subjective clause and a simple sentence when its subject is expressed by gerundial phrase, accusative + infinitive or accusative + participle

9. *His coming here is really desirable.*

It is really desirable that he (should) come.

3. Complex sentence with an objective subordinate clause and simple sentence when its object is expressed by expanded form of infinitive or gerund, for-to infinitive, gerundial phrase, accusative + infinitive or accusative + participle

10. I felt somebody touch my shoulder.

I felt that somebody had touched/was touching my shoulder.

4. Complex sentence with a relative (attributive) clause and a simple sentence when its attribute is expressed by infinitive (after the words *thefirst, the last, the only*, etc and some superlatives), of + gerund or the participle, often postpositional

11. The captain was the last man to leave the ship.

The captain was the last man who left the ship.

5. Complex sentence with an adverbial subordinate clause and a simple sentence when its adverbial modifier is expressed by infinitive or for-to infinitive construction, gerund or its expanded form, present or past participle, absolute participle construction

12. I had to bite my lips in order not to laugh.

I had to bite my lips so that I wouldn't laugh.

6. Main clause of a complex sentence or one of the clauses of a compound sentence is synonymous with a participle functioning as an adverbial modifier of a simple sentence

13. Opening the drawer he took out a revolver.

- *He opened the drawer and took out a revolver.*

synonymy between simple sentences with direct and inverted word order

Inversion may be caused by adverbs and prepositional phrases

- 14. Along this cool avenue my girlfriend led me.
- *My girlfriend led me along this cool avenue.*

inversion of the subject when the sentence initial position is taken by predicate, object, participle construction, part of the compound nominal predicate

- 15. Playmates I found there...

I found playmates there

Conclusion

When you have a good level of English and are able to communicate in different situations, you start to face a new challenge: increasing your vocabulary. One of the best way to do this is to learn synonyms for words you already know. A synonym is a different word that means the same thing. For example, you probably know the adjective fast. Quick and rapid are synonyms for fast. If you already know fast, why do you need to know other words that mean the same thing? For three reasons: 1. to be able to understand what you hear and read, 2. so you don't have to use the same words all the time, and 3. because it's fun. Maybe the first reason is the

most important for you, but I would recommend thinking about the second and third as well. Learning synonyms is a great way to rapidly increase your English fluency. A good way to learn synonyms is to use a thesaurus.

So, the conclusion is that some words of a language don't lend themselves well to the analysis in terms of semantic fields. Other important idea is the difficulty of finding finite sets of words. In any case, there's an internal contradiction between the ideas of a set with the structuring of words of a language. A set is a close set. A word can belong to several fields depending on the organizing concept. Speakers of the language clearly identify the central example but not the peripheral ones. This doesn't mean that it would never happen that. The degree of flexibility in the discrepancy of the categorization of words is smaller.

Ex: Please give me some more tables ('Table' is here a mass noun meaning 'space in a table').

E.G. Two races are grown in India. Here two races' refers to 'two types of rice'

The idea behind this is that the dynamic character of a vocabulary cannot be reflected in the static character of the semantic fields, which are a static way of organizing the vocabulary of a language.

Having analyzed the problem of synonymy in Modern English we could do the following conclusions:

- a) The problem of synonymy in Modern English is very actual nowadays.
- b) There are several kinds of analysis of synonyms: semantical, stylistic and componential.
- c) A number of famous linguists dealt with the problem of synonymy in Modern English. In particular, Profs. Ullmann and Broal emphasized the social reasons for synonymy, L. Lipka pointed out non-binary contrast or many-member lexical sets and gave the type which he called directional opposition, V.N. Comissarov and Walter Skeat proved the link of synonymy with other kinds of lexical devices.
- d) There are several classification systems for synonyms which were established by different scientists, such as: Academician V.V Vinogradov, the famous Russian scholar or Russian philologist A.I. Smirnitsky. In Vinogradov's classification

system there are three types of synonyms: ideographic (which he defined as words conveying the same concept but differing in shades of meaning), stylistic (differing in stylistic characteristics) and absolute (coinciding in all their shades of meaning and in all their stylistic characteristics). However, the following aspects of his classification system are open to question. Firstly, absolute synonyms are rare in the vocabulary and, on the diachronic level; as to professor G. M. Hoshimov: “*the phenomenon of absolute synonymy is anomalous and the vocabulary system invariably tends to abolish it either by rejecting one of the absolute synonyms or by developing differentiation characteristics in one or both (or all) of them*”. Therefore, it does not seem necessary to include absolute synonyms, which are a temporary exception, in the system of classification.

e) In both languages lexical synonyms have to do with bound morphemes, lexemes, lexical units and phrases in both languages. Lexical synonymy is a sense relation that holds between two or more lexical units with the same sense in the given contexts in which they are interchangeable, e. g. *to finish – to complete – to conclude; завершать–заканчивать–кончать*. There are also phraseological synonyms in both languages, these words are identical in their meanings and styles but different in their combining with other words in the sentence, e.g. *to be late for a lecture– опоздать на урок but to miss the train–пропустить поезд, to visit museums–посетить музей but to attend lectures–присутствовать на лекциях* etc.

f) The problem of synonymy is still waits for its detail investigation.

Having said about the perspectives of the work we hope that this work will find its worthy way of applying at schools, lyceums and colleges of high education by both teachers and students of English. We also express our hopes to take this work its worthy place among the lexicological works dedicated to synonymy.

List of used literature

1. Каримов И. А. Постановление о совершенствовании системы обучения английскому языку Народное Слово 11 декабря 2012 г. № 240
2. <http://uza.uz/en/politics/shavkat-mirziyoyev-youth-education-is-one-of-the-most-import-16-06-2017>
3. Abayev V.I. Synonyms and their Semantical Features Т. О'qituvchi 1981 pp. 4-5, 8, 26-29
4. Bloomsbury Dictionary of New Words. М. 1996 стр.276-278
5. Dubenets E.M. Modern English Lexicology (Course of Lectures)

6. Hornby The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. Lnd. 1974
стр.92-93, 111
7. Internet: http://www.mpsttu.ru/works/english_philology/ Э. М. Дубенец.
Курс лекций и планы семинарских занятий по лексикологии
английского языка.htm
8. Internet: <http://www.wikipedia.com/English/articles/synonyms.htm>
9. Internet:[http://www.freeessays.com/english/E.Cruse Quantitative and
Qualitative synonyms.htm](http://www.freeessays.com/english/E.Cruse_Quantitative_and_Qualitative_synonyms.htm)
- 10.Smirnitsky A.I. Synonyms in English M.1977 pp.57-59,89-90
- 11.Антрушина Г.Б., Афанасьева О.В., Морозова Н.Н. Лексикология англ.
языка. М: Высшая школа 1985.
- 12.Апресян Ю. Д. Фразеологические синонимы типа " глагол-
существительное "в современном английском языке/ дис...кан. фил. н.-
М., 1956.
- 13.Апресян Ю.Д.Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства
языка. М.1974.
- 14.Аракин В. Д. Сравнительная типология английского и русского языков.
Учебное пособие. 3-е изд. М.: Физматлит, 2005.
- 15.Баранникова Т. Б. Стилистические синонимы/ дис...док фил. н.- М.,
1989.
- 16.Бондоренко А. В. Грамматическое значение и смысл. Л., 1978.
- 17.Булыгина Т. В. Грамматические и семантические категории и их связи.
М: Наука, 2002.
- 18.Буранов К., Назаров Т.Узбекистан – на пути прогресса. Т: Узбекистан,
2001.
- 19.Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. М.
1975.
- 20.Ворно Е.Ф., Кошечева М.А., Малышевская Е.В., Потапова
И.А.Лексикология английского языка. Ленинград. 1955.

21. Дубенец Э. М. Курс лекций и планы семинарских занятий по лексикологии английского языка. 2008.
22. Дудник А. А. Semantic structure of the word in modern English. Вестник КАСУ № 2, 2007.
23. Зализняк А. А. Словоформа // Русский язык: Энциклопедия. М., 1979.
24. Карцевский С. О. Об асимметричном дуализме лингвистических знаков // Звегинцев В. А. История языкознания XIX-XX вв. в очерках и извлечениях. Т. 2. М., 1965.
25. Кубрякова Е. С. Семантика производного слова // Аспекты семантических исследований. М., 1980.
26. Трофимова З. С. Dictionary of New Words and New Meanings. Изд. 'Павлин', 1993. стр. 48