

**MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIALIZED
EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN**

**NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF UZBEKISTAN
NAMED AFTER MIRZO ULUGBEK**

**FACULTY OF FOREIGN PHILOLOGY
DEPARTMENT OF
THEORY OF TRANSLATION AND COMPARATIVE
LINGUISTICS**

All rights reserved

УДК 80/81.811.111+891.322(575.1)

Dadajanova Aziza Karimullayevna

**COGNITIVE SYNONYMS AND THE PROBLEMS OF THEIR
TRANSLATION**

(ON THE MATERIAL OF THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES)

5A120201 – Theory and practice of translation

DISSERTATION

Written to get academic degree of Master

Scientific adviser: Ph.D., Ass. prof. J. Sh. Djumabaeva

TASHKENT 2015

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3-7
CHAPTER I. COGNITIVE SYNONYMY: A GENERAL OVERVIEW.....	8-30
1.1. Cognitive synonymy on the scale of synonymyty.....	8-16
1.2. The scale of synonymity	16-20
1.3. Cognitive and contextual synonymy.....	20-28
Conclusion of the chapter I	28-30
CHAPTER II . SYNONYMS IN LANGUAGE.....	31-52
2.1. Function of synonymy in language.....	31-44
2.2. Truth-conditional equivalence and mutual entailment.....	44-51
Conclusion of the chapter II.....	51-52
CHAPTER III. SYNONYMS IN LITERATURE AND THEIR TRANSLATION.....	53-95
3.1. Function of synonymy in language.....	53-73
3.2. Synonyms in Uzbek literature and their translation.....	73-84
Conclusion of the chapter III.....	85-86
CONCLUSION.....	87-90
THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE	91-95

Introduction

Translation is the communication of the meaning of a source-language text by means of an equivalent target-language text. Translation is one of the ancient actions of people. Whereas interpreting undoubtedly antedates writing, translation began only after the appearance of written literature; there exist partial translations of the Sumerian Epic of Gilgamesh (ca. 2000 BCE) into Southwest Asian languages of the second millennium BCE. Appearing the written translation gave a chance to know about other nation's cultural life. People have been able to share the experiences and emotions expressed in foreign works.

After the achievement of our Independence the attention is increasing especially to the learning of one language. Under the guidance of President Islam Karimov a special attention is paid to formation of harmoniously developed, highly education, modern thinking generation, able to take responsibility for the fate of the Homeland. On December 10, 2012 President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov signed a decree "On measures to further improve foreign language learning system". It's note that in the framework of the Law of the republic of Uzbekistan "on education" and the National Program for Training in the country, a comprehensive foreign languages" teaching system, aimed or creating harmoniously developed, highly educated, modern thinking young generation, further integration of the country to the world community, has been created. Therefore, the President of Republic Uzbekistan I.A.Karimov has noted, that « especially the great value gets a question on our youth aspires to what values, that it agitates, than it lives »¹, also it is necessary to remember, and that «XXI century is a century over which the intellectual abundance predominates. And that state which has not realized it inevitably remains behind frameworks of world progress » . As progress of a

¹ Каримов И.А. Обеспечение приоритета интересов человека – главная цель всех проводимых реформ и преобразований // По пути модернизации страны и устойчивого развития экономики. - Т.16 – Т.: «Узбекистан», 2008. – 206 с.

mental potential « solitarily influences mood in a society when such human features peculiar since olden days to the Uzbek people as mutual understanding and mutual tolerance »¹ are to the fullest shown.

This study investigates the notion of cognitive synonyms in literary works in Uzbek-English and English-Uzbek translation. In order to highlight the problem under discussion, the research explores the translation of some cognitive lexical items in their original context of use.

The present study argues that cognitive synonyms are harder to translate than any other lexical items due to some subtle differences that exist between cognitive synonyms. Synonyms are used to convey certain implications. Differences in meaning or use among pairs of synonyms are claimed to be context-dependent. The context is the only criterion for selecting appropriate words. There are many occasions when one word is appropriate in a sentence, but its synonyms will be odd.

In literary texts where synonyms are used to convey certain implications, translators can provide formal, functional or ideational equivalence. The researcher discusses also word-strings involving two cognitive synonyms or more, identifying their functions, and pinpointing the obstacles of this phenomenon for translation.

Throughout the centuries grave doubts have been raised over the feasibility of the translations of literary works. Some translation theorists still express their doubts and mention that only a poet or writer translates a poet. Frequently, it has been maintained that it is not possible for anyone to convey from one language into another the thoughts, emotions, style and form of literary works. Yet the fact remains that the art of translation has been made practical everywhere in the world. Through this art many of the literary achievements of

¹ Каримов И.А. Обеспечение приоритета интересов человека – главная цель всех проводимых реформ и преобразований // По пути модернизации страны и устойчивого развития экономики. - Т.16 – Т.: «Узбекистан», 2008. – 206 с.

one country have found a hearing in other countries. People have been able to share the experiences and emotions expressed in foreign works.

Once literary translators agree to take the risk of translating a certain literary text, they have to face the ordeal and accept the challenge. They have to reproduce the style of the original, as closely as they can, not only mimicking the original, but also conveying the message by finding an equivalent for the original text in the Target Language (TL). They have to collect all their previous knowledge about the writer or the speaker, the Source Language (SL) culture, the TL norms and the personality of the translatee; and they have to understand the source text in order to reproduce its same effect.

Topicality of the dissertation. This research work examines the role and some features of the synonymy and cognitive synonymy. Many linguistic researches devoted to the study of this problem, the features of cognitive synonymy in context. In our work, we attempted to explore ways to give synonymic words in English and Uzbek texts. At the same time exists translation problem of cognitive synonyms, which influences the main plot of the text. Thus, we can prove that this problem has to be solved and it requires thorough research of the problem for those who want to brush up their cognitive synonyms in both languages.

The object of the research is the phenomenon of synonymy in English and Uzbek texts.

The subject of the research is definite features of cognitive synonymy in a literary text in compared languages and ways of translation of cognitive synonyms.

The aim of the research is to reveal the role of synonymy, the features of cognitive synonymy and its impact on the colorfulness of the text.

Tasks of the research:

- to study, analyze, and sum up all the possible changes happened in the studied branch of linguistics for the past fifty years;
- to study cognitive synonyms in the translation of poems;

- investigating the renditions of some cognitive synonyms in Uzbek, English texts;
- to teach the problem of synonymy to young English learners.
- to demonstrate the significance English.
- to mention all the major of linguists' opinions concerning the subject studied.

Level of study of the research work. Currently a special place in the linguistics of text emphasis on studying the artistic text units constituting it, including cognitive synonymy. Synonymy is the focus of many works linguistics such as Prof. J.Buranov, A.Muminov, D.A.Cruse, M.Farghal, H. Jackson, J. Lyons, F.R.Palmer, S.Ullmann, M.L.Murphy, V.A. Kuharenko, I.M. Voznesenskaya, Y.B.Kurasovskaya, G.I.Lushnikova, O.A. Nechaeva, V.N.Ryabova, N. V. Sityanina and etc.

Novelty of the research work.

- It was analyzed most possible changes happened in the studied branch of linguistics.
- Cognitive synonyms in translation were studied.
- It was found out some mistakes of translating cognitive synonyms in poetry.
- Cognitive synonyms in Uzbek poems and their translation were analyzed.
- Translating some cognitive synonyms from English belles-lettres text into Uzbek were analyzed.

The materials of the research. Chulpan's poem "Men va boshqalar", Translation "Me and others" was done by Begoyim Xolbekova; Oybek's poem "Na'matak", translation was done by Begoyim Xolbekova; "The ant and grasshopper" by William Somerset Maugham. The translator of the fables is Abror Rakhimov.

The methods of the research. Structural and component analysis, semantic analyses were the main methods in defining main characteristics of cognitive synonyms.

Theoretical value. Many scientists in different foreign languages improved the theory of translation. But not all of them pay attention to the rendition of cognitive synonyms in translation. In this research many books, scientific articles on the phenomenon of synonymy were analyzed. So, the approaches suggested in this work bring certain theoretical value to the theory of translation. Results of this work can be used in writing textbooks on “Theory and practice of translation”, and in writing scientific articles.

The practical value of the results of research is the ability to use the results in the courses of lexicology, stylistics and interpretation of the text, in practical classes of the linguistic analysis of the text.

The structure of the work. The research consists of an introduction, three chapters, conclusion and the list of used literature.

The results of the dissertation were published in two articles:

Таржимада синонимлар ва когнитив синонимларнинг узатилиши
//Филология масалалари ёшлар талкинида.-Тошкент.,2014.64-66-б.

Types of synonyms in English //Тилшунослик. Адабиётшунослик.
Таржимашунослик.-Тошкент.,2015.48-50-б.

CHAPTER I. COGNITIVE SYNONYMY: A GENERAL OVERVIEW

1.1. Cognitive synonymy on the scale of synonymy

When it comes to giving a clear, precise and correct definition of synonymy, many difficulties arise. There are numerous approaches with numerous definitions of synonymy and types of synonyms, because there are different ways in which synonyms may differ.

Generally speaking, synonymy denotes the phenomenon of two or more different linguistic forms with the same meaning. Those linguistic forms are called synonyms, e.g. *peace* and *tranquility* can be substituted with one another in certain contexts.

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, or into lexical, phrasal and propositional synonymy. The first division, in which lexical synonymy comprises phrasal synonymy can be explained in the following manner.

Lexical synonymy has to do with bound morphemes, lexemes, lexical units and phrases. 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.

Propositional synonymy has to do with clauses, sentences and propositions. It can be explained by means of paraphrase when the propositional contents of sentences are identical:

Mary fed the cat.

The cat was fed by Mary.

It was the cat that Mary fed¹.

¹ Cann R., Kempson R. Gregoromichelaki E. *Semantics: An Introduction to Meaning in Language*.- Cambridge: CUP, 2009.-p.9

Synonymy is a paradigmatic relation that enables lexically simple units to have the same meaning as lexically complex units, and vice versa, e.g. *ophthalmologist* and *eye specialist*.

In addition, the research work deals with words that belong to the same word class, even though J. Hurford and B. Heasley¹ claim that synonymy is possible between words belonging to different parts of speech (as between the verb *sleeping* and adjective *asleep*).

D. Cruse² 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.

Absolute synonymy is set as the complete identity of all meanings of two or more lexemes in all contexts. However, it is unnatural for a language to have absolute synonyms, or lexemes with exactly the same meaning. Firstly, the function or use of one of them would gradually become unnecessary or unmotivated and, as a result, it would soon be abandoned or dropped. Secondly, their interchangeability in all the contexts can neither be demonstrated nor proved, for, on one hand, the number of contexts is infinite, and, on the other hand, the exceptions from absolute interchangeability are inevitable. Therefore, the lexicons of natural languages do not have absolute synonymy as their feature. It is generally accepted that absolute synonymy is impossible or non-existent. It is regarded only as a referential point on the alleged scale of synonymity or the initial criterion for the defining of synonymy. 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. J. Lyons³ 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. Near-synonyms are lexemes whose meaning is relatively close or more

¹ Hurford J. R., Heasley B. *Semantics: A Coursebook*.- Cambridge: CUP.1983.- p.104.

² Cruse D. A. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*.-Oxford:OUP.2000.-p.157.

³ Lyons J. *Linguistic Semantics*.- Cambridge ;CUP.1996.p.63.

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.

Moreover, unlike cognitive synonyms, near-synonyms can contrast in certain contexts:

*He was killed, but I can assure you he was NOT murdered, madam.*¹

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 D.A. Cruse is the most general. There also are other views. J. 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.

Since most lexemes are polysemous (have different senses in different contexts), M.L. Murphy² 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. D.A. 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

¹ Cruse D. A. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*.-Oxford: OUP.2000.-p.159.

² Murphy M. L. *Semantic Relations and the Lexicon*.-Cambridge: OUP.2003.-p. 146.

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.

Cognitive synonymy is the identity of cognitive (descriptive) meaning and it is also known as descriptive synonymy, propositional synonymy or referential synonymy. Cognitive synonymy is sometimes described as incomplete synonymy, or non-absolute or partial synonymy¹. The examples of cognitive synonyms are:

Liberty / freedom, statesman/politician, hide/conceal, thrifty/economical/stingy.

There are two definitions of cognitive synonymy and both of them should be equally taken into account.

Cognitive synonyms imply sentences with equivalent truth-conditions and propositions which are mutually entailing. This is a semantic or logical definition of synonymy. It is presented by R. Kempson and F.R. Palmer². Palmer describes synonymy as symmetrical hyponymy³.

Cognitive synonyms are described as words with the same cognitive meaning J.Lyons⁴, and as words with the same sense. Therefore, cognitive synonymy is regarded as a sense relation. Moreover, this type of synonymy is concerned with sameness or identity, not similarity of meaning. This is a pragmatic or context-dependent understanding of synonymy and it is the view presented by M.L. Murphy. Most writers in cognitive linguistics accept both definitions, e.g. D.A. Cruse. As synonymy is considered to be sameness of meaning of different expressions, it is vital, before continuing with the theory of synonyms, to clarify the 'sameness' involved and the 'meaning' involved.

Harris believes that there are at least four different kinds of 'sameness':

¹ Lyons J. Linguistic Semantics.- Cambridge ;CUP.1996.

² Murphy M. L. Semantic Relations and the Lexicon.-Cambridge:CUP.2003.-p. 150.

³ Palmer F. R. Semantics: A New Outline.-Cambridge: CUP.1981.

⁴ Lyons J. Linguistic Semantics.- Cambridge ;CUP.1996.-p.63.

- a) ‘type-1 sameness’ – the word ‘same’ is used “in connexion with various parts of the history of one continuous thing”, for example, it does not matter what position the chair is moved to it is still regarded as ‘the same chair’
- b) ‘type-2 sameness’ – there are “two or more instances of non-continuous things, as when we talk about ‘the same dance step’ or ‘the same experiment’, alluding to a repetition of previous actions”
- c) ‘type-3 sameness’ – two or more coexistent copies of one thing are recognized the same, e.g. ‘the same newspaper’
- d) ‘type-4 sameness’ – “at least two continuous things are the same in a given respect”, for example, when someone is told to have ‘the same eyes’ as their father

R. Harris¹ concludes his discourse on ‘sameness’ by claiming that if two expressions have the same meaning, then they are the same according to the ‘type-4 sameness’.

In one of his works John Lyons asserts that “the noun ‘meaning’ and the verb ‘to mean’ themselves have many distinguishable meanings”², i.e. it is possible to find several different types of meaning. The explanation of the term ‘meaning’ has been of great concern not only to linguists but also to philosophers, psychologists and anthropologists, and there is no doubt that linguists’ point of view was heavily influenced by all the three disciplines. I will give an account of the types of meaning some semanticists distinguish and will answer the question of what type of meaning synonyms have in common.

G.N. Leech³ breaks down the meaning into seven different ingredients:

- 1) ‘conceptual’ meaning (sometimes called ‘denotative’ or ‘cognitive’ meaning) is assumed to be the basic meaning of a word and the central factor in linguistic communication. It organized in agreement with two

¹ Harris R. (1973) *Synonymy and Linguistic Analysis*.-Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.

² Lyons J. *Semantics*.- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.-p.1.

³ Leech G. N. *Semantics*.- Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1981.-p.9.

structural principles, which form the basis of all-linguistic patterning: the principle of contrastiveness (whether the meaning of a word possesses or not certain features) and the principle of structure (according to which larger linguistic units are built up out of smaller units).

2) ‘connotative’ meaning- is the communicative value an expression has by virtue of what it refers to, over and above its purely conceptual content”. Since connotations vary considerably according to culture, historical period and the experience of the individual, the connotative meaning is regarded as peripheral compared with conceptual meaning.

3) ‘social’ meaning- is that which a piece of language conveys about the social circumstances of its use”. A reader is able to understand the social meaning of a text through his or her recognition of different dimensions and levels of style within the same language. There are to be found several dimensions of socio-stylistic variation, for example: variation according to dialect (e.g. the language of geographical region or social class), time (e.g. the language of the eighteenth century), province (e.g. the language of law), status (e.g. polite, colloquial, slang language), modality (e.g. the language of memoranda) and singularity (e.g. the style of Ch. Dickens).

4) ‘affective’ meaning

Language reflects personal feelings and speaker’s attitudes. G.N. Leech considers affective meaning to be a parasitic category because it is mainly through the conceptual and connotative content of the words used that this meaning can be communicated.

5) ‘reflected’ meaning- is the meaning which arises in cases of multiple conceptual meaning, when one sense of a word forms part of our response to another sense”. G.N. Leech illustrates this point by synonymous expressions *The Comforter* – *The Holy Ghost* and says that “*The Comforter* sounds warm and comforting, while *The Holy Ghost* sounds awesome”.

- 6) ‘collocative’ meaning- a word acquires through the associations with words which tend to occur in its environment is called collocative meaning. The adjective *hard*, for example, collocates with *currency*, *copy* and *disc* while the adjective *difficult* form collocations with *behaviour*, *issue* and *position*.
- 7) ‘thematic’ meaning- is determined by the way a speaker or writer organizes the message. This type of meaning is connected with functional sentence perspective. Thus, it is possible to state the difference between an active sentence and its passive equivalent.

Moreover, G.N. Leech introduces the term ‘associative’ meaning that brings together the types of meaning with open-ended, variable character, which can be analysed in terms of scales and ranges: connotative, social, affective, reflected and collocative meaning. Finally, he claims “that whereas conceptual meaning is substantially part of the ‘common system’ of language shared by members of a speech community, associative meaning is less stable, and varies with the individual’s experience” .

Other authors use a different classification of meaning. Although J. Hladký and M. Růžicka adopted G.N. Leech’s classification in their study, they do not use the term ‘social meaning’ but employ ‘stylistic meaning’ instead¹ .

J. Lyons draws a distinction between ‘descriptive’ (or ‘propositional’) and ‘non-descriptive’ (or ‘non-propositional’) meaning². He claims that descriptive meaning (its alternative terms are ‘cognitive’ or ‘referential’) is the meaning carried by descriptive statements, which are true or false according to whether the propositions that they express are true or false. Non-descriptive meaning (its equivalent terms are ‘affective’, ‘attitudinal’ and ‘emotive’) is more heterogeneous and includes an ‘expressive’ component. Furthermore, he talks about ‘lexical’ and ‘grammatical’ meaning: “Different forms of the same lexeme will generally, though not necessarily, differ in meaning: they will share the

¹ Leech G. N. *Semantics*.- Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1981.-p.20

² Lyons J. *Linguistic Semantics*.- Cambridge ;CUP.1996.-p.44.

same lexical, but differ in respect of their grammatical meaning". While lexical items have both lexical and grammatical meaning, grammatical items contain only grammatical meaning, which is of three kinds: a) morphological meaning, b) the meaning of the minor parts of speech (e.g. subject-of), c) the meaning associated with sentence types (declarative, interrogative, imperative).

X.G. Alexander thinks that the communicative process has four distinguishable phases or senses of meaning¹. These are:

- 1) 'intentional' meaning – it is the meaning which is in the mind of the speaker when he is framing his message
- 2) 'content' meaning – it is the meaning of the message that the speaker intends to convey, and is further subdivided into 'conceptual', 'emotive' and 'active' meaning
- 3) 'significative' meaning – it is the meaning of the signs and symbols (including language) that the speaker or writer uses
- 4) 'interpreted' meaning – it is the meaning which is conveyed to the mind of the listener when he receives the message

According to G.N.Leech², hardly any words have both the same conceptual and the same stylistic meaning. This observation has frequently led linguists to declare that true synonyms do not exist. If synonymy is seen as complete equivalence of communicative effect, it is difficult to find an example that could disprove this statement. It is, therefore, necessary to restrict the term 'synonymy' to equivalence of one of the meanings mentioned. Since conceptual (cognitive) meaning is defined as the focal centre of understanding, many semanticists have based the criterion for selecting synonyms upon it.

J. Lyons³ mentions two kinds of synonymy: 'cognitive' (later he introduces the term 'descriptive synonymy' for this type of synonymy) and 'non-cognitive', and claims that the distinction between them is drawn in various ways by

¹ Alexander H. G. *Meaning in Language*. Glenview: Scott, Foreman & Comp, 1969.

² Leech G. N. *Semantics*.- Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1981.-p.14.

³ Lyons J. *Linguistic Semantics*.- Cambridge :CUP.1996.-p.49.

different authors. Nevertheless, “in all cases it is cognitive synonymy which is defined the first (and) no one ever talks of words as being emotively but not cognitively synonymous”.

1.2. The scale of synonymy

It is often suggested that synonymy is a matter of degree. D.A. Cruse confirms this statement by saying that: “Within the class of synonyms some pairs of items are more synonymous than others, and this raises the possibility of a scale of synonymy of some kind”¹. Since complete equivalence of meaning, i.e. ‘absolute synonymy’, can be established with clarity, he chooses it as the zero point on the scale. The notion of ‘zero synonymy’, on the other hand, is not a unitary concept. D.A. Cruse gives examples of the pairs *long – short* and *green – expensive* which are both regarded as examples of zero synonymy but for different reasons. If the zero point on D.A. Cruse’s scale is absolute synonymy, then the first point is occupied by ‘cognitive synonymy’, and the notion of ‘plesionymy’ occurs on the second point.

According to D.A. Cruse², absolute synonyms are those lexical items that do not differ in respect of register or dialect, have the same expressive meaning and do not differ collocationally. It is, however, difficult for lexical items to comply with all the three conditions and thus it is not sure whether absolute synonyms exist at all. To be cognitive synonyms, a pair of lexical items must share certain semantic properties. D.A. Cruse defines cognitive synonymy as follows:

“X is a cognitive synonym of Y if:

- i. X and Y are syntactically identical, and
- ii. any grammatical declarative sentence S containing X has equivalent truth-conditions to another sentence S1, which is identical to S except that X is replaced by Y”, for example, *fiddle* and *violin* in *He plays the___ very well*.

¹ Cruse D. A. *Lexical Semantics*.- Cambridge: CUP.1985. -P 267-268.

²Cruse D. A. *Lexical Semantics*.- Cambridge: CUP.1985.-p.291.

He continues specifying cognitive synonyms in terms of ‘semantic mode’, which is of two kinds: ‘propositional mode’ and ‘expressive mode’. “Propositional meaning depends partly on the propositional attitude expressed by the sentence in which it operates”, i.e. whether it is a statement, question, command or exclamation, and can determine truth-conditions. On the other hand, expressed meaning conveys some sort of emotion or attitude and is valid only for the utterer, at the time and place of utterance. Cognitive synonyms hence must be identical in respect of propositional traits, but their expressive traits may be different. “Plesionyms are distinguished from cognitive synonyms by the fact that they yield sentences with different truth-conditions”. It must be always possible to assert one member of a plesionymous pair, without paradox, while simultaneously denying the other. D.A. Cruse illustrates this fact by sentences: *It wasn’t foggy last Friday – just misty.*, *He is by no means fearless, but he’s extremely brave.*, *She isn’t pretty, but in her way she is quite handsome.* Plesionyms differ from cognitive synonyms also in that they collocate with the expressions *not exactly* and *more exactly*, and they shade slightly into non-synonymy.

J. Lyons¹ uses different terms for the points on the scale. He observes the notion of ‘absolute synonymy’ and lists three conditions which lexical items must satisfy if they are to be called absolute synonyms:

- a) all their meanings must be identical
- b) they must be synonymous in all contexts, i.e. they must have the same collocational ranges
- c) they must be semantically equivalent on all dimensions of meaning, descriptive and non-descriptive

The words whose descriptive meaning is identical are called ‘descriptive synonyms’, for example, *big* and *large* in *They live in a ___ house*. J. Lyons adds that if words share the same descriptive meaning, they almost always differ in

¹ Lyons J. *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction.* - Cambridge: CUP.1995.-p.60.

respect of the degree or nature of their expressive meaning, and thus indicates that absolute synonyms are very rare.

The other kinds of synonymy J. Lyons introduces are ‘partial synonymy’ and ‘near-synonymy’. Partial synonyms are those lexical items which meet the criterion of identity of meaning but which fail to meet the conditions of absolute synonymy. This implies that descriptive synonyms are part of the group of partial synonyms. As an example of near-synonyms, J. Lyons provides the pair *mist – fog*.

The way in which cognitive synonyms differ serves as the basis of F.R. Palmer’s division of synonyms into five groups¹:

- 1) they belong to different dialects of the language – e.g. *fall* (USA) and *autumn* (GB)
- 2) they are words used in different styles – e.g. *a nasty smell* and *an ’orrible stink*
- 3) they differ only in their emotive or evaluative meaning – e.g. *liberty* and *freedom*
- 4) they are collocationally restricted – e.g. *rancid* occurs with *bacon* or *butter* but not with *cheese*

F.R. Palmer suggests that these words may be called ‘true synonyms’ because they differ only in that they are found in different environments.

- 5) synonyms as the words that are close in meaning, or whose meanings overlap – e.g. for *mature* possible synonyms are *adult*, *ripe*, *perfect* and *due*

Those words are synonymous in a loose sense of synonymy, which is the kind of synonymy that is exploited by the dictionary maker.

A looser sense of synonymy, along with a stricter sense of synonymy, was also recognized by J. Lyons². “According to the stricter interpretation two items are synonymous if they have the same sense”. If a dictionary proposes many

¹Palmer F. R. (1986) *Semantics*.- Cambridge: CUP.1986.-P.89-91.

² Lyons J. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*.- Cambridge: CUP.1968.-p.446.

synonyms for a word, but each of them has a different ‘shade of meaning’ and could replace the particular word only in one particular context, then these words are synonymous under the looser interpretation of the notion of synonymy. Lyons demonstrates his idea with the word *nice* for which he found synonyms: *savoury, discriminative, exact, good, pleasing, fastidious* and *honourable*.

D.A. Cruse¹ based his division of cognitive synonyms upon register. According to him, register manifests three interacting dimensions of variation: ‘field’, ‘mode’ and ‘style’. Field is concerned with the topic or field of discourse, e.g. legal discourse, advertising language or cooking commentaries. Mode refers to “the manner of transmission of a linguistic message – whether, for instance, it is written, spoken, telegraphed, or whatsoever”. The third dimension of register is style, which refers to language characteristics that indicate different relations between the participants in a linguistic exchange, for example, formal – informal dimension. D.A. Cruse emphasizes the importance of style because it is the producer of the greatest number of cognitive synonyms.

D. Bolinger asserts that “the measure of synonymy is replaceability”². Two lexical items may have many characteristics in common; however, they are not synonyms unless one can be used instead of the other. F.R. Palmer³ confirms this rule and adds that as there are not true synonyms, which would be interchangeable in all their environments, this ‘test by substitution’ must be applied to the words which are interchangeable in certain contexts only. This can be exemplified by the adjectives *difficult* and *hard* that can be both used with *times* but only *hard* with *drugs*. In addition, F.R. Palmer offers another possibility for investigation of synonymy. If two words are to be called synonyms, it is necessary that they have the same opposites, i.e. antonyms. This time again, they have to be taken from the same environment, for instance, it is

³ Cruse D. A. *Lexical Semantics*.- Cambridge: CUP.1985.-p.283.

³ Bolinger D. and Sears D. A. *Aspects of Language*.- New York: Harcourt, Brace & World,1968.-p.123.

³ Palmer F. R. *Semantics*.-Cambridge: CUP.1986.-p.91.

precisely the context in which *hard* and *difficult* are interchangeable that they have the antonym *easy*.

1.3. Cognitive and contextual synonymy

One of the important fields in linguistic studies is the area of sense relations (semantic relations). Sense relations include the relations of sameness and oppositeness of meaning. Lexical items fall into three major relations: paradigmatic, syntagmatic and paronymic¹. According to D. Cruse and F. Palmer², the paradigmatic relations are those into which a linguistic unit enters through being contrasted or substitutable, in a particular environment, with other similar units, e.g., the student and the boy in:

- a. *The boy came from school.*
- b. *The student came from school.*

The student and *the boy* are in the subject position. They can be substitutable since they belong to the same syntactic category or slot. Therefore, a paradigmatic relation which is of crucial importance is synonymy. Syntagmatic relations have to do with collocability. Certain lexical items have a mutual expectancy of occurrence with each other³. The examples below can be used for more illustration:

- a. *Deep love,*
- b. *Profound love,*
- c. *Deep lake, and*
- d. **Profound lake.*

Deep and profound can be used with love, but only deep is used with lake. Since the present study deals with word-strings involving synonyms or collocated synonyms, then the study has to do also with syntagmatic relations. A paronymic relation has to do with two lexical items from two different syntactic

¹ Cruse D. Lexical Semantics. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.-P.55-87.

² Palmer F. R. Semantics. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.-p.67.

³ Cruse D. Lexical Semantics. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.-P.100-106.

categories but belonging to the same root as in work and worker¹. Paronymic relations will be excluded from this study.

Synonymy is a linguistic term that refers to lexical items that share the same, or similar, meanings. It falls within the domain of semantic study.

The definitions given to synonymy by semanticists are similar in one way or another. Synonyms are words that sound different but have the same or nearly the same meanings. Semanticists seem to agree that synonymy is a relation between two, or more, lexical items having the same denotations, and the more similar denotations these items share, the higher the degree of synonymity that exists between them.

This comparative/ contrastive translation study sheds light on the linguistic analysis of synonymous lexical items in texts in the light of D. Cruse's classification of English synonyms. The researcher will adapt D. Cruse's ideas as a theoretical framework for the purpose of his comparative/ contrastive translation analysis of cognitive synonyms in texts. The researcher will also refer to other related writings on synonymy and translation by S. Ullmann, J. Lyons, P. Newmark, A. Shunnaq and others.

According to D. Cruse², J. Lyons³ and A. Shunnaq⁴, there are four types of synonyms: "absolute", "contextual", "cognitive" and "plesionymy".

Cognitive synonyms, the main concern of this study, are words which refer to the same referent but differ in respect of their evaluative/connotative meaning. In fact, cognitive synonyms share "the propositional or semantic content" to the effect that one cannot deny one word while affirming the other. For example, pass away and die are cognitive synonyms in the sentence below:

Ali's father passed away/ died yesterday.

In the example above, we cannot say the following sentence:

¹ Cruse D. -Lexical Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1986.-p.55.

² Cruse D. -Lexical Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1986.-P.268-270.

³ Lyons J.-Language and Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1981.-p.148.

⁴ Shunnaq Abdullah.-Functional Repetition in Arabic Realized Through the Use of Word-Strings with Reference to Arabic-English Translation of Political Discourse. Translation. Vol. XI, No. 1. 1992.-p.24.

Ali's father did not pass away yesterday; he only died.

The "semantic ill-formedness" of the sentence above is an immediate consequence of denying a word while affirming its cognitive synonym.

Illustration comes from the two cognitive synonyms fiddle and violin. Taking D. Cruse's definition of cognitive synonymy into consideration, we can say that X stands for fiddle and Y stands for violin. Both items have the same syntactic category and, D. Cruse maintains, are incapable of producing sentences with different truth values. According to A. Radford¹, et al, we can investigate cognitive synonymy in terms of entailment. Fiddle and violin are cognitive synonyms because if we consider a sentential context such as *He plays the...*, both entailments below obtain:

- a. *'He plays the fiddle' entails 'He plays the violin', and*
- b. *'He plays the violin' entails 'He plays the fiddle'.*

Therefore, concerning the synonymous pair fiddle and violin, we cannot say the following sentence:

He plays the fiddle, but not the violin.

D. Cruse² made an important distinction regarding the way in which a lexical meaning is put across. To illustrate this, he provides these examples:

- a. *I just felt a sudden pain.*
- b. *Ouch!*

According to D. Cruse, "a" and "b" differ in what he calls the semantic mode. (i.e., the meaning in "a" is in the propositional mode but the meaning in "b" is in the expressive mode). The following two texts from *Macbeth* can be used to give more illustration:

Text 1. *Look like th' innocent flower,
But be the serpent under it. (I,v, 65)*

Text 2. *We have scorched the snake,
Not killed it. (III, i, 13)*

¹ Radford A. et al. *linguistics: An Introduction*.- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1999.-p.198.

²Cruse D.-*Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1986.-p.271.

The two synonymous items *serpent* and *snake*, to a great extent, come to mean the same. They look like cognitive synonyms. To prove this it would be possible to apply two criteria depending on D. Cruse¹. To judge whether the two lexical items *serpent* and *snake* are cognitive synonyms or not, one should ask the following questions:

(i) Question one:

Could the two synonyms be used contrastively? (i.e., would it be possible to assert one of the synonyms and deny the other?) Consider the following examples:

a. *He killed the serpent but not the snake.*

b. *He killed the serpent and the snake.*

If the answer to "a" is "no" and to "b" is "yes", in the above examples, then the two lexical items, *serpent* and *snake*, may be categorized as cognitive synonyms.

(ii) Question two:

Would it be possible to use the synonyms in a number of contexts with a slight change in meaning? Consider these two sentences:

a. *Visitors can see many serpents/ snakes in the zoo.*

b. *Serpents/ snakes can be dangerous.*

If the answer is "yes", then they are cognitive synonyms. But if the answer is "no", they are not cognitive synonyms².

F.R. Palmer³ discusses *statesman* and *politician* as an example of cognitive synonyms. Both lexical items obtain the same propositional traits, but their connotative meanings differ from one lexical item to another. Both items refer to a person who works in politics and state affairs, but *statesman* is said to have a positive connotation, while *politician* indicates a negative connotation.

¹Cruse D. -Lexical Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1986.-p.88.

²Shunnaq Abdullah.-Functional Repetition in Arabic Realized Through the Use of Word-Strings with Reference to Arabic-English Translation of Political Discourse. Translation. Vol. XI, No. 1. 1992.-p.25.

³Palmer F. R.-Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1981.-p.90.

This type of synonymy refers to lexical items which are cognitive synonyms in certain contexts but not in most contexts. J. Lyons¹ calls this type "context-dependent synonymy". This type of synonymy is best illustrated by discussing the lexical items *buy* and *get* in the following context:

I'll go to the shop and get/ buy some bread.

These two words *get* and *buy* are used interchangeably in this context, so they are cognitive synonyms only in such a context. However, *buy* and *get* are not interchangeable in all contexts. Only *get* can be used in the sentence below:

I will get my son from his office.

J. Lyons² mentions that "context-restricted synonymy may be relatively rare, but it certainly exists". For example, *broad* and *wide* are not absolutely synonymous, since there are contexts in which only one is normally used and the substitution of one for the other might involve some difference of meaning. For example, *wide* and *broad* are not interchangeable in a sentence like "The door was three feet wide", or in a sentence like "He has broad shoulders". However, J. Lyons notes that there are also contexts in which they appear to be completely synonymous as it is the case in a sentence like "They painted a wide/ broad stripe across the wall".

D. Cruse³ uses the term "pseudo-synonymy" instead of "context-dependent synonymy". He differentiates between cognitive and pseudo-synonyms:

Two sentences differing only in respect of cognitive synonymy occupying a parallel syntactic position are in general logically equivalent. However, logical equivalence between sentences differing only in respect of lexical items occupying a particular syntactic position does not guarantee that the lexical items in question are cognitive synonyms- they may well be pseudo-synonyms.

Moreover, D. Cruse¹ points out that "pseudo-relations occur when lexical items which do not, in fact, stand in a particular relation mimic, as it were, one

¹ Lyons J.-Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press,1969.-p.452.

² Lyons J.-Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press,1969.-p.149.

³ Cruse D.-Lexical Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1986.-p.98.

or more of the contextual characteristics of that relation under special circumstances". Consider the following examples:

- a. *Arthur picked a green disc from this box in which all and only the green discs are smooth.*
- b. *Arthur picked a smooth disc from this box in which all and only the green discs are smooth.*

D. Cruse states that, in the above examples, the logical relationship between smooth and green is restricted to the very specific conditions in the sentence.

Now consider the two lexical items monument and storehouse which may be categorized as examples of contextual-cognitive synonyms. It would be interesting to test them in different contexts:

Carried to Colme Kill,
The sacred storehouse of his predecessors,
*And guardian of their bones.*²

The two words storehouse and monument may be used interchangeably in this context, so they are cognitive synonyms only in such a context.

However, storehouse and monument are not interchangeable in all contexts. Only storehouse can be used in the sentence below:

The book is a storehouse/ monument of information.*

Therefore, contextual-cognitive synonyms may produce sentences with different propositional content in different contexts.

Near-synonyms bring forth or give sentences with different propositional content. They refer to lexical items that share some aspects of meaning and differ in others. Therefore, near-synonyms are expressions that are more or less similar, but not identical, in meaning. D. Cruse³ calls this type of synonymy as plesionymy. He defines it saying:

¹ Cruse D.-Herbert Ernst Wiegand, *Semantics and Lexicography: Selected Studies*. International Journal of Lexicography. Vol.14, No.2. 2001-.p.98.

² Shakespeare W.-Macbeth. Herfordshire: Clays Ltd.II,v.1992.-p.72.

³ Cruse D.-Lexical Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.-p.285.

Plesionyms are distinguished from cognitive synonyms by the fact that they yield sentences with different truth conditions: two sentences which differ only in respect of plesionyms in parallel syntactic positions are not mutually entailing, although if the lexical items are in hyponymous relation, there may well be unilateral entailment. There is always one member of a plesionymous pair, which is possible to assert, without paradox, while simultaneously denying the other member.

Unlike cognitive synonyms which have the same truth conditions, plesionyms have different truth conditions. Near-synonyms are different from cognitive synonyms by the fact that they give sentences with different propositional content. According to M. Farghal¹, the members of the synonymous pair *foggy/ misty* are near-synonyms rather than cognitive synonyms in that we can deny one while affirming the other. The sentence below illustrates this:

It wasn't foggy yesterday; it was just misty.

Clearly, mistiness is a lower degree of fogginess.

The difference between a plesionymous pair and a hyponymous one is that the lexical items in the former deny one another, as in: "He is not just fearless; but more exactly, he is brave", but in the latter (hyponymous pair) the lexical items involve inclusion and entailment, e.g., bus, car and truck are included in vehicle, and tulip and rose are included in flower. In fact, plesionyms differ from one another only in respect of "subordinate traits": subordinate traits are those which have a role within the meaning of a word analogous to that of a modifier in a syntactic construction, e.g., red in a red hat and quickly in ran quickly².

For the purpose of this study, as mentioned earlier, emphasis will be given to cognitive synonymy as well as context-dependent synonymy. Other types of synonymy will not be discussed in this comparative/ contrastive translation

¹Farghal M.-Vocabulary Development and Lexical Relations: A Course Book. Irbid (Jordan): Dar Al-Hilal for Translation, 1998.-p.118.

²Cruse D.-Lexical Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.-p.287.

analysis of cognitive synonyms in English and Uzbek texts. Writers sometimes associate fine-grained semantic connotations with words. The implicated meaning of cognitive synonyms can be well figured out when they are contextually identified.

Absolute synonymy is also described by some linguists as perfect, total, complete, genuine, actual, real or full synonymy. Most semanticists agree that real synonymy is a non-existence: that no two words have exactly the same meaning.

D. Cruse defines absolute synonymy as "two lexical units which would be absolute synonyms, i.e., would have identical meanings if and only if all their contextual relations were identical". D. Cruse mentions that having absolute synonyms is impossible and impractical since we cannot check their relations in all conceivable contexts. D. Cruse¹ admits that "There is no motivation for the existence of absolute synonyms in a language" unless two dialects of one language use two different lexical items to signify one object. D. Cruse² also believes that the degree of synonymy changes from time to time. He gives the words *sofa* and *settee* as examples for further illustration. These two terms are synonyms; *sofa* was considered more elegant than *settee*, but he says that *settee* is nowadays considered more elegant than *sofa*, so these terms could be considered as absolute synonyms by some people. M. Farghal³ points out that "absolute synonyms are hard to find in English". Consider the lexical items *commence* and *begin* in these sentences:

	<i>commences</i>	
<i>The work</i>		<i>at 7: 30 a.m.</i>
	<i>begins</i>	

¹Cruse D.-Herbert Ernst Wiegand, *Semantics and Lexicography:Selected Studies*. International Journal of Lexicography. Vol.14,No.2.2001.-p.268.

²Cruse D.-Herbert Ernst Wiegand, *Semantics and Lexicography:Selected Studies*. International Journal of Lexicography. Vol.14,No.2. 2001.-p.265.

³Farghal M.-*Vocabulary Development and Lexical Relations: A Course Book*. Irbid (Jordan): Dar Al-Hilal for Translation.1998.-p.116.

The two lexical items are similar but they differ in the degree of formality. Commence is more formal than begin. Commence is used in legal and official documents as well as in religious discourse. It should be reserved for use in association with law, ceremonial, and church service, and begin should be used instead of commence in less formal situations. Moreover, absolute synonymy entails that the items in question have the same denotation, distribution and complete interchangeability in all environments; of course, this is difficult to be proved. Addressing the same notion, S. Ullmann¹ rejects the idea of absolute synonymy in natural languages, but accepts the idea in scientific terms or what he calls "technical nomenclatures". For instance, S. Ullmann cites the two medical terms caecitis and typhlitis, both of which mean inflammation of the blind gut. The former comes from Latin and the latter comes from Greek. For more illustration, we can discuss two synonyms from Macbeth:

enemy and foe.

Accordingly, if we are agree with S. Ullmann, we can say that the two items are absolute synonyms. Foe has fallen out of use and enemy has completely taken its place, though foe is still retained in some contexts, mainly of a literary nature. It is undoubtedly true that no two terms can be absolute synonyms: there will always be a point at which the two terms will diverge.

Conclusion of the first chapter

Synonymy is the type of paradigmatic relationships and is seen as sameness of meaning. There are numerous approaches with numerous definitions of synonymy and types of synonyms, because there are different ways in which synonyms may differ.

This research work analyses synonymy from the perspective of cognitive linguistics. This concept is held by many scholars, among them F. R. Palmer, D.

¹ Ullmann S.-Meaning and Style:Collected Papers. Oxford: Basil Blackwell,1973.-P.141-142.

Cruse, S. Ullman, M. Farghal, J. Lyons, G. Leech, M. Murphy, D. Bolinger and others. Each of them gave different types of synonyms.

According to Lyons and Shunnaq there are four types of synonyms: absolute, contextual, cognitive and plesionymy.

Absolute synonymy is also described by some linguists as perfect, total, complete, genuine, actual, real or full synonymy. Most semanticists agree that real synonymy is a non-existence: that no two words have exactly the same meaning. Cruse defines absolute synonymy as "two lexical units which would be absolute synonyms, i.e., would have identical meanings if and only if all their contextual relations were identical". Cruse mentions that having absolute synonyms is impossible and impractical since we cannot check their relations in all conceivable contexts. Cruse admits that "There is no motivation for the existence of absolute synonyms in a language" unless two dialects of one language use two different lexical items to signify one object. Ullmann cites the two medical terms *caecitis* and *typhlitis*, both of which mean inflammation of the blind gut. The former comes from Latin and the latter comes from Greek.

Cognitive synonymy is the identity of cognitive (descriptive) meaning and it is also known as descriptive synonymy, propositional synonymy or referential synonymy. Cognitive synonymy is sometimes described as incomplete synonymy (Lyons, 1981), or nonabsolute or partial synonymy (Lyons, 1996). The examples of cognitive synonyms are:

liberty/freedom, statesman/politician, hide/conceal, thrifty/economical/stingy.

The other kinds of synonymy Lyons introduces are 'partial synonymy' and 'near-synonymy'. Partial synonyms are those lexical items which meet the criterion of identity of meaning but which fail to meet the conditions of absolute synonymy. This implies that descriptive synonyms are part of the group of partial synonyms. As an example of near-synonyms, Lyons provides the pair *mist – fog*:

It wasn't *foggy* yesterday; it was just *misty*.

Clearly, *mistiness* is a lower degree of *fogginess*.

In this chapter we tried to give the most important and close ideas of scientists with which we are agree with. As it is given there are a lot of different ideas about synonymy and its types. But as the definitions are different in their shapes but the meaning of them are close. The ways are different but the goal was one and all of them achieved it themselves. Digging all information about synonymy and types of synonyms we found out a lot of interesting and very useful knowledge and we hope this research work will also help to others.

CHAPTER II. SYNONYMY IN LANGUAGE

2.1.Function of Synonymy in Language

If there are fine differences between any two seemingly similar expressions, why is it the case that written, especially literary, texts and people in everyday life communication use different words to mean the same thing? D. Cruse¹, P. Newmark², S. Ullmann³, and others, notice that synonymy in language has different functions. Synonyms may be used (a) to avoid repetition, (b) to secure cohesion, (c) to expand the text in the interest of redundancy, (d) to provide additional comment about the topic (Palestine is a small country-it is the Holy Land'), and (e) to avoid poor and monotonous style. S. Ullmann⁴ points out some of the reasons behind the uses of synonymy:

1. People like to hear good words in succession which causes a flow of synonyms.
2. Poets use synonyms motivated by the exigencies of meter.
3. A collocation of synonyms could produce a contrast effect either serious or humorous.
4. Synonymy is used to correct one's use of words when one wishes to replace a word by a more appropriate/ exact one.
5. When a poet tries to formulate his thoughts and ideas, he may put in his text all the various synonyms that come to his mind.

S. Ullmann⁵ mentions another important factor of producing synonymy. Synonyms are produced due to what he calls "centers of synonymous attraction". He states that:

It is then found that there are in each idiom and each period certain significant clusters of synonyms or centers of attraction as they have been called... It has been found, for example, that in the old English epic Beowulf

¹Cruse D.-Lexical Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1986.-p.267.

²Newmark P. -Approaches to Translation. Oxford: Pergamon Press,1981.-P.103-104.

³Ullmann S.-Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning.Basil Blackwell. Oxford:1962-P.151-155.

⁴Ullmann S.-Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning.-Basil Blackwell. Oxford:1962.-p.153.

⁵Ullmann S.-Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning.Basil Blackwell. Oxford:1962.-P.149-150.

there are thirty-seven words for "battle" or "fight", seventeen for "sea", and eleven for "ship" or "boat".

Concerning synonymy and translation, P. Newmark¹ points out that "a translator cannot do without synonyms; he has to make do with them as a compromise, in order to translate more important segments of the text, segments of the meaning more accurately. But unnecessary use of synonyms is a mark of many poor translations". As for synonyms in collocation, P. Newmark² states that from a translator's point of view, synonyms in collocation are of five kinds: (1) traditional formulas, (2) emphasis, (3) bad writing, (4) word-strings intended to make delicate distinction and (5) lists that do not often correspond with a TL text. We can conclude that the use of synonymy is sometimes for stylistic purposes rather than for a real need for the use of different words to refer to the same object.

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

¹Newmark P. -A Textbook of Translation. Herdfordshire: Prentice Hall,1988.-p.84.

² Newmark P. Approaches to Translation. Oxford:Pegramon Press,1981.-p.104.

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.*

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.*

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.*

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 tall. 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 *moego*, 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.*

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, 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, flection 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. 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 re-silts 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 seminary tic structure of existing words that are close to it in meaning. When in the 13th century the word soil (For 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: elope, land, folder. All these words had other central meanings so (hat the meaning in question was with (hem secondary. Avow, if two words coincide in meaning and use, the tendency is for one of them to drop out of the language. Folder had the same function and meaning as elope 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 (his 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. 1 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.*

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.*

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 have 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 of opinion 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 basis 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.

This part 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 others¹.

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,

¹ Виноградов В. В. -Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. -М. 1977.- стр 119-122.

but, regrettably, the majority of the studies in this area belong to the foreign lexicologists, especially by the Russian ones. In Uzbekistan the studying of the problem of synonymy is investigated by a relatively small quantity of lexicologists, except for Prof. Buranov and Prof. Muminov.

The following chapter of my qualification work studies the verbal synonymy, which is one of the most fewly studied problems concerned with linguistics at all and the problems of synonymy in particular.

2.2. Truth-conditional equivalence and mutual entailment

Cognitive synonymy can be explained by virtue of relations that hold between sentences or propositions that contain pairs of cognitive synonyms. Cognitive synonyms require truth-conditional equivalence of the sentences which contain them. Propositions are abstract entities which represent the semantic structure of sentences, and they are characterized by truth values (while sentences are characterized by truth conditions), i.e. they express something true or false.

Cognitive synonymy can be described through implication¹ and entailment. Implication is a logical operation². It is the relation between two assertions that can be true or false. X is the cognitive synonym of Y if, and only if, the proposition containing one of the synonyms X implies the proposition with identical syntactic structure in which X is replaced with Y. As a result, such propositions only differ in the presence of the given synonyms and they are mutually implied, for synonymy itself is a symmetrical relation (if X is synonymous with Y, then Y is synonymous with X, and vice versa). In other words, cognitive synonyms are propositionally equivalent.

Given that statesman and politician are cognitive synonyms, a substitution test, which is a diagnostic test for judging synonymy and contextual restrictiveness of lexemes, can be applied. Namely, interchangeability of

¹ Lyons J. Linguistic Semantics.- CUP, Cambridge:CUP.1996.-p.63.

²Cruse D. A. Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics.- Oxford:CUP.2000.-p.158.

synonymous pairs is tested by means of substitution of one synonym with another in the same context. Synonyms are interchangeable only in certain environments, so this test can be utilized to illustrate the difficulties in finding the pairs of absolute synonyms. The proposition *The statesman spoke at the conference* implies the proposition *The politician spoke at the conference*. Since the first proposition is true, the second one must necessarily be true, and vice versa. Entailment is the relation between two sentences or propositions where the propositional content of one proposition includes that of the other. Mutual entailment is the relation in which the propositional contents of sentences are identical, so the truth of one requires the truth of the other, and vice versa.

A proposition containing one synonym is mutually entailed by the same proposition containing the other. The following propositions are "mutually entailing: John bought a violin entails and is entailed by John bought a fiddle; I heard him tuning his fiddle entails and is entailed by I heard him tuning his violin; She is going to play a violin concerto entails and is entailed by She is going to play a fiddle concerto. Notice that fiddle is less normal in the last example, while leaving truth conditions intact, which shows that fiddle and violin are not absolute synonyms¹."

It is generally assumed that cognitive synonyms are lexemes with the same sense (answer/reply, pullover/sweater). In addition, synonymy is considered as one of the three basic types of sense relations, including hyponymy as sense inclusion, and antonymy as oppositeness in sense.

Lexical meaning is a complex unity which consists of cognitive and associative meaning. If synonymy has to do with two or more lexemes which are interchangeable in certain contexts in which they have the same meaning, it is necessary to emphasize that it is the cognitive meaning we are dealing with.

¹ Cruse D. A. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. - Oxford: CUP. 2000. - p. 158.

Pragmatics restricts synonymy to the identity of cognitive meaning (which is also called descriptive). Cognitive meaning consists of sense and denotation, and synonymy is usually defined as sameness of senses of two or more lexemes, e.g. father, daddy, dad, pop.

Cognitive meaning is also termed descriptive, conceptual, referential, denotative (denotation), propositional and logical. It is characterized by objectiveness and it does not necessarily depend on place and time. It consists of sense and denotation (that is why it is named denotational); it determines the truth value, i.e. whether the proposition is true or false (owing to that it is called propositional or logical meaning); it leads the hearer to identify referents which certain forms refer to in extralinguistic reality (therefore it is known as referential); and due to the fact that this type of meaning enables conceptual categorization, the term conceptual meaning is created.

Sense and denotation are of the utmost importance for the analysis of synonymy. Sense is an abstraction which relates one lexeme to other lexemes in the same language and it is internal to the language. Denotation of a lexeme is a relation that holds between the given lexeme and classes of entities in the external world¹. It is a set of entities in the world that a word can refer to².

Denotation is the relationship between sense and reference. A lexeme outside the context has sense and denotation but when it is used in the context reference arises. It is the relation between the lexeme used in the context and the exact entity which is being talked about, called the referent. It is singled out from the classes of entities in the external world determined by denotation. It should be underlined that cognitive synonyms, i.e. synonymous terms which have the same sense, do not necessarily have the same denotation or the same referent.

Nevertheless, there are such cases. "Most speakers would agree that the words bucket and pail share the same denotation: the set of all cylindrical vessels

¹Lyons J. *Linguistic Semantics*.- CUP, Cambridge:CUP.1996.-p.79.

² Evans V., Green M. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*.-Cambridge:CUP.2006.-p.210.

with handles that can be used to carry water. These words share the same denotation because they are synonyms"¹. In cognitive semantics, it is accepted that although cognitive synonyms have the same descriptive meaning, there are other aspects and dimensions of meaning in which they differ. Associative (non-descriptive or non-propositional) meaning generates differences between cognitive synonyms.

Associative meaning is very complex and has a number of classifications. In order to describe this type of meaning linguists use the following terms: connotative, emotional, expressive, socio-expressive, evaluative and affective meaning. The meanings of these terms overlap and a possible distinction is hard to find².

Associative meaning is subjective. It expresses emotions or attitudes, as well as approval or disapproval, and other subjective states. It shows that natural languages abound in emotional connotations and associations. Linguists have given different classifications of associative meaning, for it is not one-dimensional. Two of them are presented here.

"While definitions of synonymy often require similarity (or identity) of denotative meaning and part of speech, they frequently allow for (or even expect) differences among non-denotative elements of meaning, or expressive meaning. Expressive meaning includes connotation, affect, and other social information that gives denotatively similar words different significance without changing their contributions to a sentence's truth-conditions³."

G.N. Leech⁴ considers associative meaning as individual mental understandings of the speaker. He observes that associative meaning includes connotative, social, affective, reflected, collocative and thematic meaning.

¹ Evans V., Green M. Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction.-Cambridge:CUP.2006.-P.210-212.

² Prčić T. Semantika i pragmatika reči, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci / Novi ad..1997.-P.22-23.

³ Murphy M. L. Semantic Relations and the Lexicon.- Cambridge:CUP.2003.-P.151-154.

⁴ Leech G. N. Semantics.- Penguin, Harmondsworth.1981.

Enumerating the ways in which synonyms might differ has been the preoccupation of many writers in classical semantics.

The theory of componential analysis has been trying to prove that cognitive synonyms share core components (features), while their peripheral components differ. For example, synonymous terms "may contain the same referentially relevant diagnostic components but differ with respect to certain emotive and/or supplementary components¹." The cognitive linguistics has adopted and developed certain views, and came up with new approaches. In metalexicographical approach, "a synonym set includes only word-concepts that have the same contextually relevant properties, but differ in form."

J. Hurford and B. Heasley² claim that lexemes may differ in their stylistic, social or dialectal associations. D. Cruse³ underlines that differences in meaning of cognitive synonyms comprise some aspects of non-propositional meaning, and the most important ones are differences in expressive meaning (jolly/very, father/daddy, infant/baby, go on/continue), 1 differences in style (on colloquial-formal dimension) and the field of discourse. According to Murphy⁴ synonym pairs may differ in connotation (*punish/discipline*), affect (*gay/homosexual*), register (*legs/gams*), dialect (*milkshake/frappe*), general use vs. specialized vocabulary (*word/lexeme*), or even language (*dog/perro*). Some aspects of associative meaning in which cognitive synonyms may differ are going to be presented below.

(a) Cognitive synonyms may differ in their collocational range. When lexemes that belong to different parts of speech are combined into phrases, collocations are restrictions imposed upon linguistic units and their relations in a sentence or discourse, which allow a limited number of lexical combinations to take place. Interchangeability is restricted, as well. The most common examples are *pretty* and *handsome* as two different forms which have the same sense.

¹ Nida E. A. Componential Analysis of Meaning.-Mouton: The Hague,1975.-p.98.

² Hurford J. R., Heasley B. Semantics: A Coursebook.- Cambridge:CUP.1983.-p.102.

³ Cruse D. A. Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics.- Oxford:CUP.2000.-p.158.

⁴ Murphy M. L. Semantic Relations and the Lexicon.- Cambridge:CUP.2003.-p.155.

However, pretty collocates with girl and handsome collocates with man. F.R. Palmer¹ explains collocational restriction of rancid, which occurs with bacon or butter, and addled, which is combined with eggs or brains.

(b) Synonyms may belong to different styles or levels of formality. Consider *obtain/get*, *provide/give*, *procure/get*, where the first member of the synonymous pair belongs to formal, and the second one belongs to informal style, respectively. Choosing between synonyms is sometimes transferred to the field of stylistics. Lexemes may vary from formal, over informal to colloquial style, and even belong to slang (*pass away*, *pass on*, *die*, *kick the bucket*, *pop off*). However, it would be too simplified to reduce style to formality and informality, as it is much more complex than that. Style can also be viewed in terms of functional styles.

The style is the choice made by language users in different situations. It is a language variant that depends on the subject matter, the roles of the speaker and the hearer, their relationship, their social status and the positions they hold, their age and gender, as well as the environment and situation they are involved in. Therefore, cognitive synonyms may be defined as lexemes whose cognitive meaning is the same, but their stylistic differences reflect in variations in the lexis.

(c) Cognitive synonyms may belong to different registers or fields of discourse in which they typically appear. Register is a language variety determined by the use of a language in the given situation, and it is especially associated with the use of language among the people of the same profession. The typical examples are *matrimony*, *marriage* and *wedlock* (marriage belongs to legal register, wedlock is in the religious register, and matrimony belongs to both legal and religious register).

(d) Cognitive synonyms may belong to different dialects of the same language. Dialects are regional or social language varieties determined by

¹ Palmer F. R. Semantics.- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.-p.62.

the language users (*autumn/fall, lift/elevator, glen/valley*). Geographical borders play important roles distinguishing the dialects. In addition, sociolects (*kitchen/kitchenette, settee/sofa, serviettes/napkins*) might form synonymous pairs¹.

(e) Certain terms are synonymous with their euphemisms. These are lexical units or phrases which create circumlocution primarily in order to avoid negative connotations of certain terms (*drunk/intoxicated, pass away/depart this life*). Euphemisms used as synonyms are mainly regarded as polite, mild or neutral terms which replace the terms which are unpleasant (*illness/disease*) or controversial. Some circumlocutions belong to slang. They are being used to avoid the taboo (*mentally challenged/retarded*), to create comical or jocular effects, both intentionally and unintentionally (*bean counter/accountant*). Nowadays more and more euphemisms are used by politicians in order to attain political correctness or instead of pronouncing unpleasant facts (*economically disadvantaged/poor*).

The general account of cognitive synonymy provides two possible definitions. The definitions have been presented. Both of them should be taken into consideration when it comes to determining the phenomenon of cognitive synonymy. Substitution of one cognitive synonym with another should not alter the truth-conditions of sentences which contain them. Both objective factors and subjective attitudes should be taken into account, as well, because lexical meaning consists of both cognitive and associative meaning. Various aspects of associative meaning give slightly different significance to the words that can be described in the same way (have identical descriptive meaning). Cognitive synonyms differ in various aspects of associative meaning, such as expressive meaning, stylistic meaning, collective meaning, etc. In that respect, considering different argumentations, cognitive synonyms might be differentiated on the basis of different registers, styles or

¹ Cruse D. Lexical Semantics.- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, p. 283.

dialects they belong to, or by virtue of different connotations, collocations, etc. What they have in common is the same sense.

Conclusion of the second chapter

D. Cruse, P. Newmark, S. Ullmann, and others, notice that synonymy in language has different functions. Synonyms may be used

- to avoid repetition
- to secure cohesion
- to expand the text in the interest of redundancy
- to provide additional comment about the topic (Palestine is a small country-it is the Holy Land')
- to avoid poor and monotonous style.

S. Ullmann¹ points out some of the reasons behind the uses of synonymy:

1. People like to hear good words in succession which causes a flow of synonyms.
2. Poets use synonyms motivated by the exigencies of meter.
3. A collocation of synonyms could produce a contrast effect either serious or humorous.
4. Synonymy is used to correct one's use of words when one wishes to replace a word by a more appropriate/ exact one.
5. When a poet tries to formulate his thoughts and ideas, he may put in his text all the various synonyms that come to his mind.

Concerning synonymy and translation, Newmark points out that "a translator cannot do without synonyms; he has to make do with them as a compromise, in order to translate more important segments of the text, segments of the meaning more accurately. But unnecessary use of synonyms is a mark of many poor translations". As for synonyms in collocation, Newmark states that from a translator's point of view, synonyms in collocation are of five kinds:

¹ Ullmann S.-Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning.-Basil Blackwell. Oxford:1962.-p.153.

(1) traditional formulas, (2) emphasis, (3) bad writing, (4) word-strings intended to make delicate distinction and (5) lists that do not often correspond with a TL text.

In this chapter we tried to describe how important is the role of synonymy in language and how it is important while translating some kind of texts. Using synonyms in the speech makes it beautiful, usage of synonyms in the translation helps translator to make their translation more lively, emotive and interesting.

CHAPTER III. SYNONYMS IN LITERATURE AND THEIR TRANSLATION

3.1. Synonymy in English literature and its translation

Throughout history, synonymy has never been a new subject for discussion. It has attracted the attention of linguists in both languages Uzbek and English. This chapter reviews much of the literature that has been written about this notion (synonymy) in both English and Uzbek. The review will also cover some translation studies on synonymy. The phenomenon of synonymy has been a controversial issue in English. Many scholars have addressed this phenomenon in English. As in regard to Uzbek, there are two points of view regarding synonymy: the strict point of view and the flexible one. The former denies the existence of synonymy altogether. The flexible view, on the other hand, maintains that any two words which share at least one sense are synonymous.

J. Lyons believes that synonymy is a relation which holds between lexical items that share more or less the same meaning¹. Two synonyms may share most of their semantic features but there is always a part of their meaning that will be different, e.g., *happy* and *merry* are synonyms although *merry* has the additional feature of being cheerful. Thus, synonyms may share the same meaning on one dimension but not on another. J. Lyons² differentiates between completely synonymous lexemes and absolutely synonymous lexemes. He states that:

Lexemes can be said to be completely synonymous (in a certain range of contexts) if and only if they have the same descriptive, expressive and social meaning (in the range of contexts in question). They may be described as absolutely synonymous if and only if they have the same distribution and are completely synonymous in their meanings and in all their contexts of occurrence.

It is generally recognized that complete synonymy of lexemes is relatively rare in natural languages and that absolute synonymy is almost nonexistent. J.

¹ Lyons J. Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics.-Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.-p.446.

² Lyons J. Language and Linguistics.- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.-p.148.

Lyons¹ beholds the context in his consideration of synonymy. He mentions that "two elements can not be absolutely synonymous in one context unless they are synonymous in all contexts". Moreover, J. Lyons asserts that "two or more expressions will be defined to have the same sense (i.e., to be synonymous) over a certain range of utterances if and only if they are substitutable for one another without affecting their descriptive meanings".

J. Lyons² makes an attempt to clarify the notion of cognitive synonymy. He mentions that lexemes may be descriptively synonymous without having the same expressive or social meaning. According to him, "descriptive synonymy (commonly called cognitive or referential synonymy) is what many semanticists would regard as synonymy properly so called". He provides examples of cognitive synonyms, such as *father, dad, daddy, pop*, etc. In fact, not all speakers of a language will necessarily use, though they may well understand, all members of a set of synonyms. The above discussion shows that J. Lyons emphasizes the importance of denotative/ descriptive meaning over the connotative.

D. Cruse³ suggests that a language exhibits different degrees of synonymy: "*settee* and *sofa* are more synonymous than *die* and *kick the bucket*, which in turn are more synonymous than *boundary* and *frontier*". D. Cruse points out that synonymy, as mentioned earlier, are divided into four types: "absolute", "cognitive", "pseudo-synonymy" and "plesionymy". He defines synonymy by saying:

Synonyms are lexical items whose senses are identical in respect of 'central' semantic traits, but differ, if at all, only in respect of what we may provisionally describe as 'minor' or 'peripheral' traits.

¹ Lyons J. *Semantics*.- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.-p.427.

² Lyons J. *Language and Linguistics*.- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.-p.150.

³ Cruse D. *Lexical Semantics*.-Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.-p.265.

D. Cruse¹ points out that "a full treatment of propositional synonymy would need to confront J. Lyon's notion of 'context-dependent synonymy', by drawing a distinction between cases like *my horse/ mare has just given birth to a foal*, where substitution *salva veritate* is restricted to contexts where the feature 'female' can be inferred". In its most basic form, synonymy is viewed as a relation between individual senses associated with different word-forms; hence, a prerequisite for a thorough discussion of synonymy is a consideration of the principles of sense division. Moreover, D. Cruse states that "any notion of 'absolute synonymy' can be discounted as having no lexicographic relevance". The synonyms that are the stock-in-trade of lexicographers are by no means all propositional synonyms, but they are nonetheless in some intuitive sense close enough to be grouped together.

L. Bloomfield² rejects the notion of sameness in meaning of items in his basic assumption that "each linguistic form has a constant and specific meaning. If the forms are phonemically different, we suppose that their meanings are also different". Bloomfield does not take into consideration some influential factors that make synonymy a reality in natural languages.

S. Ullmann³ provides a historical review of the idea of synonymy. He attempts to illustrate that the idea of synonymy was known to Aristotle. He points out: "in his *Rhetoric*, Aristotle (384-322 BC) made an interesting remark on the difference between synonymy and ambiguity. Synonymy, according to him is useful to the poet, whereas words of ambiguous meaning are chiefly useful to enable the sophist to mislead hearers".

S. Ullmann⁴ makes great contributions in illustrating the idea of synonymy. He defines synonymy as "several names connected with one sense", as in the items *little* and *small*. But he denies the existence of complete

¹ Cruse D. Herbert Ernst Wiegand, *Semantics and Lexicography: Selected Studies*. International Journal of Lexicography. Vol.14, No.2. 2001.-P.139-143.

² Bloomfield L. *Language*.-London, 1962.-P.144.

³ Ullmann S. *Meaning and Style: Collected Papers*.- Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972.-P.151-152.

⁴ Ullmann S. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*.- Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.-p.62

(absolute) synonymy in natural languages, saying: "in contemporary linguistics it has become axiomatic that complete synonymy does not exist"¹. According to him, absolute synonymy occurs only in "technical nomenclatures" (i.e., scientific terminology), e.g., *salt* and *sodium chloride*. To give more illustration, S. Ullmann discusses the two medical terms *caecitis* and *typhlitis*, both of which mean inflammation of the blind gut, the former comes from Latin and latter comes from Greek.

S. Ullmann² summarizes the ways by which we may differentiate between meanings of any two expressions by listing Professor W.E. Collinson's nine possible differentiae:

1. One term is more general and inclusive in its applicability; another is more specific and exclusive, e.g., *seaman/ sailor*.
2. One term is more intense than another, e.g., *repudiate/ refuse*.
3. One term is more highly charged with emotion than another, e.g., *looming/merging*.
4. One term may imply normal approbation or censure where another is neutral, e.g., *eavesdrop/ listen*.
5. One term is more professional than another, e.g., *domicile/ house*.
6. One term may belong more to the written language; it is more literary than another, e.g., *passing/ death*.
7. One term is more colloquial than another, e.g., *turn down/ refuse*.
8. One term is more local or dialectal than another, e.g., *flesher* and *butcher*.
9. One term belongs to child-talk, is used by children or in talking to children, e.g., *daddy, dad, papa/ father*.

S. Ullmann³ talks about three criteria that must be taken into consideration in distinguishing between synonyms. The first criterion is "the substitution test".

¹ Ullmann S. *Meaning and Style: Collected Papers*.- Oxford: Basil Blackwell,1972.-p.141.

² Ullmaan S. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*.- Oxford:Basil Blackwell,1962.-p.142.

³ Ullmaan S. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*.- Oxford:Basil Blackwell,1962.-P. 143-144.

Some synonyms are interchangeable in some but not all contexts. The second criterion has to do with distinguishing between synonyms by finding their opposites (antonyms). For instance, *deep* and *profound* are synonyms in a phrase like "*deep/ profound* sympathy" because they share the same antonym (superficial), but only *deep* in "*deep* water" since the antonym in this case is *shallow* which is not shared with the antonym of *profound*. Concerning the third criterion, S. Ullmann suggests arranging the synonyms into a series of scales or grades so as to differentiate between them taking into consideration shades and nuances of meaning.

S. Ullmann¹ discusses the stylistic use of the collocation of synonyms. He attempts to show how synonymous collocates are functional in certain environments:

1. To emphasize the meaning and to make it clearer and more emphatic, e.g., *Freedom* and *Liberty*.
2. To correct oneself or change a word which, on second thought, one wishes to replace by a more suitable one. e.g., "*Perhaps, after all, America never has been discovered.... I myself would say that it had merely been detected*". The alternative here is not more appropriate but merely has a more learned air.
3. Provide an outlet of strong emotions.

S. Ullmann² discusses collocations of synonyms in *Hamlet*. He states that such collocations may have a number of different uses. They provide an outlet for strong emotions. Hamlet's very first soliloquy starts with such an impassioned accumulation of synonyms:

*O, that this too too solid flesh would melt,
Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew!*

In his discussion of the above text, S. Ullmann notices that an important function of such collocations of synonyms is to make one's meaning clearer and more

¹ Ullmann S. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*.- Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962. -P. 153-154.

² Ullmann S. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*.- Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962. -p. 153.

emphatic. He¹ adds that "when one encounters this kind of gratuitous tautology in poetry, one has the impression of 'mere padding' designed to fill out the line".

H. Jackson² contributes much in clarifying the notion of synonymy. According to him, synonymy needs to be defined in terms of contexts of use: two words are synonyms if they can be used interchangeably in all sentence contexts. Jackson's definition of synonymy as words being interchangeable in all contexts is sometimes referred to as strict synonymy. However, he presents two arguments against strict synonymy. One is economic: having two words which are totally synonymous is a luxury which a language can afford to do without. The economy of a language will not tolerate, except perhaps for a short period of time, the existence of two words with exactly the same range of contexts of use; and it certainly will not tolerate a proliferation of them. Jackson mentions that a differentiation of meaning usually takes place and one of the words begins to be used in contexts from which the other is excluded. Moreover, one of the words may fall out of use and become obsolete, leaving the other as the sole lexeme with that meaning. Jackson gives the synonymous pair *foe* and *enemy* as an example. In this case, *foe* has fallen out of use and *enemy* has completely taken its place, though *foe* is still retained in some contexts, mainly of a literary nature.

H. Jackson examines some of the ways in which synonyms may be differentiated:

1. Synonyms may persist in the vocabulary because they belong to different dialects, e.g., *lift* and *elevator*.
2. Synonyms may be differentiated by style or level of formality, e.g., *climb* and *ascend*.
3. Synonyms are differentiated in terms of technicality. We refer to some lexemes as technical vocabulary or jargon, e.g., *cardiac/heart*.

¹ Ullmann S. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*.- Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.-p. 154.

² Jackson H. (1988). *Words and Their Meaning*.- London: Longman, 1988.-p.68.

4. Synonyms may be differentiated as a result of connotation, e.g., *love* and *adore*. In fact, *adore* has connotations of passion or worship, which *love* does not share: *love* is the more neutral of the pair.

5. Euphemism is a fifth reason, e.g., *die/ pass away*. H. Jackson's discussion shows that synonyms have more or less the same reference but differ in their context of use: geographically (dialect), stylistically (informal vs. formal), in domain or register (technical vs. common), attitudinally (connotation), or in sensitivity (euphemism).

In a similar way to S. Ullmann and H. Jackson, F. Palmer¹ rejects the existence of absolute synonymy in language by saying: "it can, however, be mentioned that there are no real synonyms, that no two words have exactly the same meaning. Indeed, it would seem unlikely that two words with exactly the same meaning would both survive in a language". In support of his claim, he mentions that absolute synonymy is difficult to attain due to some factors. First of all, it is said that English is rich in synonyms for historical reasons, i.e., its vocabulary has come from different sources: Anglo-Saxon, French, Latin and Greek. Secondly, synonyms differ due to regional variation. *Fall* is used in American English whereas *autumn* is used in British English. Thirdly, synonyms differ from one another due to stylistic differences. The items *gentleman*, *man* and *chap* differ in degree of formality. Fourthly, synonyms differ in the degree of connotative meanings. The item *politician* has a negative connotation while *statesman* has a positive one. Finally, synonyms are collocationally restricted as in *addled eggs*.

J. Saeed² investigates the various words used for *police* around the English speaking world: *police*, *cop*, *copper*, etc. He agrees with H. Palmer³ that the synonyms often have different distributions along a number of parameters, "the synonyms may have belonged to different dialects. Or the words may belong to

¹Palmer F. R. *Semantics*.-Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1981.

² Saeed J. *Semantics*. (2nd. ed).- Oxford: Blackwell,2003.-p.66.

³ Palmer F. R. *Semantics*.-Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1981.

different registers, those styles of language, colloquial, formal, literary, etc. that belong to different situations". Moreover, J. Saeed asserts that synonyms may portray positive or negative attitudes of the speaker. One or other of synonyms may be collocationally restricted. We can notice that J. Saeed, as well as F. Palmer and S. Ullmann, believes that synonymy is sometimes used for stylistic purposes rather than for a real need of different words to refer to the same object.

Reiter¹ takes a similar position to J. Saeed and states that "the choice between synonyms is mostly determined by non-semantic factors, including the preferences and idiolects of individual authors". Reiter adds that "poets use synonyms motivated by the exigencies of metre". When poets try to formulate their thoughts and ideas, they may put in a text all the various synonyms that come to their minds.

In the same domain, S. Falk² notes that "whenever two words do have the same meaning, they tend to separate, one acquiring an additional semantic feature that distinguishes it from the other". He argues that words are described informally as synonyms when they refer to the same thing, as in the case of *child* and *kid* or, for some dialects, *supper* and *dinner*. In such cases, there is generally a stylistic difference involved. *Child* and *dinner*, for example, tend to be more formal than *kid* and *supper*.

E. Nida³ states that close investigation of the use of expressions in a natural language will always reveal some reason for denying their absolute synonymity. He tackles synonymy in terms of overlap. Certain lexical items have certain semantic features in common between them. E. Nida talks about interchangeability between lexical items in some, but not all, contexts. He points out that "terms whose meaning overlap are usually substitutable for one another in at least certain contexts, but rarely if ever are two terms interchangeable for

¹ Reiter E. Contextual Influences on Near-Synonyms Choice. Computational linguistics. Vol.28. 2004.-p.549.

² Falk S. Linguistics and Language. (2nd. Ed.).- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1979.-p.252.

³ Nida E. Componential Analysis. -The Hague: Mouton,1975.p.98.

each other in meaning in all contexts. In most discussions of meaning, synonyms are treated as though the terms overlap, while in reality what is involved is the overlapping of particular meaning of such terms". When one says that *peace* and *tranquility* are synonyms, what is really meant is that one of the meanings of *peace*, involving physical and/ or psychological state of calm, overlaps the meaning of *tranquility*, also involving physical and/ or psychological calm.

F. Southworth and Daswani¹ advocate the idea that there are no complete synonyms in a language, i.e., if two forms are phonemically different, then their meanings are also different. According to them, *buy* and *purchase* are similar in meaning, but differ at least in their level of formality and, therefore, are not completely interchangeable: that department of an institution which is concerned with the acquisition of materials is normally the *Purchasing Department* rather than the *Buying Department*; a wife would rarely ask her husband *to purchase a pound of butter*. Though in some contexts words may appear completely synonymous, there are likely to be differences in other contexts. To support their discussion, Southworth and Daswani state that in speaking of a person who is mentally deficient (or in expressing one's annoyance at someone who has acted stupidly), the terms *idiot*, *imbecile* and *moron* are more or less interchangeable, whereas in a technical sense these refer to three distinguishable levels of mental deficiency, and would not be considered as synonymous by a psychiatrist working in a mental institution. When cases of synonyms are looked at carefully, it usually turns out that differences of this type are present.

Stork² emphasizes that words are sometimes emotionally charged. He does not approve the existence of perfect (absolute) synonymy; he says that "all words have an emotional impact as well as a purely referential one. Therefore, it is impossible to find absolute synonyms or one-to- one equivalent between languages". For example, the referential meaning of the word *night* is known and

¹ Southworth F. and Daswani. Foundations of Linguistics- New York: the Free Press,1974.-p.181.

² Stork F. and J. Widdowson. Learning About Linguistics.- London:Hutchinson,1974.p.111.

unchangeable, but the emotive impact of the word *night* varies from one person to another.

F. Laev¹ states that "synonyms are words or expressions that have the same meanings in some or all contexts". He mentions that although it is easy to think of contexts in which both words in each pair have essentially the same meaning, there are also contexts in which their meanings diverge at least slightly. T. Leav discusses the two items *youth* and *adolescent*. Both items refer to people of about the same age, only the latter word has the meaning of 'immature' in a phrase such as *what an adolescent!* Moreover, T. Leav believes that it would be inefficient for a language to have two words whose meanings are absolutely identical in all contexts, and that complete synonymy is, therefore, rare or nonexistent.

G. Yule² notes that the idea of "sameness of meaning" used in discussing synonymy is not necessarily "total sameness". There are many occasions when one word is appropriate in a sentence, but its synonym would be odd. Yule discusses the two synonymous words *answer* and *reply*. He gives the following examples:

Cathy had only one answer correct on the test. Yule states that whereas the word *answer* fits in this sentence, its synonym, *reply*, would sound odd.

J. Katz³ states that "synonymy is the limiting case of semantic similarity; it is the case where two constituents are as similar as possible, where there is no difference in meaning between a sense of one and a sense of another". According to him, if two constituents are synonymous, then they are semantically included in the other, but if one is semantically included in the other, it does not follow that the two are synonymous. J. Katz notices the importance of the context. Lexical items such as *peace* and *tranquility* are

¹ Laev T. Contemporary Linguistics.-Boston: Bedford/ St. Martin's,1997.p.246.

² Yule G. The Study of Language.-Cambridge: The University Press,1998.p.118.

³ Katz J. Semantic Theory.-New York: Harper and Row,1972.P.48-49.

normally listed as synonyms, but in a context such as "peace conference", only *peace* is acceptable.

E. Hatch and C. Brown¹ study synonymy and register. According to them, if all the features are the same, the words should be interchangeable. However, native speakers will consistently select among them in similar ways. E. Hatch and C. Brown study the synonymous pair *cease* and *stop*. We might assign the same features to *cease* and *stop* and yet realize that *cease* is most often selected in legal discourse. A mother is unlikely to say "cease that!" to a misbehaving child. Such words may be synonymous, but they survive in the language because there are differences in the ways and situations in which they are used. Of course, synonyms do not usually share all their features. We often use synonyms to make our lexical choices more precise.

R. Wells² concerns himself much with lexicography. He mentions that "Generally, the synonymy attempts to differentiate among two or more words which are essentially alike in their denotative meaning, but are distinguished by their implication, connotation, idiomatic use, or application". He adds that if usage is differentiation among "socially graded synonyms", then the synonymy suggests the key to usage orientation in the dictionary. He points out that the usage note is often too brief and too generalized to convey the multiple associations and value reactions which are generated by idiomatic usage. Skillful distinctions are required by the lexicographer in order to write a synonymy; but once they are made, the synonymy proves an excellent lexicographical device for conveying usage information.

Anderson talks about synonymy in terms of "the extension or reduction of the reference". According to him, synonyms arise through various processes. The use of a word for another, with which its meaning is closely aligned, for

¹ Hatch E. and C. Brown. Vocabulary, Semantics, and Language Education.-Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1995.p.19.

² Wells R. Dictionaries and the Authoritarian Tradition. The Netherlands: Mouton and Co. N. V., Publishers, The Hague,1973.p.117.

example, *chair* and *professorship*, is referred to as metonymy. The word *chair* has extended its referent. Moreover, the naming of a thing for one of its parts, i.e., synecdoche, generates expressions such as *hands* for *laborers* or *wheels* for *car*. Abbreviations create forms synonymous with their longer counterparts, e.g., *light* for *electric light*.

Mathews tries to give distinctions between some of the synonymous items. The items reveal staggering differences. Mathews points out that *hurricane*, *cyclone*, *tornado*, and *typhoon* are synonymous: they all are *cyclones*. However, "if it happens on land, it's a tornado; if it happens in the Atlantic Ocean, it's a hurricane; if it happens in the Far East, it is a typhoon; if it happens in Australia it's (believe it or not) a willy-willy -not to be confused with williwaw, or 'violent squall'".¹

C. Jiwei² talks about "sense-synonymy". He states "when two forms or lexemes are said to be synonymous, their synonymy is in fact to be understood as sense-synonymy, as the two forms/ lexemes are sharing one rather than all their senses". When C. Jiwei talks about words being synonymous, he should be understood to mean that there is one sense from among the several senses of a word which is synonymous with one sense from among the several senses of another word.

Generative-transformational linguists have formulated the distinction in terms of "full synonymy" and "i-ways synonymy", the typical case of the latter being one-way synonymy. S. Abraham and F. Kiefer³ define synonymy in a very similar manner:

(i) We say that between two words, W1 and W2, a full synonymy holds if, and only if, their trees have exactly the same branching structure (i.e., the same paths) and exactly the same labels on the corresponding nodes.

¹ <http://www.smart.net/~wisdom/mary/mwmpofl.html>.

² Jiwei C. Synonymy and Polysemy.- *Lingua* 72, 1987.-P. 315-331.

³ Abraham S. and F. Kiefer. *Theory of Structural Semantics*. -The Hague: Mouton, 1966.-p.33.

(ii) We say that between two words, W1 and W2, an i-ways synonymy holds if, and only if, they have in their treeraphs i-paths in common.

S. Odell¹ considers the context in distinguishing between two kinds of synonyms, (1) *monotypical synonymy*, which is the kind of synonymy that exists when the same linguistic expression has the same meaning in different linguistic contexts, and (2) *multitypical synonymy*, which is the kind of synonymy that exists when one linguistic expression has, in the same, or a different, linguistic context, the same sense as another linguistic expression. S. Odell² provides the sentences below:

- A. Men over six feet tall are *rare* in Greece.
- B. Women who like macho men are *rare* these days.
- C. He was *caught* trying to cross the border.
- D. She was *captured* when she visited his grave.

The 'rare' of (A) is monotypically synonymous with the 'rare' of (B). The 'caught' of (C) and the 'captured' of (D) are multitypically synonymous. In fact, *monotypical synonymy* exists between two tokens of the *same* type, but *multitypical synonymy* exists between two tokens of *different* types. Baldinger presents the following argument concerning synonymy:

If the signifie has but one sememe, signifie and sememe are identical. If, on the other hand, the signifie contains several sememes, it constitutes a semasiological field. As far as synonymy is concerned, this basic formulation allows us to distinguish between two kinds of synonymy on the plane of the substance of context. A synonymy of two signifies (if the two signifies linked to two different monemes, contain but one sememe each...) A synonymy of two sememes which are linked by means of two complex signifies (which contains more than one sememe), to two different monemes...

¹ Odell S. Periphrastic Criteria for Synonymy and Ambiguity.-Theoretical Linguistics. Vol.11, No. 1/2 1984.-P. 115-125.

² Odell S. Periphrastic Criteria for Synonymy and Ambiguity.-Theoretical Linguistics. Vol.11, No. 1/2 1984.-p.119.

K. Baldinger¹ asserts that there are "external factors" and "internal factors" that influence a person's choice of words. External factors have to do with the speaker, whereas the internal factors depend on the structure of the language itself. The external factors have to do with the social position, region, origin, profession, age, environment and the impression that the speaker wants to have on those s/he is talking to.

D. Cooper² discusses the theory of synonymy in the light of the interchangeability theory. He claims that synonymy is a function of words being interchangeable in sentences without altering the truth-values of those sentences. He states that "two expressions are synonymous in a language L if and only if they may be interchanged in each sentence of L without altering the truth value of that sentence". So, for example, *bachelor* and *unmarried* are synonyms if any true sentence containing *bachelor* remains true when *unmarried man* replaces *bachelor* and similarly for false sentences.

J. Foder³ deals with synonymy from a different perspective from that of D. Cooper. J. Foder emphasizes that the phenomenon of synonymy must be examined only in terms of lexical items. He mentions that "there could never be synonymy between a word and a phrase". For instance, synonymy cannot exist between *bachelor* and *unmarried man* for these expressions are not parallel in structure, i.e., one is simple and the other is a compound.

From a syntactic point of view, Hudson, et al mentions that synonymy is an impossible conception⁴. To support their claim, they provide various examples like the following:

- He is *able*/* *capable* to work hard.
- He is capable/* able of hard work / working hard.

¹ Baldiger K. Semantic Theory: Towards a Modern Semantics.-Oxford. Basil:Blackwell,1980.-p.237.

² Cooper D. Philosophy and the Nature of Language.- England:Longman,1979.-p167.

³ Foder J. Semantics: Theories of Meaning in Generative Grammar.-Massachusetts: Harvard University Press,1980.

⁴Hudson et al.Synonyms and Syntax.Journal of Linguistics, Sep. Vol. 32, No.2. 1996.

They come up with a result that it is possible to learn purely syntactic facts without need of semantics.

J. Morreall¹ has made a strong case for not deriving sentences like (1) from deep structures like (2).

(1) *John killed Mary.*

(2) *John caused Mary to die.*

His basic argument is that *kill* is a word, while *cause to die* is a phrase; and he states that "even where a phrase and a word are synonymous, the former will characteristically exhibit degrees of syntactic freedom unavailable to the latter". J. Morreall argues that *kill* and *cause to die* are not both actions. Causing is not an action. Killing, on the other hand, is an action; for example, it can be done quickly or slowly. J. Morreall discusses the sentences below:

(3) *John killed Mary slowly.*

(4) *John caused Mary to die slowly.*

If (3) is true, then Mary *died* slowly, of course; yet the slowness in (3) is not the slowness of Mary's death, but the slowness of John's action- his killing . Causing is not quick or slow because it is not an action. But in (4) it is clear that it is Mary's dying that is slow, and not John's action of killing.

A. Radford², et al, investigate cognitive synonymy in terms of entailment. They argue that *horse* and *steed* are cognitive synonyms because if we consider a sentential context such as *Sir Lancelot rode a white...*, both entailments below obtain:

a) '*Sir Lancelot rode a white horse*' entails '*Sir Lancelot rode a white steed*' , and

b) '*Sir Lancelot rode a white steed*' entails '*Sir Lancelot rode a white horse*'.

A. Radford argue that we cannot simply drop the modifier 'cognitive' and say that these two lexemes are synonyms because "there are sentential contexts where their appearance, while not affecting the truth value of the containing sentence, certainly affects its acceptability".

¹ Morreall J. (1976) The Non-synonyms of 'Kill and Cause to Die: Linguistic Inquiry.- Vol.7. 1976.-P. 516-519.

² Radford A. et al. Linguistics: An Introduction.- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.-p.198.

J. Hurford and B. Heasley¹ approach synonymy differently. They mention that "examples of perfect synonymy are hard to find, perhaps because there is little point in a dialect having two predicates with exactly the same sense". In fact, their definition of synonymy requires identity of sense. This is a stricter definition than is sometimes given: sometimes synonymy is defined as similarity of meaning, a definition which is vaguer than theirs. Clearly the notions of synonymy and sense are interdependent. J. Hurford and B. Heasley point out that "in considering the sense of a word, we abstract away from any stylistic, social, or dialectal associations the word may have". They concentrate on what has been called the cognitive or conceptual meaning of a word.

J. Hurford and B. Heasley add that "synonymy is a relation between predicates, and not between senses (i.e., word forms). A word may have many different senses; each distinct sense of a word is a predicate". They distinguish between predicates by giving them subscript numbers. For example, *hide1* could be the intransitive verb, as in *let's hide from Mummy*; *hide2* could be the transitive verb, as in *Hide your sweeties under the pillow*; and *hide3* could be a noun, as in *We watched the birds from a hide*. The sentence *The thief tried to hide the evidence*, for example, makes it clear that one is dealing with the predicate *hide2* (the transitive verb). *Hide2* is a synonym of *conceal*.

K. Allan² notices the importance of *connotations* that result from the conventional use of certain cognitive synonyms in literary texts. To clarify her point, she gives the lexical items *steed* and *horse* as examples of cognitive synonyms that differ in their connotative meaning. On the one hand, *steed* connotes a noble animal ridden on festive occasions, or ridden to war in old days; on the other hand, *horse* connotes nothing in particular, for it is the unmarked form.

¹ Hurford J. and B. Heasley. *Semantics: A Coursebook*.-Cambridge:Cambridge University Press,1983.-p.102.

² Allan K. *Linguistic Meaning*.-London: Routledge and Kegan Paul,1986.-p.194.

P. Newmark¹ believes that synonyms are sometimes used to secure the cohesion of the text. Unlike A. Shunnaq², P. Newmark advises translators to use componential analysis in translating some synonymous items. The process depends on splitting up the various senses of a word into sense-components. P. Newmark investigates some synonyms such as *bawdy*, *ribald*, *lewd*, etc. According to P. Newmark, the procedures of componential analysis can help translators "to distinguish the meaning of two collocated synonyms". P. Newmark³ states that "when synonyms are coupled by an innovative writer, the translator has to attempt a parallel coupling".

This review of relevant literature sheds some light on synonymy as a semantic notion and a problem in translation. It summarizes and evaluates the views of some linguists and semanticists regarding the existence of synonymy in natural languages. This review also shows that few linguists have touched upon synonymy in translation.

In this part of research work we will try to analyze synonyms translated from English into Uzbek. As an analyzing source we chose "THE ANT AND THE GRASSHOPPER" by William Somerset Maugham. Translation was done by Abror Rakhimov. Translating from foreign language in to native language is more difficult than translating from native in to foreign language. Translator should dig all meanings of each word, choose suitable one and give it to the reader as in the source text. Using synonyms in short stories make them more lively and interesting. They make reader to draw the whole picture in their mind and to enter in the story, participate in it. Now we will try to analyze synonyms used in the story. In the source story there were used such synonyms:

Store – larder (noun synonyms)

Human – people (noun synonyms)

¹ Newmark P. Approaches to Translation.- Oxford: Pergamon Press,1981.-p.26.

² Shunnaq Abdullah.Functional Repetition in Arabic Realized Through the Use of Word-Strings with Reference to Arabic-English Translation of Political Discourse. Translation.- Vol. XI, No. 1.1992.-P.5-38.

³ Newmark P.A Textbook of Translation.- Herdfordshire: Prentice Hall,1988.-p.120.

Respectable – honorable (adjective synonyms)

Borrow – loan – lend (verb synonyms)

Terribly upset – very much upset (verb synonyms)

Go to prison – be convicted (verb synonyms)

Beautiful – pretty – good looking (adjective synonyms)

To be happy - to be glad (adjective synonyms)

Wear an expression of such a deep gloom- the burden of the whole world set on one's shoulders (phraseological synonyms)

As we see there were a lot of and different synonyms used in the short story. The synonyms given above are cognitive synonyms. They can be not synonyms in all their meaning but in the certain context they are used as cognitive synonyms.

Translation was also done very well. Translator tried to give all meaning in the source text. He tried to find the synonyms as in the source. Nevertheless, the synonyms in the translation were more than in the source:

Don – ozuqa - ovqat- yegulik (noun synonyms)

Berahm- rahmsiz (adjective synonyms)

Bosib-yanchib- ezib (verb synonyms)

Juda g'amgin- juda xafa (adjective synonyms)

Juda yaxshi- yaxshigina (adjective synonyms)

Mablag' - pul (noun synonyms)

Hashamatli- eng qimmat- qimmatbaho (adjective synonyms)

Xushchaqchaq- kayfiyati chog' (adjective synonyms)

Pul sarflamoq- pul sovurmoq (verb synonyms)

Bazm- maishat- kayfu safo (noun synonyms)

Chiroyli- go'zal (adjective synonyms)

Muqarrar- turgan gap (adjective synonyms)

Fig'oni falakka chiqdi- g'azabdan bo'g'riqdi- jahli chiqdi ()

Bahtli hayot kechirdi- davron surdi (phraseological synonyms)

Jo'nab ketmoq- tark etmoq (verb synonyms)

Ko'ngil yozish- hordiq chiqarish- dam olish (verb synonyms)

As we see in translation were used more synonyms. It means that there are a lot of synonyms of one word in Uzbek language. But the synonyms *borrow-lend-loan* were given with one word “*qarz*”:

They shook their heads and asked what would happen when his money was spent. They soon found out: he borrowed. He was charming and unscrupulous. I have never met anyone to whom it was more difficult to refuse a loan. (The ant and the grasshopper. William Somerset Maugham. Collected Short Stories.)

“Puli tugagach, u qanday qilarkin?” - degan savol qiynardi ularni. Tez orada savolga javob topildi. Puli tugagach u do'stlaridan qarz oldi. Uning oladigan qarzi unchalik ko'p bo'lmagani uchun do'stlari odatda qarzni so'rab ham o'tirishmasdi. (Chumoli bilan chigirtka. Abror Rakhimov.)

The next synonym *store* and *larder* (ombor- zapas) were translated as *don-ozuqa- ovqat- egulik* (food- meal- nourishment). Because in Uzbek language there is no one word expressing store or larder. When Uzbek people want to mean store they use expression to gather nourishment (*ozuqa g'amlamoq*)(Chumoli bilan chigirtka. Abror Rakhimov).

The ant spends laborious summer gathering its winter store. Winter comes and ant is comfortably provided for, but the grasshopper has an empty larder. - *Chumoli yoz bo'yi tinimsiz mehnat qiladi. U har kuni uyiga don tashiydi. Yoz ohiriga borib u qishga yetarli ozuqa g'amlab qo'yadi. Keyin qish keladi chigirtkaning ovqati bo'lmaydi* (The ant and the grasshopper. William Somerset Maugham. Collected Short Stories).

The word combination “*putting foot on it*” is translated with two cognitive synonyms to give more expressive meaning:

My sympathies were with grasshopper and for some time I never saw an ant without putting my foot on it. - *Men qayerda chumolini ko'rsam uni bosib-yanchib, ezib o'tib ketadigan bo'ldim.*

Respectable and *honorable* are adjective synonyms. *Respectable* was used three times and it was used to describe people: *respectable people- yaxshi*

oila; George was respectable- Jorj juda obro'-etiborli edi; respectable lawyer-in translation this sentence was omitted. Honorable was used with career: honorable career- yaxshigina biznes (The ant and the grasshopper. William Somerset Maugham. Collected Short Stories) .

In the short story were also used cognitive synonyms: *terribly upset- very much upset:*

George was terribly upset. – Jorj juda hafa bo'ldi.; Poor George! I sympathized with him. I wondered now as I sat down beside him what infamous thing Tom had done. George was evidently very much upset. - Men stulga o'tirdim. Bechora Jorj. Unga ichim achishib ketdi. –Bu gal nima bo'libdi?-so'radim undan. Here in translation cognitive synonym was omitted but using other expressions made the meaning complete.

Pretty- beautiful- good looking adjective synonyms are translated with Uzbek cognitive synonyms go'zal- chiroyli:

For twenty years Tom raced and gambled, philandered with the prettiest girls, danced, ate in the most expensive restaurants, and dressed beautifully. -Shunday qilib yigirma yil davomida Tom bahtli hayot kechirdi. Yigirma yil davomida u go'zal ayollar davrasida davron surdi (The ant and the grasshopper. William Somerset Maugham. Collected Short Stories).

In translation “*bahtli hayot kechirdi- davron surdi*” cognitive synonyms were used. But the one part of the sentence was omitted: *danced, ate in the most expensive restaurants, and dressed beautifully*. But it was translated with one expression “*davron surdi*”- includes all meanings of omitted expressions.

It was all very well when Tom was young and good-looking. – U yosh va chiroyliligida do'st orttirishi oson edi (The ant and the grasshopper. William Somerset Maugham. Collected Short Stories).

In the example below one expression in source text was translated with two cognitive synonym words:

George was evidently very much upset. George could hardly bring himself to speak.- Jorj g'azabdan bo'g'riqib ketdi. Uning shunchalik jahli chiqqandiki,

hatto gapirolmay qoldi. In translation the meaning was exaggerated but it helps to draw the real position of George.

The description of George's mood was given in source text very emotive: *I never saw anyone wear an expression of such a deep gloom. He was staring into the space. He looked as though the burden of the whole word sat on his shoulder.- U stolda yolg'iz o'tirar va juda g'amgin ko'rinardi* (Chumoli bilan chigirtka. Abror Rakhimov). The meaning was weakened. But in the source text, in this part it was used two types of synonyms: *Look- see- stare; the burden of the whole word sat on his shoulder- wear an expression of such a deep gloom*.

In this part of our research work we tried to analyze cognitive synonyms on the source text comparing it with translation. Summing up we want to say that the whole meaning of the source text and the translation is similar but not identical. Translator tried to give the meaning of the short story and tried to give the reader what the author wanted to say. Some part he generalized and in some he narrowed the meaning. But he used cognitive synonyms in the right way. He tried to give Uzbek readers the short story more understandable, and he used some expression and generalized, and omitted some expression that he thought is not so important.

3.2. Problems in translating synonyms from Uzbek into English

In the scientific work, we will try to keep track of consistent methods and ways of achieving adequacy based on the translation of cognitive synonyms. Before starting analyzing the translation of cognitive synonym words and word combinations, we look into terms which will be used during scientific explanation of one or another translating term.

First term, widespread in the literature on translating, is adequate translation. Adequate translation, following V. N. Komissarov, is understood as "... a translation that meets the pragmatic tasks of translating act the most possible to achieve the goal of equivalence level, while preventing the rule breaking and usage of translating language, following the genre-stylistic

requirements to texts of given type and conformity to conventional norms of translation. In loose definition, adequate translation is a “right” translation”¹.

There are other important terms for the theory of translation such as “pragmatic task”, “translating act”, “equivalence level”, “norm”, “customary usage”, “translating language”, “genre-stylistic requirements to texts”, “texts of given type” and “conformity with conventional norms of translation”.

In total, abovementioned terms determine the adequate level of translation. We continue with the term “texts of given type”. In our case, they are literary texts. “No matter from which point of view we look at translation today, on the fair observation by I. S. Alekseeva², we cannot manage without the term “text””.

It is well known that the text type implies the information forms in the text. Based on the information form, functional styles and equivalency of transferring this information in the translation are distinguished. According to I. S. Alekseeva, there following forms of information: cognitive, operative, emotional and aesthetic. I. R. Galperin³ distinguished three forms of information in text.

Peculiarities of literary text require the information of emotional and aesthetic nature where all linguistic units that are used as stylistic method gain special meaning. Translator’s task is, in this case, total clear that is adequately pass the information without breaking the language norms and usage of translating language, more clearly, in conformity with conventional norms of the translation. The adequacy level defines the skillfulness of the translator. As mentioned above, the translation was right. Judging from kept linguistic units, one can track the equivalency level as well. In this case, it is necessary to speak about linguistic conformity in translation; translated word corresponds with word, word combinations correspond with word combinations and so forth. Translating act or translating process ends with the representation of translation

¹ Комиссаров В. Н.- Теория перевода: лингвистические аспекты.- Москва :Высшая школа,1990.-ст.246.

² Алексеева И. С. Текст и перевод: Вопросы теории. -Москва: Международное отношение.-ст.50-58.

³ Гальперин И. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования.- Москва:Наука,1981.

product called translated text or work of certain author. As mentioned before, we are speaking about literary text. According to the views of specialist on Germanic studies and stylistics, I. R. Galperin¹, literary style is divided into three subdivisions: prose, poetry and drama. We are examining and discussing literary prose text as other forms of literary text, for instance poetry has its specific peculiarity connected with strophe, rhythm, rhythmic, euphony and so on.

As to translating units, any language unit can be so according to the levels/aspects theory of equivalency (A. D. Shveyser, L. S. Barkhudarov, V. N. Komissarov). Synonyms as lexical unit or of more exactly lexical semantic level can be considered as a translation unit in this level and all operations and transformations related to translation accordingly have direct relationship to the translation of synonyms. In order to translate properly or adequately, translator should know their types or genre-stylistic differences and specific peculiarities. Systematic approach provides more serious, in terms of science, study semantics of lexical units and facilitates more exact understanding of their content. Moreover, study of lexical units in their systematic conditionality is carried out not only inside various lexical groups but also semantic relationships between words that belong to different groups are studied; also types of these relationships and relationships between synonyms are studied. The phenomenon of synonymy includes all semantic groups of words, all levels of the language. In overwhelming majority works, synonymy is considered separately as not connected to each other. However, several authors highlight the necessity of considering these phenomena as interrelated. The study of cognitive synonyms helps deeper understanding of language's nature, facilitates deeper penetration into the essence of language phenomenon. This and other features of synonyms should be considered by translator during the translation process. Synonymy is a universal language phenomenon, but they differ from language to language. Synonyms, possessing common semantic component – invariant meaning, are

¹ Гальперин И. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. -Москва:Наука,1981.

set off against, at least one more component which is available in one synonym but absent in another. Different synonyms, depending on their type in language, carry out different roles. For instance, this is about stylistic synonyms. Besides abovementioned type of stylistic synonyms, there are style and conceptual (ideographic).

Stylistic synonyms frequently appear in the language of belles-lettres. In the language of poetry and prose, “common” synonyms can be met. But along with these “common” synonyms, sometimes there are special, “poetical” synonyms in belles-lettres. Double correlated stylistic synonyms – with language features and with literary intention of an author – define the difference between stylistic synonyms from commonly used ones.

Stylistic synonyms are acknowledged as helping to “artist to convey common ideal intention of the work; they happen to be an important link in the chain of other creative methods of an author”. According to L. I. Barannikova¹, they can be called “emotional-expressive synonyms”. Emotional-expressive hue of synonyms is very peculiar in different languages and often creates difficulties for translation.

Abovementioned ideographic and stylistic synonyms include two the biggest groups of synonyms in English language. Ideographic synonyms such as power-force-energy are correlated with one conception and belong to one – neutral-stylistic sphere; stylistic synonyms belong to different stylistic sphere: expire-die-kick the bucket.

For every pair of synonyms, convergence and divergence of meanings in components that is semantic for ideographic synonyms and stylistic for non-ideographic are important.

So, synonyms can be distinguished by non-stylistic component of meaning: look-glance-watch; stylistic component of meaning: expire-die; and,

¹ Баранников Л. В. Введение в языкознание. -Саратов: н.а.1973.-ст.126.

finally, by both components at the same time, forming “double dimension” – semantic and stylistic: visage-puss-mug.

Considering the fact that not every semantic word differentiation is stylistic: *excellent-splendid*, but every stylistic differentiation is certainly semantic: *face-puss*, *face-mug*, it is possible, according to V. A. Zveginsev, to affirm that semantic basis of stylistic synonyms fundamentally does not differ from similar basis of ideographic synonyms because both stylistic and semantic component have the same function – sense distinctive.

According to one standpoint, ideographic synonyms are neutral in stylistics (*excellent-splendid*) compared to stylistics (*stunning-topping*); according to another point of view, ideographic synonyms are always homogeneous stylistically whereas stylistic ones – heterogeneous; it means, according to this standpoint, ideographic synonyms (*excellent-splendid*) and (*stunning-topping*) will be a pair as they are tinged stylistically; these words will be synonyms if they are put in one synonymic row – *excellent-splendid-stunning-topping*. According to V. A. Zveginsev¹, there are no non-stylistic synonyms but there are stylistically homogeneous (ideographic) synonyms and stylistically heterogeneous (stylistic), and here stylistic synonyms possess common “ideographic potential”.

There are two big classes of synonyms – common language and stylistic synonyms. In turn, there are conceptual and style synonyms under common language synonyms. Between these types of synonyms, there is not only difference, but also constant and comprehensive interrelationship.

Abovementioned is related to vocabulary or lexical-semantic level in tote. Theoretically, the problem in translation equivalency precedes the adequate translation. Literary text wherein synonym words or word combinations are used will be considered and translated within the framework of such style, genre and all that follows the “translation consequences”. Adequacy here is understood to

¹ Звегинцев В. А. Теоретическая и прикладная лингвистика. - Москва, 1968.- ст.139.

the widest extent of this word including adequacy of the style, genre, text, sentences, word combinations, words, morphemes and so on. They are compulsory components of an adequate translation, original text from one language to another regardless of their closeness or affinity. During translation, adequacy is also achieved through proper selection of stylistic methods and words, including synonymic, stylistic methods of different level used in the original text. In order to keep the features of an original text it is necessary to keep communicative relevance of author's intention in text or artistic work. Main and important question of functional styles is their pragmatic orientation or aspect communication.

Translation of synonyms and synonymic combinations is directed to keep the stylistic peculiarity of an original text. Here, different translating transformations are used (replacement, omission, addition and others) in order to provide equivalency in lexical and lexical-semantic levels and in the final analysis to reach higher level of adequacy. This can be shown in the example of English synonymic words – *disease, illness, sickness, malady* which correspond to “*kasallik*”, “*betoblik*”, “*bemorlik*”, “*dard*”. To select appropriate translation for these synonymic words either context or word combination of these words are necessary. Compatibility or valence or synonymic words of English and Uzbek languages is not the same. While translating between these two languages, one should consider precisely these features of synonyms. Compatibility plays big role in selecting variants for translating synonyms. This gives an opportunity to find equivalent synonyms and choose corresponding lexical stratum (neutral, verbal and literary) which, in turn, provides the adequacy of a whole statement which is a goal of every translation of any level and style.

Synonyms are widely used in Uzbek poems as belles-lettres. But one can come across different problems in translating them into English. Now we would like to analyze some Uzbek poems by Cho'lpon and Oybek translated by Begoyim Kholbekova.

Na'matak

Oybek

Nafis chayqaladi bir tup na'matak
 Yuksakda, shamolning belanchagida,
 Quyoshga *ko'tarib* bir savat oq *gul*,
 Viqor-la o'shshaygan qoya labida,
Nafis chayqaladi bir tup na'matak...

Mayin raqsiga hech qoniqmas ko'ngil,
 Vahshiy toshlarga ham u berar fusun.
 So'nmaydi *yu*zida yorqin tabassum,
Yanoqlarin tutib oltin bo'sa-chun,
 Quyoshga *tutadi* bir savat oq *gul*!

Poyida yig'laydi kumush qor yum-yum...
Nafis chayqaladi bir tup na'matak...
 Shamol injularin separ chashmadek
 Boshida bir savat oq yulduz-*chechak*,
Nozik salomlari naqadar *ma'sum*!

Tog'lar havosining firuzasidan
Mayin tovlanadi butun niholi.
 Vahshiy qoyalarning ajib ijodi:
 Yuksakda raqs etar bir tup na'matak,
 Quyoshga bir savat *gul* tutib hursand!¹

Translation:

The rosehip

Begoyim Xolbekiva

Dances *gently* a bush of rosehip

¹Xolbekova B. Muhabbat muhri.-Toshkent.O'zbekiston Milliy kutubxonsi nashriyoti,2011.-p. 44.

The wind sways it on the hill,
 A basket of white flowers
 Strive for the sun with great will.
 Dances *gently* a bush of rosehip...

How can I be satisfied with its dance,
 Even stones seem attractive with it.
 Smiles glitter on its bright *face*,
Cheeks are eager to get golden gift-
 Strives for the sun, for a kiss by chance!

Silver snows melting under its feet...
 Dances *gently* a bush of rosehip...
 A basket of white stars on its head
 Swing in the breeze with *calmly* leap,
 What a nice greeting, what a *virgin* fit!

In the fresh air of high mountain
Tenderly shines the young bough still.
 Striking creature of wild rocks-
 A bush of rosehips dances on the hill,
 Happily presenting its bounty!¹

In Uzbek poem *nafis-mayin-nozik-ma'sum* ; *ko'tarib-tutib*; *yuz- yanoq*; *gul-chechak* synonyms were used.

Nafis-mayin-nozik-ma'sum – these 4 words have different vocabulary meaning, but in the poem they have the same cognitive meaning. They are used to describe very gentle action, to give fragile expression to the poem. Repeating

¹Xolbekova B. Muhabbat muhri.-Toshkent.O'zbekiston Milliy kutubxonsi nashriyoti,2011.-p.45.

and using different cognitive synonym words made the poem very emotive and expressive. In target text *nafis-mayin-nozik-ma'sum* are translated as *gently-tenderly-calmly-virgin*. This translation is not word by word translation, and the translator chose very interesting and cognitively correct words. The main aim was well done. *Gently-tenderly-calmly-virgin* these adverbs are not synonyms out of the context but in certain poem they are used to draw emotive picture by the translator's pencil.

In translation *gently-tenderly-calmly-virgin; face-cheeks* synonyms were used. As we see in translation there are less synonym words were used, and the meaning of the poem weakened. *Gently-tenderly-calmly-virgin; face-cheeks* these words are not absolute synonyms, we can not use them in different context as synonyms. But in this poem they are cognitive synonyms. Usage of cognitive synonyms makes reader to hear the inner voice of poor girl, to be sorry for her sadness.

The next poem which we want to analyze is "Men va boshqalar" (said by Uzbek girl) by Chulpan.

Men va boshqalar

Kulgan boshqalardir, yig'lagan menman,
O'ynagan boshqalar, ingragan menman.
 Erk ertaklarin *eshitgan* boshqa,
 Qullik *qoshig'ini tinglagan* menman...

Boshqada qanot bor, ko'kda uchadir,
 Shohlarga qo'nadir, bog'da yayraydir.
 So'zlari sadafdek, tovushi naydek,
 Kuyini har yerda elga sayraydir.

Menda-da qanot bor, lekin bog'langan...
 Bog' yo'qdir, shox yo'qdir, qalin devor bor.
 So'zlari sadafdek, tovushi naydek,

Kuyim bor, uni-da devorlar *tinglar*...

Erkin boshqalardir, qamalgan menman,
Hayvon qatorida sanalgan menman¹.

Translation:

Me and others (words of an uzbek girl)

Others *laugh, in tears* I am,

They *play games, in sorrow* I am.

Others *listen to* the tales of freedom,

The slavery *songs listening* I am ...

Others have got wings, fly in the sky,

They've *fun* in gardens here and there.

Their words like pearls, sounds clear,

They can sing their *song* everywhere.

I've got wings too, but it's fastened...

There're no gardens, there's a thick wall.

My *songs* like pearls, they're resonant,

But the only walls *listen to* them all...

Others are free, prisoner I am,

As an animal regardless I am².

This poem by Chulpan is so exiting, when you read it you will tremble and you will get sorry for that girl. She feels herself alone and as if she is fastened and kept in prison. In original text many synonym words are used:

¹ Xolbekova B. Muhabbat muhri.-Toshkent.O'zbekiston Milliy kutubxonsi nashriyoti,2011.-p.42.

² Xolbekova B. Muhabbat muhri.-Toshkent.O'zbekiston Milliy kutubxonsi nashriyoti,2011.-p.43.

Kulgan- o'ynagan- yayragan ; yig'lagan- ingragan; eshitgan- tinglagan; qo'shiq- kuy;

“*Kulgan- o'ynagan- yayragan*” these words are not synonyms (kulgan- smiling; o'ynagan-dancing/playing; yayragan- amusing), but according to the context they are contextual or cognitive synonyms. Reading the poem reader will cognize the same meaning and the whole picture will appear in his mind. In other texts we can not change the word “kulgan” with the word “o'ynagan” as they are not synonyms and they have completely different meaning.

To translate these word and giving the same expression and emotions as poet gave translator should read the text for several times, analyze it in own language, then to translate them. In the first line translator give the word “kulgan” as “lough”, in the second line the synonym word “o'ynagan” is given as “play games”- which we think was not so correctly chosen and cognitive meaning was omitted. By the word combination “o'ynagan boshqalar” poet meant that others are having fun, relaxing. Translator has taken only dictionary meaning by not knowing the knowledge on cognitive synonyms. We think if we translate like “they are amusing” the meaning will be better understandable to the reader.

Amusing – divert; occupy pleasantly; cause to laugh or smile.¹

“*Eshitgan – tinglagan*” (listen-hear) are synonyms. “Eshitgan” is used in everyday life in speech, in literary texts... But “tingla” is not widely used in oral speech, that's why they can not be absolute synonyms, they are cognitive synonyms. In the translation both of them is given like “listen”. Synonym word to listen is to hear. These two words are also cognitive synonyms. But not in all contexts we can use them interchangeable. Their meaning is not identical in all context of use.

Hear- perceive by ear; listen to; try (case); heed; perceive sound; learn.

Listen- try to hear; attend to.

¹ Harper Collins Webster's dictionary .-Harper Collin's Publisher Limited. New York,-2003.

Translator used *listen to* and *listening* to translate these two cognitive synonyms as *hear* is not suitable in this context. To listen to music, to the tale ... to listen to something. But to hear the sound, noise... Here we can see that words *hear* and *listen* have one common meaning, others meanings are different. That's why they are cognitive synonyms. We can not use them interchangeable in all contexts.

“Kuy – qo’shiq” these two words have different vocabulary meaning (music- song). But in the contexts they full fill each other and made the whole same meaning.

In 1974 the American poet James Merrill wrote a poem, "Lost in Translation", which in part explores this idea. The question was also discussed in Douglas Hofstadter's 1997 book, *Le Ton beau de Marot*; he argues that a good translation of a poem must convey as much as possible of not only its literal meaning but also its form and structure.

Analyzing cognitive synonyms in the source poem and the translation we understood that translating poem is not an easy job. It is not the same with translating belles-letters text. Finding equivalent of the word in translation and using them in the right place in a right way is very hard job.

Frequently, it has been maintained that it is not possible for anyone to convey from one language into another the thoughts, emotions, style and form of poem. Yet the fact remains that the art of translation has been made practical everywhere in the world. Through this art many of the literary achievements of one country have found a hearing in other countries. People have been able to share the experiences and emotions expressed in foreign works.

Poetry presents special challenges to translators, given the importance of a text's formal aspects, in addition to its content. In his influential 1959 paper "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation", the Russian-born linguist and semiotician Roman Jakobson went so far as to declare that "poetry by definition [is] untranslatable". Robert Frost was equally pessimistic: "Poetry is that which is lost in translations."

Conclusion of the third chapter

This chapter is analyzing part of the research work. Chapter consists of two parts. The materials of the research are Chulpan's poem "Men va boshqalar", Translation "Me and others" was done by Begoyim Xolbekova; Oybek's poem "Na'matak", translation was done by Begoyim Xolbekova; "The ant and grasshopper" was written by William Somerset Maugham. The translator of the fables is Abror Rakhimov.

In the first part cognitive synonyms in the fables "The ant and grasshopper" and in its translation "Chumali va chigirtka" were analyzed. In translation were used more synonyms. It means that there are a lot of synonyms of one word in Uzbek language. But the synonyms *borrow- lend-loan* were given with one word "*qarz*":

The next synonym *store* and *larder* (ombor- zapas) were translated as *don-ozuqa- ovqat- egulik* (food- meal- nourishment). Because in Uzbek language there is no one word expressing store or larder. When Uzbek people want to mean store they use expression to gather nourishment (*ozuqa g'amlamoq*).

In this part of our research work we tried to analyze cognitive synonyms on the source text comparing it with translation. Summing up we want to say that the whole meaning of the source text and the translation is similar but not identical. Translator tried to give the meaning of the short story and tried to give the reader what the author wanted to say. Some part he generalized and in some he narrowed the meaning. But he used cognitive synonyms in the right way. He tried to give Uzbek readers the short story more understandable, and he used some expression and generalized, and omitted some expression that he thought is not so important.

In the second part of the chapter cognitive synonyms in Chulpan's poem "Men va boshqalar", Translation "Me and others" was done by Begoyim Xolbekova; Oybek's poem "Na'matak", translation was done by Begoyim Xolbekova were analyzed.

Analyzing cognitive synonyms in the source poem and the translation we understood that translating poem is not an easy job. It is not the same with translating belles-letters text. Finding equivalent of the word in translation and using them in the right place in a right way is very hard job.

Frequently, it has been maintained that it is not possible for anyone to convey from one language into another the thoughts, emotions, style and form of poem. But if translator has enough knowledge he could translate even the poem. But he should pay attention to the meaning of the words used in the source. We analyzed cognitive synonyms in the translation and tried to give our versions too. And we hope it will help to the translators who want to translate poetry.

CONCLUSION

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. Synonymy is the type of paradigmatic relationships and is seen as sameness of meaning. There are numerous approaches with numerous definitions of synonymy and types of synonyms, because there are different ways in which synonyms may differ.

This research work analyses synonymy from the perspective of cognitive linguistics. This concept is held by many scholars, among them F. R. Palmer, D. Cruse, S. Ullman, M. Farghal, J. Lyons, G. Leech, M. Murphy, D. Bolinger and others. Each of them gave different types of synonyms.

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.

D. Cruse, P. Newmark, S. Ullmann, and others, notice that synonymy in language has different functions. Synonyms may be used

- to avoid repetition
- to secure cohesion
- to expand the text in the interest of redundancy
- to provide additional comment about the topic (Palestine is a small country-it is the Holy Land')
- to avoid poor and monotonous style.

S. Ullmann¹ points out some of the reasons behind the uses of synonymy:

1. People like to hear good words in succession which causes a flow of synonyms.
2. Poets use synonyms motivated by the exigencies of meter.
3. A collocation of synonyms could produce a contrast effect either serious or humorous.
4. Synonymy is used to correct one's use of words when one wishes to replace a word by a more appropriate/ exact one.
5. When a poet tries to formulate his thoughts and ideas, he may put in his text all the various synonyms that come to his mind.

The materials of the research are Chulpan's poem "Men va boshqalar", Translation "Me and others" was done by Begoyim Xolbekova; Oybek's poem "Na'matak", translation was done by Begoyim Xolbekova; "The ant and grasshopper" was written by William Somerset Maugham. The translator of the fables is Abror Rakhimov.

It was found out that translator should not only translate word by word not knowing the cognitive meaning of it, it will ruin the meaning of the source text. Translator should not only translate the words, he should translate the meaning of the source text and should give all emotions that author wanted to give. For example the fables "The ant and grasshopper" was not translated word by word. Some expressions and even some sentences were dropped. But translator translated in the right, clear and interesting way. He made the fables more understandable for Uzbek reader. In the source text it was used cognitive synonym words *borrow- lend-loan* were given with one word "qarz". And it was right because in Uzbek language we have no cognitive synonym of the word "qarz", and using it several times wasn't made the translation weak.

¹ Ullmann S.-Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning.-Basil Blackwell. Oxford:1962.-p.153.

Translating poem is more difficult, and finding synonyms to all word which are given in the source poem is the hardest one. Because not only meaning and the sound also should be close to the source text. As Begoyim Kholbekova is poet, she translated the poems very beautiful, but using some word's first meaning was little bit wrong in our opinion. For example :

“Kulgan- o’ynagan- yayragan” these words are not synonyms (kulgan-smiling; o’ynagan-dancing/playing; yayragan- amusing), but according to the context they are contextual or cognitive synonyms. Reading the poem reader will cognize the same meaning and the whole picture will appear in his mind. In other texts we can not change the word “kulgan” with the word “o’ynagan” as they are not synonyms and they have completely different meaning.

To translate these word and giving the same expression and emotions as poet gave translator should read the text for several times, analyze it in own language, then to translate them. In the first line translator give the word “kulgan” as “lough”, in the second line the synonym word “o’ynagan” is given as “play games”- which we think was not so correctly chosen and cognitive meaning was omitted. By the word combination “o’ynagan boshqalar” poet meant that others are having fun, relaxing. Translator has taken only dictionary meaning by not knowing the knowledge on cognitive synonyms. We think if we translate like “they are amusing” the meaning will be better understandable to the reader.

Amusing – divert; occupy pleasantly; cause to laugh or smile.¹

“Eshitgan – tinglagan” (listen-hear) are synonyms. “Eshitgan” is used in everyday life in speech, in literary texts... But “tingla” is not widely used in oral speech, that’s why they can not be absolute synonyms, they are cognitive synonyms. In the translation both of them is given like “listen”. Synonym word to listen is to hear. These two words are also cognitive

¹ Harper Collins Webster’s dictionary .-Harper Collin’s Publisher Limited. New York,-2003.

synonyms. But not in all contexts we can use them interchangeable. Their meaning is not identical in all context of use.

Hear- perceive by ear; listen to; try (case); heed; perceive sound; learn.

Listen- try to hear; attend to.

Translator used *listen to* and *listening* to translate these two cognitive synonyms as hear is not suitable in this context. To listen to music, to the tale ... to listen to something. But to hear the sound, noise... Here we can see that words hear and listen have one common meaning, others meanings are different. That's why they are cognitive synonyms. We can not use them interchangeable in all contexts.

This research work was done to make the translation more emotive and to give all thoughts that author wanted to give to the readers. Researching and analyzing cognitive synonyms was very interesting and it took us two years and we hope and we believe that we achieve the goal.

THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Каримов И.А Обеспечение приоритета интересов человека
– главная цель всех проводимых реформ и
преобразований// По пути модернизации
страны и устойчивого развития экономики.-
Т.16–Т.:«Узбекистан»,2008.
2. Baker M. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.
London: Routledge,1998.
3. Baldiger K. Semantic Theory: Towards a Modern
Semantics.Oxford: Basil, Blackwell.1980.
4. Barnstone W. Poetics of Translation. Yale: Yale University
Press, 1993.
5. Bassnett.McGuire S., Translation Studies. NY: Methuen & Co.
Ltd.1980.
6. Cooper D. Philosophy and the Nature of Language.
England: Longman, 1979.
7. Cruse D. Lexical Semantics. Cambridge-Cambridge
University Press, 1986.
8. Cruse D. Herbert Ernst Wiegand, Semantics and
Lexicography:Selected Studies//International
Journal of Lexicography. Vol.14,No.2. 2001.
9. Farghal M. Vocabulary Development and Lexical Relations:
ACourse Book. Irbid (Jordan)- Dar Al-Hilal for
Translation,1998.
10. Foder J. Semantics: Theories of Meaning in Generative
Grammar. Massachusetts: Harvard University
Press,1980.

11. Hudson. Synonyms and Syntax//Journal of Linguistics, Sep.1996. Vol. 32, No.2.
12. Hummer Christiane. A Corpus Based Approach to Near Synonymy of German Multi-Word. Germany:Berlin Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004.
13. Hurford J. and B. Semantics: A Coursebook. Cambridge: Heasley. Cambridge University Press,1983.
14. Jackson H. Words and Their Meaning. London: Longman, 1988.
15. Jiwei C. Synonymy and Polysemy. *Lingua* 72.1987.
16. Kachru Yale. Towards Defining the Notion‘Equivalence’ in Contrastive Analysis.TESL5. 1980.
17. Katz J. Semantic Theory. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
18. Levinson Stephen. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1983.
19. Lyons J. Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. Cambridge-Cambridge University Press, 1969.
20. Lyons J. Semantics. Cambridge-Cambridge University Press, 1977.
21. Lyons J. Language and Linguistics. Cambridge-Cambridge University Press,1981.
22. Lyons J. Linguistic-Semantics//An introduction. Cambridge-Cambridge University Press, 1995.
23. Newmark P. Approaches to Translation. Oxford- pergamon, 1981.
24. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. Herdfordshire-Prentice Hall,1988.

25. Nida E. and Taber C. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Netherlands- E.J. Brill, 1969.
26. Nida E. Toward a Science of Translation. Leiden.E.J. Briu-Netherlands, 1964.
27. Nida E. Componential Analysis.The Hague-Mouton,1975.
28. Odell S. Periphrastic Criteria for Synonymy and Ambiguity//Theoretical Linguistics. Vol.11, No. 1/2.1984. 115-125.
29. Palmer F. R. Semantics. Cambridge-Cambridge University Press,1981.
30. Persson G. Meanings, Models and Metaphors: A Study in Lexical Semantics in English. Stockholm: Acta Universitatis Umensis,1990.
31. Quine W.V.O. Two Dogmas of Empiricism// Philosophical Review, 1951.
32. Radford A. Linguistics: An Introduction. Cambridge-Cambridge University Press,1999.
33. Reiter E. Contextual Influences on Near-Synonyms Choice. Computational linguistics. Vol.28. 2004.
34. Sinclair J. Corpus Concordance Collocation. Oxford: OUP,1991.
35. Shakespeare W. Macbeth. Herdfordshire- Clays Ltd,1992.
36. Shunnaq A. Issues in Translation. Irbid(Jordan)- Irbid National University and Jordanian Translators' Association,1998
37. Ullmaan S. Semantics//An Introduction to the Science of Meaning. Basil Blackwell-Oxford,1962.

38. Ullmaan S. Meaning and Style//Collected Papers. Oxford: Basil-Blackwell,1973.
39. Wierzbicka A. Lingua Mentalis//the Semantics of Natural Language. Sydney/New York- Academic Press, 1980.
40. Yule G. The Study of Language. Cambridge-The University Press,1998.
41. Abayev V.I. Synonyms and their Semantical Features T. O'qituvchi, 1981.
42. Buranov A. Muminov J. Readings on Modern English Lexicology T. O'qituvchi, 1985.
43. Odilova G., Mahmudova U. O'zbek tarjimonlari va badiiy tarjimalar.Toshkent.Yangi asr alodi.2012.
44. Otaboyev A. Yomg'ir.Toshkent.Akademanshr,2014.
45. Xolbekova B. Muhabbat muhri.Toshkent.O'zbekiston Milliy kutubxonsi nashriyoti,2011.
46. Алексеева И. С. Текст и перевод: Вопросы теории. -Москва: Международное отношение.
47. Баранников Л. В. Введение в языкознание. -Саратов: н.а.1973.
48. Гальперин И. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. -Москва:Наука,1981.
49. Звегинцев В. А. Теоретическая и прикладная лингвистика. - Москва, 1968.
50. Комиссаров В. Н. Теория перевода: лингвистические аспекты. - Москва :Высшая школа,1990.

THE LIST OF USED DICTIONARIES

51. Bloomsbury Dictionary of New Words. M. 1996.

52. Merriam-Webster. Webster's New Dictionary of Synonyms; a Dictionary of Discriminated Synonyms with Antonyms and Analogous and Contrasted Words. Springfield, Mass., U.S.A.: Merriam-Webster, 1984.
53. Philip B. Webster's New Dictionary of Synonyms// Merriam-Webster, Springfield, MA., 1984.
54. Shoukhanov A. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. Boston-Houghton Mifflin Company, 1992.

THE LIST OF USED INTERNET RESOURCES

55. WordNet. A Lexical Database for the English Language, 2006. <http://www.cogsci.princeton.edu/~wn>
56. http://www.db.dk/bh/lifeboat_ko/CONCEPTS/synonymy.
57. <http://www.smart.net/~wisdom/mary/mwmpofl.html>.
58. <http://www.accomoda.co.uk/amlsh.htm>.
59. <http://Csd.abdn.ac.UK/~ereiter/papers/inlgo4/pdf>.
60. <http://www.translationdirectory.com/article11.htm>.
61. http://www.fmx.ru/inostrannye_yazyki_i_yazykoznanie/synonyms_an_the_ir_translation.html
62. <http://advancedscience.org/2014/5/066-068.pdf>
63. [http://www.freeessays.com/english/E.Cruse.Quantiitive and Qualitive synonymy.htm](http://www.freeessays.com/english/E.Cruse.Quantiitive_and_Qualitive_synonymy.htm)
64. <http://www.wikipedia.com/English/articles/synonyms.htm>