ЎЗБЕКИСТОН РЕСПУБЛИКАСИ ОЛИЙ ВА ЎРТА МАХСУС ТАЪЛИМ ВАЗИРЛИГИ

ЎЗБЕКИСТОН ДАВЛАТ ЖАҲОН ТИЛЛАРИ УНИВЕРСИТЕТИ

ИНГЛИЗ ТИЛИ ЛЕКСИКОЛОГИЯСИ КАФЕДРАСИ

Ибрагимов Акром Нарзикулович

инглиз тили 2- факультети 419 гуруҳ

ИНГЛИЗ СИНОНИМЛАРИНИНГ СЕМАНТИК ХУСУСИЯТЛАРИ

5120100 – филология ва тиллар ўқитиш (инглиз тили) таълим йўналиши бўйича бакалавр даражасини олиш учун

БИТИРУВ МАЛАКАВИЙ ИШИ

“ҲИМОЯГА ТАВСИЯ ЭТИЛАДИ”

Инглиз тили лексикологияси кафедраси мудири_____ Ж. Матякубов

2016 йил “____” _____

ИЛМИЙ РАҲБАР:

_____ Ф.Муродходжаева

2016 йил “____” _____

Тошкент – 2016

MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

THE UZBEK STATE WORLD LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY

THE ENGLISH LEXICOLOGY DEPARTMENT

Ibragimov Akrom Narziqulovich

English faculty- 2 group- 419

QUALIFICATION PAPER

SEMANTIC PECULIARITIES OF ENGLISH SYNONYMY

5120100-Philology and teaching languages (The English Language) for granting the bachelor's degree

THE QUALIFICATION PAPER IS ADMITTED TO DEFENSE

The head of the English Lexicology Department _____ Matyakubov J.

2016 "____" _____

SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR:
_____F.Murodxodjayeva

2016 "____"_____

TASHKENT-2016

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Conditions of reforming of all education system the question of the world assistance to improvement of quality of scientific theoretical aspect of educational process is especially actually put. Speaking about the 20th anniversary of National Independence President I.A. Karimov has declared in the program speech "Harmoniously development of generation a basis of progress of Uzbekistan": … all of us realize that achievement of great purposes put today before us noble aspirations it is necessary for updating a society". The effect and destines of our reforms carried out in the name of progress and the future results of our intentions are connected with highly skilled, conscious staff the experts who are meeting the requirements of time.[1]

This qualification paper is devoted to the study "Semantic equivalence in synonymy and its representation in various dictionaries", which closely connected with Lexicology and the main branch of Linguistics. The problem of Synonymy is one of the very disputable interesting problems and we may also call it unstoppable problem as it is connected with the language, so that language is a living moving thing.

The topicality of this work caused by several important points. We seem to say that the problem of synonyms is one of the main difficult ones for the English language learners. It can be most clearly seen in the colloquial layer of a language, which, in its turn at high degree is supported by development of modern informational technologies and simplification of alive speech. As a result, a great number of new meanings of one and the same word appear in our vocabulary.

[1] Каримов И.А. Гармонично развитое поколение – основа прогресса Узбекистана. – Т: 1998. - "The further improvement of the system of learning English" стр. 156-168.

The aim of this qualification paper is directed to the point out the main peculiarities of the structure of the Synonymy, their significant role enrich the vocabulary unit system of English Language.

According to this general aim, we put forward the following particular tasks:

1. To show kinds of synonyms and their specific features.
2. To reveal distributional features of the English synonyms.
3. To enlarge source of synonymy.
4. To create combinability of synonyms.
5. To analyze cognitive synonymy.
6. To distribute synonymy and collocative meaning.
7. To exemplify semantic and functional relationship in synonyms.

The method of the qualification paper. In the qualification paper we have used such method as comparative, distributional and contextual analyses methods.

Degree of study. Having said about the linguists studied the material before we can mention that our qualification work was based upon the investigations made by a number of well-known English, Russian and Uzbek lexicologists as A.I.Smirnitsky, B.A. Ilyish, N. Buranov, V.V. Vinogradov, O.Jespersen and some others.

The object of the paper is that the study of synonymy in different spheres from seismological and stylistic points of view gives the opportunity to obtain the language units completely and of course; it provides the expressive usage of the synonyms speech in a right order.

The subject of the qualification paper is Synonymy in Modern English.

Synonymy, being a developing branch of linguistics it requires a special attention of teachers to be adequate to their specialization in English.

Having based upon the actuality of the theme we are able to formulate the general goals of our qualification work.

To study, analyze, and sum up all the possible changes happened in the studied branch of linguistics for the past fifty years.

To teach the problem of synonymy to young English learners.

To demonstrate the significance of the problem for those who want to brush up their English.

To mention all the major of linguists' opinions concerning the subject studied.

The novelty of this qualification paper is that the work studies the problem from the modern positions and analyzes the modern trends appeared in this subject for the last ten years. In particular, the new computer-based meanings of some habitual words were given.

The practical significance of the paper can be concluded in the following items:

The work could serve as a good source of learning English by young teachers at schools and colleges. The lexicologists could find a lot of interesting information for themselves. Those who would like to communicate with the English-speaking people through the Internet will be able to use the up-to-date words with the help of our qualification work.

The theoretical significance of this paper is that the theoretical position can be used in delivering lectures on Lexicology.

The practical value of the qualification paper is that the practical result and conclusion can be used in seminars on Lexicology.

Article written on the base of material of certain qualification paper is included.[2]

[2] To'xtasinov I.M., Muhiddinova H.S., Omonov P.H. "linguistics and the efficient strategies of learning languages"- Toshkent: iqtidorli talabalar ilmiy-amaliy anjuman materiallari, 2015. Стр.276

The structure of the qualification paper consists of introduction, three chapters and conclusion which are followed by the list of used literatures in the course of research.

Each part has its subdivision onto the specific thematically items.

Introduction states the actuality, purposes, tasks and scientific and practical value of the work.

Chapter I illustrates some distinctive peculiarities of synonyms in Modern English, gives essential classifications and criteria of distinguishing synonymy from other aspects of linguistics.

Chapter II demonstrates valuable features of synonyms representation in the language and reveals its important role in the context.

Finally, chapter III, as the main part of the work which includes the theory and practice of the work, showing some significant moments of the usage synonymous combinations in the context, the duality and ways of their correct interpretation.

Conclusion deals with the theoretical and practical results of a paper and presents the results of the investigation linguistic nature of synonyms in English.

CHAPTER I The phenomenon of synonymy in Linguistics

1.1. Synonymy in the system of the language

In this chapter, a broader conception of the notion of synonymy is developed, within which cognitive synonymy takes its place as one type, or degree; and the characteristics of all varieties of synonymy are explored in some detail.

Let us take as the starting point for our discussion two robust semantic intuitions. The first is that certain pairs or groups of lexical items bear a special sort of semantic resemblance to one another. It is customary to call items having this special similarity synonyms; however, the intuitive class of synonyms is by no means exhausted by the notion of cognitive synonymy, as a glance at any dictionary of synonyms will confirm. For instance, the Larousse ***Synonyms*** associates ***nomade, forain*** and ***ambulant*** together in one article as synonyms, but gives a distinct legal definition for each which makes clear that they are in no wise cognitive synonyms. Similarly, the ***Dictionary of English Synonyms*** gives ***kill*** as a synonym of murder (but, interestingly, not vice versa), and *strong* as a synonym of *powerful*: but again, cognitive synonymy is demonstrably absent (an accidental killing is not murder, and a strong car is not necessarily a powerful car). The second institution is that some pairs of synonyms are 'more synonymous' than other pairs: ***settle*** and ***sofa*** are more synonymous than ***die*** and ***kick the bucket***, which in turn are more synonymous than ***boundary*** and ***frontier, breaker*** and ***roller***, or ***brainy*** and ***shrewd***[3]. (The items in each of these pairs occur in close association in ***Roget's Thesaurus;*** however, intuition might suggest that with the

[3] Arnold I.V. "The English Word" M. High School 1986 pp. 143-149.

last pair we are approaching the borderline between synonymy and non-synonymy.) These two intuitions seem to point to something like a scale of synonymy. But before looking into this, let us trey to obtain a clearer picture of the overall class of synonyms.

This is unfortunately no neat way of characterizing synonyms. We shall attack the problem in two ways; first, in terms of necessary resemblances and permissible differences, and, second, contextually, by means of diagnostic frames. First of all, it is obvious that synonyms must have a significant degree of semantic overlap, as evidenced by common semantic traits. So, for example, ***truthful*** and ***honest*** fall within our broad class of synonyms, and have a relatively high semantic overlap, while ***truthfu****l* and ***purple***, with virtually no traits in common, are about as far away from synonymy as one can get. However, it does not follow that the more semantic traits a pair of words share, the more synonyms they are.

Consider the following pairs:

Creature philosophy

Animal tree

Gog cat

Alsatian spaniel

As we go down the list, the semantic overlap between the paired items increases. But, intuitively, they do not become more synonymous: *alsation* and *spaniel* are simply not synonyms. No matter how finely we further sub-divide the classes, provided we end up with satisfactorily disjunction sub-classes, we shall never reach synonymy. The key to this conundrum lies in the nature of the differentiating characteristics: synonyms must not only manifest a high degree of semantic overlap, they must also have a low degree of implicit contractiveness. A major function of a term like *spaniel* is to exclude certain other closely related items, such as ***alsation***, *collie,* etc. That is to say, the traits which distinguish ***spaniel*** from other members of what might be called its 'implicit contrast set' are,

as it were, highlighted. In the case of *spaniel,* the other members of the contrast set are co-taxonomy; but this is not necessarily so in all cases-with *stallion,* for example, it would seem that the implicit contrast is more, or at least as much, with *mare* as with, say, *bull.* Furthermore, if the appropriateness of a term like *spaniel* with respect to some referent is denied (e.g. ***That's not a spaniel)***, there is at least an expectation that some other member of the implicit contrast set would be appropriate – in this case a dog of some other breed. Synonyms, however, are like this. Although ***truthful*** and *honest* do not have identical meanings, in saying ***John is honest*** the differences with ***John is truthful*** is not being highlighted; nor, in saying ***John is not honest***, is one of the implying that perhaps ***truthful*** would be more appropriate. Usually, denying one member of pair synonyms implicitly denies the other, too, unless there is some indication, either in the context, or, for instance, conveyed prosodic ally, the attention must be paid to nuances. In the following examples, a simple answer 'No' to the question would be inappropriate in the circumstances indicated:

1.

a: Does this aero plane have a motor.

B: No. (Odd if the aero plane has an engine)

2. *A: Has my husband been executed*

B: No. (Odd if A knows the man has been murdered)

3. *A: Would you say that the candidate was pretty?*

B: No. (Odd if the candidate is good-looking, or even handsome)

Synonyms, then, 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; an attempt will be made to characterize permissible differences between synonyms more precisely in **12.2** and **12.3** . Synonyms also characteristically occur together in certain types of expression. For instance, a synonym is often employed as an explanation, or clarification, of the

meaning of another word. The relationship between the two words is frequently signaled by something like ***that is to say*** or a particular variety of *or*:

He was cashiered, that is to say, dismissed.

This is an ounce, or snow leopard.

When synonyms are used contrastively, as they sometimes are, it is normal no signal the fact that it is the difference which must be attended to by some such expression as ***more exactly***, or ***rather***:

He was murdered, or rather executed.

On the table there were a few grains or, more exactly, granules of the substance. Notice that lexical items whose normal function is to contrast with one another do not co-occur normally with these 'nuance signalers':

Arthur's got himself a dog – or more exactly, a cat.

Within the class of synonyms, as we have already noted, some pairs of items are more synonyms than others, and this raises the possibility of a scale of synonymy of some kind. A scale needs at least one well-defined end-point; and if there is only one, it is more satisfactory for it to form the origin, or zero point, on the scale. With regard to degrees of synonymy, it seems that the point of semantic identity- i.e. absolute synonymy – can be established with some clarity (as we shall see in a moment); the notion of zero synonymy, on the other hand, is rather more diffuse. For one thing, it is probably not a unitary concept: ***long: short*** and ***green: expensive*** would presumably both count as examples of zero synonymy, but for different reasons. Furthermore, the dividing line between synonymy and non-synonymy is relatively vague in many cases. Where, in the following series, for instance, does synonymy end?

Rap: tap, rap: knock, rap: thwack, rap: bang, rap: thud?[4]

For these reasons it would seem better to make absolute synonymy the zero point on our scale; the scale will therefore be one of semantic differences rather than one

[4] Arnold I.V. "The English Word" M. High School 1986 pp. 143-149.

of synonymy. (Given the fact that zero synonymy is not a unitary concept, perhaps the scale should be pictured as a series of concentric circles, with the origin at the centre, rather than as a line.)

According to the conception of word-meaning developed in this book, two lexical units would be absolute synonyms (i.e. would have identical meanings) if and only if all their contextual relations (as characterized in chapter 1) were identical.[2] It would, of course, be quite impracticable to prove that two items were absolute synonyms by this definition, because that would mean checking their relations in all conceivable contexts (it would also be theoretically impossible, if as is probably the case, the number of possible contexts were infinite). However, the falsification of a claim of absolute synonymy is in principle very straightforward, since a single discrepancy in the pattern of contextual relations constitutes sufficient proof. It is convenient to conduct the search for absolute synonyms (or, more directly, the search for discrepancies between putative synonyms), in terms of the least specific of contextual relations, namely, relative normality.

Furthermore, since it is inconceivable that two items should be equinormal in all contexts and differ in respect of some other contextual relation, and since, for our purposes, what is not reflected in differential contextual semantic relations is not meaning, it follows that equinormality in all contextual semantic relations is not meaning, it follows that equinormality in all contexts is same as identity of meaning. Let us now examine an illustrative sample of possible candidates for absolute synonymy. The following will serve:

begin;

commence, munch;

chew, hate;

loathe, scandalous;

outrageous.

As it happens none of these pairs satisfies the criteria – for each, discriminating

contexts can be found ('+' indicates "more normal", and '-'"less normal"):

4a. *Johnny, tell Mummy when Playschool begins and she'll watch it with you. (+)*

b. Johnny, tell Mummy when Playschool commences and she'll watch it with you. (-)

5*a. Arthur is always chewing gum. (+)*

b. Arthur is always munching gum. (-)

6*a. I don't just hate him, I loathe him. (+)*

b. I don't just loathe him, I hate him. (-)

7*a. That is a scandalous waste of money. (+)*

b. That is an outrageous waste of money. (-)

It is important in applying the test to make sure that any differences of normality have a semantic and to a syntactic origin. Since partial absolute synonymy is perfectly possible, only contexts in which both items are syntactically normal should be used (in so far as this can be ascertained). For instance, the difference in normality between 8 and 9 should not be taken and evidence for the non-synonymy of ***hide*** and ***conceal****;*

8. *Where is he hiding? (Normal)*

9. Where is he concealing? (Odd)

The fact that *hide* and *conceal* are not absolute synonyms can be demonstrated using only contexts where each is equally at home syntactically;

10. a) Johnny, where have you hidden Daddy's slippers? (+)

b. Johnny, where have you concealed Daddy's slippers? (-)

The problems concerning ***nearly*** and ***almost*** have already been discussed; But with these, too, without going beyond contexts where presumed syntactic differences are not operative, a purely semantic discrimination can be made[5];

11a. He looks almost Chinese (+)

b. He looks nearly Chinese. (-)

12a. it was almost too horrible to look at. (+)

[5] Arnold I.V. "The English Word" M. High School 1986 pp. 143-149.

b. It was nearly too horrible to look at. (-)

A normality difference between two word forms in a particular context is not acceptable evidence against absolute synonymy if one of the word forms is part of an idiom, i.e. an opaque or translucent sequence, because in that case it would not be a lexical item. So, for instance, the normality difference between ***fast and rapid*** in ***John pulled a – one*** is not relevant to arguments concerning the synonymy or otherwise of ***fast and rapid***. It is also important not to allow irrelevant of a word form to interfere with testing; the normality difference between 13a and b, for example, is not relevant to the question of whether ***old*** and ***former in 14a*** and b, are absolute synonyms;

13a. Arthur's most recent car is an old one.

b. Arthur's most recent car is a former one

14a. He had more responsibility in his old job.

b. He had more responsibility in his former job.

One thing becomes clear once we begin a serious quest for absolute synonym, and that is that if they exist at all, they are extremely uncommon. Furthermore, it would seem reasonable to predict that if the relationship were to occur, it would be unstable. There is no obvious motivation for the existence of absolute synonyms in a language, and one would expect either that one of the items would fall into obsolescence, or that a difference in semantic function would develop. Students not infrequently suggest ***sofa*** and ***settee*** as absolute synonyms. It seemed that as these terms are currently used, discriminating contexts are hard to find. But when I was a child, ***sofa*** was considered more' elegant' than *settee*;[6] however, several students have reported that for their parents ***settee*** was the 'elegant' term. In view of this liability, the current relationship would appear unlucky, to persist. It seems probably, and many semanticists have maintained, that natural language abhor absolute synonyms just as nature abhors a vacuum. Absolute synonymy, then, is the end- point

[6] Arnold I.V. "The English Word" M. High School 1986 pp. 143-149.

of our inverse scale of synonymy. Including this point, but extending some distance along the scale, is a region which represents propositional synonymy. Since there are synonyms which are not propositional synonyms (we shall call them plesionyms), the scale also extends beyond the limit of propositional synonymy, ultimately to shade into non-synonymy. Within each region of the scale, degree of synonymy varies continuously.

In the two sections which immediately follow, we shall examine the sorts of semantic difference between two lexical items that are compatible with propositional synonymy (section 2), and with plesionymy (section 3).

Synonyms (in ancient Greek syn 'συν' plus and onoma 'όνομα' name) are different words with similar or identical meanings and are interchangeable. Antonyms are words with opposite or nearly opposite meanings. (Synonym and antonym are antonyms.)[7]

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

"A widespread impression that … Hollywood was synonymous with immorality" (Doris Kearns Goodwin)[8]

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

More examples of English synonyms:

Baby and infant (noun)

Student and pupil (noun)

Pretty and attractive (adjective)

Sick and ill (adjective)

[7] Arnold I.V. "The English Word" M. High School 1986 pp. 143-149.

[8] Ginzburg R.S. et al. A Course in Modern English Lexicology. M., 1979 pp.72-82

Interesting and fascinating (adjective)

Quickly and speedily (adverb)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kinds of synonymy and their specific features

Synonyms are words different in their outer aspects, but identical or similar in their inner aspects. In English there are a lot of synonyms, because there are many borrowings, e.g. hearty / native/ - cordial/ borrowing/. After a word is borrowed it undergoes desynonymization, because absolute synonyms are

unnecessary for a language. However, there are some absolute synonyms in the language, which have exactly the same meaning and belong to the same style, e.g. to moan, to groan; homeland, motherland etc.

In cases of desynonymization one of the absolute synonyms can specialize in its meaning and we get semantic synonyms,

e.g. «city» /borrowed/, «town» /native/.

The French borrowing «city» is specialized. In other cases native words can be specialized in their meanings,

e.g. «stool» /native/, «chair» /French/.

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

e.g. «welkin» /bookish/, «sky» /neutral/.

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

e.g. «examination', «exam».

Among stylistic synonyms we can point out a special group of words which are called euphemisms. These are words used to substitute some unpleasant or offensive words,

e.g. «the late» instead of «dead», «to perspire» instead of «to sweat» etc.

There are also phraseological synonyms, these words are identical in their meanings and styles but different in their combining with other words in the sentence,

e.g. «to be late for a lecture» but «to miss the train», «to visit museums» but «to attend lectures» etc.

In each group of synonyms there is a word with the most general meaning, which can substitute any word in the group, e.g. «piece» is the synonymic dominant

in the group «slice», «lump», «morsel». The verb « to look at» is the synonymic dominant in the group «to stare», «to glance», «and to peep». The adjective «red' is the synonymic dominant in the group «purple», «scarlet», «crimson».

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

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

The synonymous words smash and crush are semantic-ally very close; they combine to give a forceful representation of the atrocities of war. Richness and clearness of language are of paramount importance in so far as they promote precision of thought. Even this preliminary example makes it obvious that the still very common definitions of synonyms as words of the same language having the same meaning or as different words that stand for the same notion are by no means accurate and even in a way misleading. By the very nature of language every word has its own history, its own peculiar motivation, and its own typical contexts. And besides there is always some hidden possibility of different connotation arid which is feeling in each of them. Moreover, words of the same meaning would be useless for communication: they would encumber the language, not enrich it.

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

Synonyms can therefore be defined in terms of linguistics as two or more words of the same language, belonging to the same part of speech and possessing one or more identical or nearly identical denotational meanings, interchangeable, at least in some contexts, without any considerable alteration in denotational meaning, hut differing in morphemic composition, phonemic shape, shades of meaning, connotations, affective value, style, valence and idiomatic use. Additional characteristics of style, emotional coloring and valence peculiar to one of the elements in a synonymic group may be absent in one or all of the others.[9]

[9] Dubenets E.M. “Modern English Lexicology” (Course of Lectures)

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

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

The denotational meaning is obviously the same. Synonyms, then, are interchangeable under certain conditions specific to each group. This seems to call forth an analogy with phonological neutralization. Now, it will be remembered that neutralization is the absence in some contexts of a phonetic contrast found elsewhere or formerly in the language, as the absence of contrast between final [s] and [z] after [t]. It appears we are justified in calling s e-m antic neutralization the suspension of an otherwise functioning semantic opposition that occurs in some lexical contexts.

And yet suffer in this meaning (‘to undergo’), but not in the example above, is characterized by connotations implying wrong or injury. No semantic

neutralization occurs in phrases like to suffer atrocities, to suffer heavy losses. The implication is of course caused by the existence of the main intransitive meaning of the same word, not synonymous with the group, i. e. ‘feel pain’. Sustain as an element of this group differs from both in shade of meaning and style. It is an official word and it suggests undergoing affliction without giving way.

A further illustration will be supplied by a group of synonymous nouns: hope, expectation, and anticipation. They are considered to be synonymous because they all three mean ‘having something in mind which is likely to happen’. They are, however, much less interchangeable than the previous group because of more strongly pronounced difference in shades of meaning. Expectation may be either of good or of evil. Anticipation, as a rule, is a pleasurable expectation of something good. Hope is not only a belief but a desire that some event would happen. The stylistic difference is also quite marked.

The Romance words anticipation and expectation are formal literary words used only by educated speakers, whereas the native monosyllabic hope is stylistically neutral. Moreover, they differ in idiomatic usage. Only hope is possible in such set expressions as: to hope against, hope, to lose hope, to pin one’s hopes on something. Neither expectation nor anticipation could be substituted into the following quotation from T. S. Eliot: You do not know what hope is until you have lost it.

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

In the series leave, depart, quit, retire, clear out the verb leave, being general and both stylistically and emotionally neutral, can stand for each of the other four terms. The other four can replace leave only when some specific semantic component must prevail over the general notion. When we want to stress the idea of giving up employment and stopping work quit is preferable because in this word this particular notion dominates over the more general idea common to the whole group. Some of these verbs may be used transitively, e. g. He has left me... Abandoned me! Quitted me! (BENNETT).[10] In this synonymic series therefore the dominant term is leave. Other dominants are, for instance, get, a verb that can stand for the verbs obtain, acquire, gain, win, earn; also ask, the most general term of its group, viz. inquire, question or interrogate. The synonymic dominant should not be confused with a generic term. A generic term is relative. It serves as the name for the notion of the genus as distinguished from the names of the species. For instance, animal is a generic term as compared to the specific names wolf, dog or mouse (which are not synonymous). Dog, in its turn, may serve as a generic term for different breeds such as bull-dog, collie, poodle, etc.

The definition states that synonyms possess one or more identical or nearly identical meanings. To realize the significance of this, one must bear in mind that the majority of frequent words are polysemantic, and that it is precisely the frequent words that have many synonyms. The result is that one and the same word may belong in its various meanings to several different synonymic groups. The verb appear in ...an old brown cat without a tail appeared from nowhere (MANSFIELD)[11] is synonymous with come into sight, emerge. On the other hand, when Gr. Greene depicts the far-off figures of the parachutists who ...appeared stationary, appeared is synonymous with look or seem, their common component being ‘give the impression of. Appear, then, often applies to erroneous impressions.

[10] Arnold I.V. The English Word M. High School 1986 pp. 143-149
[11] Jespersen, Otto. Growth and Structure of the English Language. Oxford, 1982 pp.246-249

Compare the following groups synonymous to five different meanings of the adjective fresh, as revealed by characteristic contexts: To begin a fresh paragraph— fresh: another: different: new.

Fresh air — fresh: pure: invigorating.

A freshman —fresh: inexperienced: green: raw.

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

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

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

If the difference in the meaning of synonyms concerns the notion or the emotion expressed, as was the case in the groups discussed above, the synonyms are classed as ideographic synonyms, and the opposition created in contrasting them may be called an ideographic opposition. The opposition is formulated with the help of a clear definitive statement of the semantic component present in all the members of the group. The analysis proceeds as a definition by comparison with the standard that is thus settled. "It is not enough to tell something about each word. The thing to tell is how each word is related to others in this particular group." 3 The establishment of differential features proves very helpful, whereas sliding from one synonym to another with no definite point of departure creates a haphazard approach with no chance of tracing the system. In analyzing the group consisting of

the words glance n, look n and glimpse n we state that all three denote a conscious and direct endeavor to see, the distinctive feature is based on the time and quickness of the action. A glance is ‘a look which is quick and sudden’ and a glimpse is quicker still, implying only momentary sight.

In a stylistic opposition of synonyms the basis of comparison is again the denotational meaning and the distinctive feature is the presence or absence of a stylistic coloring which may also be accompanied a difference in emotional coloring.

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

The general effect of poetic or learned .synonyms when used in prose or in everyday speech is that of creating alit elevated tone. The point may be proved by the very first example in this chapter [12] where the poetic and archaic verb slays is-substituted for the neutral kill. We must be on our guard too against the idea that the stylistic effect may exist without influencing the meaning: in fact it never does. The verb slay not only lends to the whole a poetical and solemn ring, it also shows the writer’s and his hero’s attitude to the fact, their horror and repugnance of war and their feeling for its victims.

[12] Smirnitsky A.I. Synonyms in English M.1977 pp.57-59,89-90

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

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

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

1.2. Synonymy in syntagmatic

Synonymic pairs like wear and tear are very numerous in modern English and often used both in everyday speech and in literature. They show all the typical features of idiomatic phrases that ensure their memorableness such as rhythm, alliteration, rhyme and the use of archaic words seldom occurring elsewhere.

The examples are numerous: hale and hearty, with might and main, nevertheless and notwithstanding, modes and manners, stress and strain, rack and ruin, really and truly, hue and cry, wane and pale, without let or hindrance, act and deed. There are many others which show neither rhyme nor alliteration, and consist of two words equally modern. They are pleonastic, i. e. they emphasize the idea by just stating it twice, and possess a certain rhythmical quality which probably enhances their unity and makes them easily remembered. These are: by leaps and bounds, to pick and choose, pure and simple, stuff and nonsense, bright and shining, far and away, proud and haughty and many more.

In a great number of cases the semantic difference between two OP more synonyms is supported by the difference in valence. Distributional oppositions between synonyms have never been studied systematically, although the amount of data collected is very impressive. The difference in distribution maybe syntactical,

morphological, lexical, and surely deserves more attention than has been so far given to it. It is, for instance, known that bare in reference to persons is used only predicatively while naked occurs both predicatively and attributively.

The same is true about alone, which, irrespectively of referent, is used only predicatively, whereas its synonyms solitary and lonely occur in both functions. The function is predicative in the following sentence: you are idle, be not solitary, and if you are solitary be not idle. (s. JOHNSON)[13] It has been repeatedly mentioned that begin and commence differ stylistically, ft must be noted, however, that their distributional difference is not less important. Begin is generalized in its lexical meaning and becomes a semi-auxiliary when used with an infinitive. It follows naturally that begin and not commence is the right word before an infinitive even in formal style. Seem and appear may be followed by an infinitive or a that-claw. See whereas look which is stylistically equivalent to them is never used in these constructions. Aware and conscious are followed either by an o/-phrase or by a subordinate clause, e. g. to be aware of one's failure, to be aware that one's failure is inevitable. Their synonym sensible is preferably used with an o/-phrase.

Very often the distributional difference between synonyms concerns the use of prepositions: e. g. to answer a question, but to reply to a question. The adjectives anxious and uneasy are followed by the preposition about, their synonym concerned permits a choice and is variously combined with about, at, for, with. The misuse of prepositions is one of the most common mistakes not only with foreigners but with native speakers as well.

Lexical difference in distribution is based on the difference in valence. An example of this is offered by the verbs win and gain. Both may be used in combination with the noun victory: to win a victory, to gain a victory. But with the word war only win is possible: to win a war. We are here trespassing on the domain

[13] Akhmanova O.S. Lexicology: Theory and Method. M. 1972 pp. 59-66

of set expressions, a problem that has already been treated in an earlier chapter. Here it will suffice to point out that the phraseological combining possibilities of words are extremely varied.

It has been repeatedly stated that synonyms cannot be substituted into set expressions; as a general rule each synonym has its own peculiarities of phraseological connections. The statement is only approximately correct. A. V. Koenig has shown that set expressions have special properties as regards synonymy, different from those observed in free phrases. Some set expressions may vary in their lexical components without changing their meaning, e. g. cast (fling or throw) something in somebody's teeth. Moreover, the meaning may remain unchanged even if the interchangeable components are not synonymous: to hang on by one's eyelashes (eyelids, eyebrows),-to bear or show a resemblance.

The nouns glance, look and glimpse are indiscriminately used with the verbs give and have: to give a look (a glance, a glimpse), to have a look (a glance, a glimpse). With (the verbs "cast arid take the word glimpse is not used, so that only the expressions to cast a glance (a look) or to take a glance (a look) are possible. With the verbs steal, shoot, throw the combining possibilities are further restricted, so that only the noun glance will occur in combination with these. It goes without saying that phraseological interchangeability is not frequent.

Source of synonymy

The distinction between synchronic and diachronic treatment is so fundamental that it cannot that it cannot be overemphasized, but the two aspects are interdependent. It is therefore essential after the descriptive analysis of synonymy in present – day English to take up the historical line of approach and discus the origin of synonyms and the causes of their abundance in English. The majority of these who studied synonymy I the past have been cultivating both lines of approach without keeping then 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. Jespersen and many others used to stress that the English language is peculiarity rich in synonyms, because Britons, Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans fighting and setting upon the soil of the British Isle could not but influence each other's speech. British scholars studied Greek and Latin and Latin as a medium for communication on scholarly topics. Synonymy has its characteristic patterns in each language.[14] Its peculiar feature I 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:[15]

Native English words	**Words borrowed** from French	**Word borrowed** from Latin
to ask	to question	to interrogative
belly	stomach	Abdomen
to gather	to assemble	to collect
empty	devoid	Vacuous
to end	to finish	to complete
to rise	to mount	to ascend
Teaching	guidance	instruction

English also uses many pairs of synonymy derivatives, the one Hellenic and the other Romance, e.g.

Periphery: circumference;

hypothesis: supposition;

[14] Jespersen, Otto. "Growth and Structure of the English Language". Oxford, 1982 pp.246-249.

[15] I V Arnold "The English Word" High School 1973

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, dead, 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 cognitively contrasted as well, and vice versa.

It would be linguistic naïve to maintain that borrowing results only in quantitative changes or that qualitative changes are purely stylistical. The introduction of a borrowed word almost invariable starts some alternation both in the newcomer and in the semantic structure of existing words that are close to it in meaning. When in the 13th century the word *soil (*Of r ***soil, soyil)*** was borrowed into English its meaning was 'a trip of land'. The upper layer of earth in which plants grow had been denoted since Old English by one of the synonyms: ***eorpe, land, folde***. The development of the group has been studied by A.A. Ufimtseva. All these words had other central meanings so that the meaning in question was with them secondary.

Now, if two words coincide in meaning and use, the tendency is for one of them to drop out of the language. ***Folde*** had the same function and meaning as ***eorpe***, and in the fight for survival the latter won. The polysemantic word ***land*** underwent an intense semantic development in a different direction but dropped out of this synonymic series. In this way it become 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 this meaning throughout its history, whereas the word ***ground*** **in** which

this meaning was formally absent developed it. As a result this synonymic group comprises at present ***soil***, ***earth*** and ***ground.***

The fate of the word ***folde*** 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 differentationand is so current that M.Breal regarded it as an inherent law of language development. It must be noted that synonyms may influence each other is dissimilation, the other reverse process, i.e. assimilation. The assimilation of synonyms consist in parallel development. This assimilation of synonyms consists in parallel development. This law was discovered and described by Stern. H.A. Trebe and G.H Vallins 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 synonyms terms at hand.

The important thing to remember is that it is not only borrowings from foreign language 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 speaker 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::truck call;

radio::wireless.[16]

There are also synonyms that originate in numerous dialect as, for instance,

clover::shamrock;

[16] I V Arnold “The English Word” High School1973

liquor: whiskey (from Irish); girl::lass,

lassie or charm::glamour (from Scottish).

The role of borrowing should not be overestimated. Synonyms are also created by means of all words – 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, by conversation, 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 post positives and compound nouns formed from them, shortenings, set expressions and conversation.

Phrasal verbs consisting of a verb with a postpositive are widely used in present – day English and may be called one of its characteristic features. Many verbal synonyms groups contain such combinations as one of their elements.

A few examples will illustrate this statement ;

choose::pick out;

abandon::give up;

continue::go on;

enter::come in;

lift::pick up;

postpone::put off;

quarrel::fall out;

return::bring back;

E.g.; *By the way. Toby has quite given up the idea of doing those animal carto*ons (Plomer)

The vitality of these expressions is proved by the fact that they really supply material for further word – formation. Very many compound nouns denoting abstract notions, persons and events are correlated with them, also giving ways of expressing notions hitherto named by somewhat lengthy borrowed terms.

There are, for instance, such synonymic pairs as;

arrangement::layout;

conscription::call – up;

precipitation::fall – out ;

regeneration;:feedback;

reproduction::playback; resistance::fight – back;

treachery::sell – out.

An even more frequent type of new formations is that in which a noun with a verbal stem is combined with a verb of generic meaning (have, give, take, get, make) into a set expressions which differs from the simple verb in aspect or emphasis;

laugh::give a laugh;

sigh:: give a sigh;

walk:: take a walk;

smoke::have a smoke;

love::fall in love

(see p.164). E.g.: Now we can all have a good rest with our coffee (Simpson).

N.N. Amosova stresses the pattern 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 and not synonymical with, the verb of the same root. This is the case with *give a lift, give somebody quite a turn, etc*.

So, quite frequently synonyms, mostly stylistically, but sometimes ideographic as well, are due to shortening, e.g.

memorandum: memo;

vegetables::veg's;

margarine::*marge;*

microphone::mike;

popular (song)::pop (song)

One should not overlook the fact the fact that conversation may also be a source of synonymy; it accounts for such pairs as commandment; command; 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. Compare also cases of different

affixation::anxiety;

anxiousness::effectiveness;

and loss of affixes;

amongst::among or await; wait.

CHAPTER II THE DUALITY AND DEBATABLE ISSUES OF SYNONYMY

2.1. Combinability of synonyms

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

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

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

Cf: The snakes crawled around the tree.

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

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

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

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

More complicated than the previously mentioned groups are the synonyms with the referring combinability restrictions. The example of such restrictions can be shown on the following synonymic row: "to reach" - "to achieve" - "to gain" - "to attain" in the meaning of "добавляться" The following noun expressions which

denote the purpose or the result of the action are of typical character for these three synonyms:

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

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

However, the verbs "to gain" and "to attain" are capable to match with the nouns, marking such conditions (the characteristics, situations), the subjects of which coincide with the subjects of actions corresponding to these subjects: that is in the case of the verbs "to gain / to attain / one's aim [success, glory]" the subject of the action of "to gain / attain" is one and the same person.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The verb “gather” “собираться” differs from their synonyms “to assemble” and “to congregate” by the following: the subject for the verbs “to assemble” and

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

The verbs “to ponder”, “to meditate» and “to ruminate” in the meaning of “размышлять” are combinable with the names of situation, characteristic, products of thoughts as object (the theme) of reflections:
cf.: to ponder / to meditate/ upon the course of actions; to ruminate over the past; to ponder / to meditate, to ruminate/ the point.

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

The verbs “to depress”, “to oppress” and “to weigh down (upon)” in the meaning of “угнетать” can be combined with the names of feelings, actions, characteristics, etc. as the reasons for the oppressed condition:
cf.: a feeling of isolation depressed / oppressed / her, she was oppressed by fear, oppressed / weighed down / by the heat. Besides, the verbs “to depress” and “to oppress” can be combined with the names of the concrete things and living beings in same meaning, which is not characteristic for the phrasal verb “to weigh down (upon)”:
Cf.: the dim room depressed / oppressed / her, she depressed me.[17]

2.2. Prepositional and synonymy

Prepositional synonymy was introduced briefly in chapter 4, it is obvious that, to be propositional synonyms, a pair of lexical items must have certain semantic properties in common. However, as we saw in the previous section, very few pairs of propositional synonyms are absolute synonyms; it follows from this in

[17] Abayev V.I. Synonyms and their Semantical Features T. O’qituvchi 1981 pp. 4-5, 8, 26-29

the majority of cases a lexical item must, in some respects at least, be different in meaning from any of its propositional synonyms. In this section an attempt will be \made to establish more clearly and explicitly the nature both of the semantic properties in respect of which propositional synonyms must be identical, and of those in respect of which they may differ.
Let us first make an important distinction between the two principal ways in which lexical meaning manifest itself. Consider the difference between 15a and b[18];
15a. I just felt a sudden sharp pain.
b. Ouch!

There is a sense in which the content of the message conveyed by these two utterance is the same, or at least very similar; however, they differ in the way that the meaning is put across. We shall say that they differ in respect of ↑**semantic mode;** the meaning in 15a is in the **propositional mode,** while the meaning in 15b is in the **expressive mode.** The characteristics of propositional meaning depend partly on the propositional attitude expressed by the sentence in which its operates that is to say, on whether it is a statement, question, command exclamation, etc. In a statement it is the propositional meaning which determines the truth- conditions, either relative to a given state of affairs, or relative to other statements; it exercises this role at least partly by controlling the referential properties of referring expression in the sentence. The role of propositional meaning in, for instance, questions, or commands, neither of which have truth conditions, is different, through related: in questions, propositional meaning commands, it determines the range of actions that count as compliance with or obedience to the command. Expressive meaning does not function in this way. Notice that 15a has truth – conditions, whereas 15b has not. At the risk of being thought presumptuous, one could challenge the veracity of ***That's a lie- I gave a double dose of Novocain****;* it would make little sense to challenge 15b in this way. Expressive meaning carried

[18] D A Cruse « Lexical Semantics» Cambridge 2001

by a lexical item in a statement plays no role in determining its truth-conditions. So, for instance, i6a and b have identical truth-conditions;

Arthur has lost the key.

b. Arthur has lost the blasted key.

However, if ***blasted***, which carries only expressive meaning, is replaced by ***spare***, which carries propositional meaning, a statement with a different truth-condition is obtained;

Arthur has lost the spare key.

In parallel fashion, neither ***blasted nor been and gone an****d* in 18 does anything to restrict the range of possible true answers to the question;

I8 Who's been and gone and locked the blasted door?

Blasted has a similar lack of effect in 19b; any action which counted as compliance with 19a in particular situation would necessarily also count as compliance with 19b (and vice versa);

19a. Shut that window1

b. Shut that blasted window!

There are other differences between propositional meaning and expressive meaning. For instance, presented meaning is for the most part coded digitally- that is to say, it can vary only in discrete jumps; expressive meaning, on the other hand, at least in respect of intensity, can be varied continuously, and is therefore analogically coded. Suppose we want to grade the intensity of the pain in 15a: if we wish to do this in terms of propositional meaning, we have a set of discreet choices, and we must opt for one or another;

I felt a sudden sharp (very sharp/ extremely sharp/.,..) pain The intensity of the pain expressed by i5b, however, can be varied with infinite subtlety by means of prosodic grading- i.e. by varying the loudness, starting pitch and pitch range of the intonation contour. (This phenomenon has already been met in connection with superlatives in chapter 9; superlatives all seem to have a

component of expressive meaning.) Amenability to prosodic grading appears to be a close correlate of expressive meaning, at least in English. Another characteristic distinguishing expressive meaning from propositional meaning is that is valid only for the utterer, at the time and place of utterance. This limitation it shares with, for instance, a smile, a frown, a gesture of impatience, or a dog's bark (all of which, as it transcend the immediate context of utterance (sometimes referred to as it happens, are also continuously gradable). The capacity of language to as the capacity for **displacement**), which will feel tomorrow in Australia, depends entirely on propositional meaning.

The relevance to propositional synonymy of the difference between propositional and expressive meaning is simple; the inherent meaning of a lexical item may be made up of either or both these types of meaning; if two lexical items are propositional synonyms, then they must be expressive traits. Let us look briefly at the ways in which expressive meaning manifests itself in language. There is a range of lexical items virtually all of whose meaning is expressive. The most obvious of these are the so-called 'expletives'. These can be exclamations;

Gosh!

Wow! Hell's Bell's! Ace! I'll say!

or they may have a grammatical role within the sentence, usually of some kind of adjectival or adverbial modifier;

Get that damn dog off my seat.

You can blooming well put it back where you got it.

Words from taboo areas lend themselves readily to expletive use;

Holy shit! Balls! My arse! Piss off! Bugger me!

(Not a few non-taboo expletives are historically merely euphemistic alterations of taboo items; e.g. ***Gosh (God), Heck (Hell), Gee whiz (Jesus)***, etc.) Expletives are not, however, the only sorts of lexical item whose meaning is wholly of the expressive variety; consider ***already, still*** and ***yet*** in 20, 21 and 22

20. He has already arrived.

21. He is still; here.

22. He hasn't arrived yet.

None of these carries any propositional meaning, since **20, 21** and **22** are logically equivalent to **23, 24** and **25** respectively[19];

23. He has arrived.

24. He is here.

25. He has not arrived.

From this it follows that all three are propositionally synonymous with zero. It does not, of course, follow that they are meaningless; their meanings can interact both with each other, and with the meanings of other items, to produce semantic oddity;

? He is already still here.

? Has he only just arrived already?

? He has already finished – thought I expected him to finish.

Expressed meaning most characteristically conveys some sort of emotion or attitude- doubt, certainty, hope, expectation, surprise, contempt, disappointment, admiration, flippancy, seriousness, and so on. In appropriate contexts, ***still, yet*** and ***already*** can express emotion; **26, 27** and **28** would most likely express surprise;

26. Hasn't he arrived yet?

27. Has he arrived already?

28. Is he still here?

However, the meaning they express is not necessarily so distinctly emotive.

Basically, what ***still, already*** and ***yet*** express in **29, 30** and **31** is an expectation, or set of expectations, on the part of the speaker.

29. The shop should still be open when the meeting finishes.

30. We tried to contact him, but he had already left.

31. That stretch of line has not yet been electrified.

[19] D A Cruse « Lexical Semantics» Cambridge 2001

These sentences can be used to make statements of relative emotive neutrality.(The meaning carried by *still*, *already* and *yet* here is expressive, in spite of not expressing what would normally be described as an emotion; however, it does not appear to be prosodically gradable. Prosodic intensification is apparently possible for these items only when they carry a distinct emotive charge.) Expressive traits and propositional traits may be simultaneously present in the meaning of lexical item. This is true of words such as ***daddy*** and ***mummy***; it is at least partly in respect of expressive meaning that these differ from ***father*** and ***mother*** (diminutive affixes often have a purely expressive function). ***He's my daddy*** can be challenged with ***No, he's not***, but that impinges only on the propositional meaning (i.e. "He's my father"), and does not call into question the genuineness of the expressive meaning. Other examples of words with 'mixed' meanings are *paw* (in the sense of "hand"), *mug* (in the sense of "face") and ***blubber*** (in the sense of "weep").

It is possible that expressive meaning is even more important than has been so far suggested: it is arguable that communication would be impossible without it. Every communicative utterance must transmit as part of its meaning an indication of intended propositional attitude. Without this, an utterance would be communicatively dead – it would resemble a proposition 'entertained' by a logician. The expression of propositional attitude has the effect of, as it were, energising a proposition. Propositional attitude may be signaled by a specific lexical item;

I promise to be faithful

I warn you not to go

or by word order;

He is here.

Is he here?

or it may be indicated prosodically.

But whatever its bearer is, there are good reasons for believing that it is conveyed via the expressive mode. Take as an example a simple question such as ***What is she wearing?*** The interrogative sense of this shows a number of typical expressive characteristics. First, it is tied to the utterer and to the time and place of utterance. (notice that interrogative is not restricted to the expressive mode; in ***Arthur asked John what Mary was wearing*** **it** appears as a propositional trait of asked – furthermore, it is 'displaced' .) Second, it is prosodic ally gradable; ***What is she wearing*** *?* Finally, it cannot be directly challenged; one cannot reply to ***What is she wearing?*** **with** ***That's untrue – it was you who brought it for her*** (meaning that the interrogativity is false, since the questioner already knows the answer). It is significant, too, that expressive meaning carried by lexical items in, say, a question, does not fall within the score of the interrogativity in the way that propositional meaning in a question does, but interacts with it and modifies its quality. For instance, the expressive meaning carried by ***already*** in ***Have they arrived already****?* Is not part of what is being asked; what it does is challenge the quality of the interrogativity, so that ***Have they arrived already*** ? is not quite the same kind of question as ***Have they arrived?***

Some lexical items have an expressive capacity which is not in evidence in all context of use – unlike the examples considered so far – yet it does not seem satisfactory to regard them as ambiguous. Among such elements two types are distinguishable. First, there are those which, although capable of quite neutral employment, can also be invested with emotive expressive meaning, usually prosodically. For instance, ***baby*** in **32**a and b is emotively cool:

32a. Mother and baby are progressing satisfactory.

b. The baby was born prematurely.

But ***baby*** can be invested with tremendous emotion;

33. Oh, look – a baby! Isn't he adorable?

In contrast, ***infant*** and ***neonate*** are incapable of expressive use, although their propositional content is very close to that of ***baby***. While it is perhaps not satisfactory to say that ***baby*** is not inherently expressive, the difference between it and ***infant*** in respect of expressive potential must be considered inherent. That second type of element with latent expressive capacity is slightly different. Like those of the first type, such elements are capable of emotively neutral use; but whereas the former need to be charged with emotion prosodically, the latter are not so responsive to this, but seem to pick up expressive traits from the context, and , as it were, focus and amplify them. Compare, first of all, **34**a and b;

34a. I want you to go on talking these tablets, Miss Smith.

b. I want you to continue talking these tablets, Miss Smith.

There is little difference between these other than perhaps in respect of evoked meaning due to difference of register; neither ***go on*** nor ***continue*** here carries a significant burden of expressive meaning. Compare **34**a and b, however, with

35a and b, and **36**a and b:

35a. He went on complaining about it for hours afterwards.

b. He continued complaining about it for hours afterwards.

36a. I can tell you, it went on for quite some time.

b. I can tell you, it continued for quite some time.

Again there is a register effect; but in addition, ***go on*** seems to amplify the expressiveness implicit in the utterances, while ***continue***, if anything, damps it down. As another examples example of the same phenomenon, consider ***issue*** slightly, in the manner of 34a and b;

37a. We shall be putting out a detailed statement later today.

b. We shall be issuing a detailed statement later today.

but there is a much greater difference between 38a and b;

38a.Public opinion has been seriously misled by the stream of lies and half-truths the management has been putting out over the last few months.

b. Public opinion has been seriously misled by the stream of lies and half-truths the management has been issuing over the last few months.
It seems that lexical items characteristic of normal style are more likely to be 'expressive amplifiers 'than items belonging to more formal styles. There seems also to be a correlation between what might be termed 'lexical eccentricity' (i.e. idioms – including phrasal verbs, frozen metaphors, bound collocants like ***foot*** in ***foot the bill,*** etc.) and expressiveness. Lexical items differing only in respect of inherent expressive traits, or potential expressivity – ***jolly*** **and** ***farther*** and ***daddy***, ***cat*** and ***pussy***, ***infant*** and ***baby***, ***go on*** and ***continue*** **-** are propositional synonyms. It must be remembered that although emotion and attitude are typically conveyed via the expressive mode, this is not necessarily the case. One may convey one's sadness by saying ***I feel sad***; this utilizes the propositional channel and constitutes a statement which may be false. (It is possible that this sentence is ambiguous between an expression of sadness and a description of one's emotional state. If so, my remarks apply only to the letter interpretation.) It is fairly common to find pairs of words whose meanings differ only in that they express different evaluative judgements on their designated referents (or one expresses s judgement while the other is there is neutral) ;

horse, nag; *car, banger;*
a smart alec, *a clever chap;*
mean, careful with one's money, etc.

These evaluative traits undoubtedly belong to the evaluative meaning may well be expressive. However, according to our criteria, none of the pairs of items just mentioned are propositional synonyms, since they yield sentences with different truth-conditions. It follows that the evaluative traits must be at least partly propositional in nature[20];

[20] D A Cruse « Lexical Semantics» Cambridge 2001

A; Arthur tried to sell me an old nag.

B; No, he didn't-it was a perfectly good horse.

A; I heard Arthur's very mean.

B; No, he isn't – he is just careful with his money.

A; Arthur's a smart alec.

B; No, he isn't-but he is clever.

Prepositional and expressive meanings are the most important types of meaning in language, and we can think of them as what a speaker principally utilizes and directly manipulates in order to convey his intended message. There are other aspects of the meanings of words, however, whose primary sphere of operation is not the interface between speakers' intentions and language, but the interactions amongst linguistic items constituting a discourse. The primary function of these semantic properties is not so much to encode message components directly (although they may do this secondarily) as to place restrictions on what linguistic items can occur together normally within the same sentence, or within the same discourse. In normal utterances, these restrictions have the effect of adding informational redundancy to the message, and cohesiveness to the discourse (thereby facilitating the hearer's task of decoding);

the restrictions can also,

however,

be deliberately flouted,

giving rise to oddness,

which may,

for instance,

act as a signal that an utterance is not to be interpreted literally.

These semantic properties will be dealt with under two headings; (i) presupposed meaning and (ii) evoked meaning.[7] Let us begin with presupposed meaning. The expressions *presupposed meaning* is used here in a pre-theoretical sense to refer to

semantic traits which are, as it were, taken for granted in the use of an expression, or lexical item, but not actually asserted, denied, questioned, or whatever, in the utterance in which they appear. Particular presuppositions (i.e. presupposed traits) can e regularly and characteristically associated with specific lexical items-hence their interest to us. For instance, the use of the verb *drink* takes for granted the existence of an actual or being liquid. Thus, ***Arthur drank it, Did Arthur drink it? Arthur didn't drink it*** and ***Drink it, Arthur!*** In normal use all presuppose that ***it*** refers to a liquid, that is to say, someone sort of liquid (barring metaphorical usage). It is this constancy of infer ability, irrespective of whether the sentence containing ***drink*** functions as an assertion, denial, or question, etc., that qualifies the trait "liquid" to count as a presupposition of ***drink***.

The main effect of the presupposed semantic traits of a lexical item is to place restrictions on its normal syntagmatic companions; we therefore refer to such traits as semantic co-occurrence restrictions (these were introduced in 4.12). It is necessary to distinguish two types of semantic co- occurrence restriction. First, there are those which are a logically inescapable concomitant of the propositional traits of a lexical item. Consider the verb ***die;*** this imposes semantic constraints on the nature of its grammatical subject;

Arthur died.

The aspidistra died

? The spoon died.

? Arthur's exam results died.

The only things can without oddness be said to die are those which are (a) organic, (b) alive (and possibly also (c) mortal; ?***The angel died).*** The semantic traits "organic", "alive" and "mortal" are logical prerequisites of the meaning of ***die*** – the notion of dying is inconceivable in their absence We shall refer to semantic co-occurrence restrictions which are logically necessary as **selectional restrictions.**

Now consider the lexical item ***kick the bucket.*** This has the same selectional restriction as ***die,*** but it imposes further semantic requirements on its subject;

Arthur kicked the bucket.

The hamster kicked the bucket.

The aspidistra kicked the bucket.

Unlike ***die, kick the bucket*** (in its idiomatic sense) is fully normal only with a human subject. But this additional restriction does not arise logically out of the meaning of ***kick the bucket.*** The propositional meaning of ***kick the bucket*** is not "die in a characteristically human way" but simply "***die***"; the restriction to human subjects is semantically arbitrary.[8] We shall call arbitrary co – occurrence restrictions of this type **collocational restrictions**. A logical relationship between collocational restrictions and cognitive synonymy will be established by definition: we shall define collocational restrictions as co – occurrence restrictions that are irrelevant to truth – conditions – that is to say, those in respect of which lexical items may differ and still be propositional synonyms. This is not entirely straightforward, as the diagnosis of propositional synonyms where collocational differences are involved requires judgements concerning the truth – conditions of odd sentences. Consider how the following questions would normally be answered in the circumstances specified in brackets;

39. Is there something wrong with the engine of your lawnmower?

(There is something wrong with the (electric) motor.)

40. Is Arthur the one of with beer-foam on his moustache?

(Arthur is one with beer-froth on his moustache.)

41. Have you grilled the bread?

(You have toaster the bread.)

42. Has the aspidistra kicked the bucket?

(The aspidistra has die.)

He would be a pedant indeed who could answer these questions with an unequivocal 'No.' The only possible cooperative response would surely be either 'Yes,' or something like 'You can't say that, you have to say XYZ – but the answer to your question is "yes",' On the strength of our reluctance to brand sentences like ***The lawn –mower engine*** is false (even though odd), when it is true that the lawn –mower motor is faulty, we shall classify ***engine*** and ***motor*** as propositional synonyms; also, for parallel reasons, ***grill*** and ***toast, froth*** and ***kick the bucket*** and ***die.*** Selectional restrictions being logically necessary are inseparable from the prepositions traits that presuppose them,, and can therefore hardly be said to have a district function in an utterance (although they have the effect of contributing to informational redundancy). Collocational restrictions ,on the other hand, are not logically necessary, son it is legitimate to ask what they bring to an utterance. Generally speaker, they are not primarily there to encode part of the message ; in the majority of occurrences ,presupposed traits(whether collocational or selectional) are duplicated by propositional traits carried by the lexical items within their scope. For instance, in ***My grandfather passed away yesterday, passed away*** imposes collocational restrictions on its grammatical subject, requiring it to be human. But ***passed away*** is not the primary carrier of the trait "human"; this role is performed by ***grandfather*** , of which "human" is an internet propositional trait. Even in sentence such as ***He passed away yesterday*** , it is not ***passed away*** which is the hearer's principal indication that referent of ***he*** would be ready known to the addressee, and the information derivable from ***passed away*** that 'he ' was human would be, in that sense, redundant. E can observe the role of collocational restrictions by comparing 43 and 44;

43. My grandfather passed away yesterday.

44. My grandfather died yesterday.

(*Die* carries the same propositional traits as ***pass away***, but lacks its collocational restrictions.) Setting aside the difference of register between ***die*** and

pass away, it can be seen that these two sentences have the same message-conveying potential .The only difference between them is that 43 displays the greater semantic cohesion, in that its subject is more predictable from the rest of the sentence. Both selectional restriction and collocation restrictions can be given a more active semiotic role. Presupposed meaning can, for instance, be used to 'leak' information;

A:What's John going to give me for my birthday?
B; I'm sworn to secrecy – but I advise you not to drink it all at once.
Or co-occurrence restrictions can be deliberately flouted for metaphoric effect: Arthur's parrot's just passed away.

Collocational restrictions vary in the degree to which to which they can be specified in terms of required semantic traits. When fully specifiable, they may be described as ↑ **systematic collocational restrictions.** In most such cases (but not all), the restrictions behave as presuppositions of the selecting item. We have already met ***kick the bucket*** and ***pass away***, which require a human subject. ***Grill*** and ***toast*** probably belong to this category, too. They denote the same action or process from the point of view of the agent, but different patients are involved. Grilling is a method of cooking, whereas toasting is not; things that get toasted are normally already cooked, whereas items for grilling are raw. Hence our hypothetical eavesdropper, on hearing ***Are you going to grill them or try them****?* , it would be able to form some opinion concerning the likely nature of the referents of ***them***. In cases where most of lexical item's collocations certain semantic properties, so that its use sets up an expectation of a certain type of collocant, but there are exceptions to the general tendency, we may speak of ↑ **semi-systematic collocational restrictions.** For instance, a *customer* typically acquires something material in exchanges for money; a *client,* on the other hand, typically receives a less tangible professional or technical service. Hence bakers, butchers, shoe-shops and newsagents have customers, while architects, solicitors and advertising

agencies have clients. But the people who use the services of a bank, surprisingly, can be called its customers. (The collocational restrictions of *client* are systematic) The collocational ranges of some lexical items can only be described by listing permissible collocants. Such items will be described as having ↑ **idiosyncratic collocational restrictions.** As a possible set of cognitive synonyms which differ in respect of idiosyncratic collocational restrictions, consider the following;

	Unblemished	spotless	flawless	immaculate	impeccable
performance	-	-	+	+	+
argument	-	-	+	-	?
complexion	?	?	+	-	-
behavior	-	-	-	-	+
kitchen	-	+	-	+	-
record	+	+	-	?	+
reputation	?	+	-	?	?
taste	-	-	?	?	+
order	-	-	?	+	+
credentials	-	-	-	-	+

Unblemished spotless flawless immaculate impeccable

The judgements recorder above represent my own intuitions. I can discern no semantic motivation for the collocational patterns. The propositional synonyms ***umpire*** and ***referee*** **also** exemplify idiosyncratic collocational preferences. The collocational restrictions of items like ***umpire*** and ***referee*** cannot, of course, give rise to presuppositions. Indeed, it is debatable whether idiosyncratic restrictions are a matter of semantics at all. Like presupposed meaning, what we shall call ↑ **evoked meaning** primarily contributes to discourse cohesion, and only secondarily has a direct communicative role. Again like presupposed meaning, it does not affect the truth-value of containing sentences, and thus provides a further potential source of variation among propositional synonyms. The possibility of evoked meaning is a

consequence of the existence of different dialects and registers within a language. Let us first look at dialect. We shall not concern ourselves with the intricacies of the notion of dialect; we shall take the simple view that dialects are varieties of a language that have a high degree of mutual intelligibility, and are characteristic of distinguishable groups of users. Dialectal variation can be classified a geographical, temporal, or social; it must be borne in mind, however, that these dimensions of variation are not rigidly separable, since , for instance, certain regional variants may be more or less restricted to older, or lower class, speaker. As far as we are concerned, a word belonging to one dialect is relevant to the description of another dialect only to the extent that it is reasonably familiar to speakers of the latter, and at the same time recognized as being characteristic of speakers of the former. For example, the Scots words ***glen, loch, wee*** and ***dram*** are probably familiar to most speaker of English outside Scotland and recognized as Scottish; on the other hand, the word ***flesher*** (=*butcher* which not infrequently crops up in discussions of synonymy, is of dubious relevance for a description of standard English because of its unfamiliarity. For a different reason, a word like ***tartan*** is probably not relevant in this connection, either; although most speakers would doubtless associate it with Scotland and things Scottish, it is a normal item of standard English, and is not particularly distinctive of speakers of Scottish English.
There is no reason in principle why a lexical item in one dialect should not be a virtually exact translation equivalent of a different lexical item in another dialect; such equivalence may well be uncommon, but there is no need to imagine any centrifugal tendency, as with absolute synonyms within one dialect. However, even if two particular items could be shown to have exactly parallel sets of contextual relations in their respective 'home' dialects, but only propositional synonyms. This is because a displaced item has the power of evoking images and associations of its 'home' surroundings, which can interact in complex ways with the new

environment, and this is sufficient to differentiate the 'foreign' item semantically from its native synonym.

Among dialect synonyms, those of the geographical variety are perhaps of minor significance. There is no shortage of examples:

autumn;

fall, lift,;

elevator, glen;

valley, wee; small- but they do not loom large in the linguistic experience of most speakers.

Much more important (alas!) are synonyms drawn from different social dialects; the consequences of choice from among these, especially for anyone aspiring to move from one social class to another, may go well beyond the relatively innocuous evocation of geographical and cultural associations linked with geographical variants. Most language –users are extremely sensitive to this dimension of variation. When I was a boy, the room the house where washing-up and cooking were done was called the ***scullery***. As my father progressed in his profession, and his salary and social standing improved, this room became first the ***kitchen***, and then the ***kitchenette***. Concurrently, the ***settee*** became the ***sofa***, ***serviettes*** metamorphosed into ***napkins***, and one stopped going to the ***lavatory*** (or, more commonly, the ***law*)** and went to the ***toilet*** instead.[10] Among certain social groups whose members identify themselves at least partly by the use of a distinctive 'slang', the temporal dimension of variation is as important as, and interacts with, the social dimension, in that it is vital, if someone wishes to maintain his status in the group, not to use out - dated terminology. Since slangs typically have a very rapid lexical turnover, this criterion discriminates sharply between 'insiders' and 'outsiders'. However, longer term lexical changes, like the replacement of ***wireless*** by ***radio***, and ***swimming-bath*** by ***swimming-pool,*** create dialectal synonyms

(characteristic of dialects spoken by different generations) whose overall significance is of the same order as that of geographical variants.

Whereas dialects are language varieties associated with different characteristics of users (e.g. age, class and regional affiliation), registers are varieties of language used by a single speaker, which are considered appropriate to different occasions and situations of use. One analysis of register, which will suffer for our purposes, distinguishes three interacting dimensions of variation; **field, mode** and **style.**[11] ***Field*** refers to the topic or field of discourse; there are lexical (and grammatical) characteristics of, for instance, legal discourse, scientific discourse, advertising language, sales talk, political speeches, football commentaries, cooking recipes, and so on. Obviously some of the lexical differences among these fields of discourse are due to the fact that different referents constitute typical foci of attention; one is more likely to encounter ***flour, egg*** and ***bake*** in a cooking recipe than in a revivalist sermon; and no doubt *sin, Hell* and *repent* are more likely in the latter. But it is by no means rare for the same referent to have different names on different occasions. If the names differ only in respect of the fields of discourse in which they typically appear, then they will be propositional synonyms. So, for example, ***matrimony*** may be regarded as a field-specific synonym (most frequently encountered in legal and religion contexts) of one of the senses of ***marriage*** ("state of being married"); ***wedlock*** overlaps with ***matrimony***, but is perhaps more likely to be heard in church than in court of law. By way of contrast, ***boobs*** is used non-pejoratively in the dress-designing trade to refer to what in other circumstances might be called ***breasts(boobs*** is also used non-technically as a colloquialism not far removed semantically from *tits;* whether this constitutes true ambiguity or not is an interesting question).

The second dimension of register is mode, which is concerned with the manner of transmission of a linguistic message – whether, for instance, it is written, spoken, telegraphed, or whatever. Again there are possibilities of synonymy, such

as, for instance, ***about;concerning*** *; re; re* is characteristic not only of written languages as opposed to spoken language, but, more specifically, of business correspondence – that is to say, it is marked for field as well as mode. Field and mode variants resemble dialectal variants in that they can be regarded as semantically neutral (in the relevant respect) when they occur in their normal contexts, but become alive with association (i.e. evoked meaning) when transported to alien environments;

Oh look! A neonate! Isn't he lovely?

A neonate is just a new – born baby, but the word is redolent of the research laboratory and the clinic, and these associations jar with the general tenor of the utterance.

Style refers to language characteristics which mark different relations between the participants in a linguistic exchange. These may depend on a number of factors – roles defined by the situation (e.g. interviewer and interviewee), how familiar the participants are mutually hostile, what their relative social positions are, whether they are mutually hostile, indifferent, or friendly, and so on. To some extent, this may be regard as the formal – informal dimension; but, in reality, it is much more complex than this. Style is of particular interest to us because it is this dimension of variation which spawns the most spectacular proliferation of cognitive synonyms. The multiplication of synonyms is most marked in the case of words referring to areas of experience which have a high emotive significance, such as (in our culture);

death,

sex,

excretory functions,

money ,

religion,

power relations, and so on. For referents in these areas we typically find a range of

subtly differentiated terms, which allows an utterance to be finely turned to its context:

(a) *kick the bucket, buy it, snuff it, cap it, pop off, peg out, expire, perish, die, pass away, decease, etc.*

(b) *fuck, screw, shaft, bang, ball, lay, have it off with, make, score with, bed, go to bed with, sleep with, make love with, have sex with, have intercourse with, be intimate with, perform coitus with,* etc.

(c) *piss, pee, piddle, wee-wee, have a slash, spend a penny, point Percy at the porcelain, pass water, urinate,* etc.

(d) *arse -licker, bootlicker, toady, yes-man, sycophant,* etc.

(some of these items may be differentiated in respected of field as well as style – it is virtually impossible to separate these two factors completely.) Style variants are undoubtedly capable of carrying evoked meaning, but they also different a more positivy way. They are not semantically passive, even in their most normal contexts; they actually, in a sense, express aspects of situations, and can therefore help to create them. For instance, a speaker can establish a relation of intimacy with a hearer merely by choosing one lexical items rather than another in the course of conversation.

For this reason, at least some of the semantic properties of style variants are probably better treated as aspects of expressive meaning, rather than evoked meaning.

2.3. Congruence relation and synonymy

The congruence relation described in chapter are applicable – with certain reservations – to both cognative synonymy and plesionymy. The application to plesionymy is the more straightforward. Since they differ in respect of criterial traits, a pair of plesionymys must, strictly speaking, be incompatibles, compatibles, or hyponym and superordinate. (Of course if they are criterially congruent, then they are no longer plesionyms, but cognitive synonyms.) Whatever the strict nature

of the semantic contrast, its communicate significance is diminished relative ti wait it would be if the contrasting items were not plesionyns; it therefore seems justifiable to give congruence relations within synonymy special names.

We shall therefore speak of ↑**micro – relations;**

micro – incompatibility: roller: breaker, executive: murder.

Priest: pastor, cashier: unfrock

Pretty: handsome, orchestra; band

Micro – compatibility: review: article, letter: note

brainy: cunning

Micro – hyponymy: roller: wave execute: kill

pretty: good – looking cashier: sack

fearless: brave.

Congruence relations do not apply in precisely the same way to cognitive synonymys. Because cognitive synonyms have identical criteria traits, and hence identical logical properties, we cannot use entailment relations to define incompatibility, hyponymy, and so on. However, there undoubtedly do exist relations analogous to these. Take the case of cognitive synonyms which differ only in their ranges of normal collocation. We can define the (more specific) sense relation between the members of such a pair in terms of the relationship between their respective ranges of normal occurrence. The two ranges may be disjunct (e.g. ***addled: rancid***)[21], giving a relationship analogous to incompatibility: or they may overlap (e.g. ***engine: motor***) giving a relationship analogous to compatibility: or the range of normal collocation of one member may be included in that of the other (e.g. ***lively: spritely***) , giving a relationship analogous to hyponymy. Itemes with identical collocational ranges,provided there were no other differences, would , of course, be absolute synonyms. Similar relationship can in priciple be established for cognitive sunonyms differing in other respects. To bring out the parallelism with

[21] D A Cruse « Lexical Semantics» Cambridge 2001

incompatibility, hyponymy, etc. , and at the same time to emphasise the relative insignificance of the differentiating traits, we may speak of

↑**nano – incompatibles,**

↑ **nano – compatibles,**

↑**nano – hyponyms**

↑**nano – superordinates.**

It was suggested in **12. 1** that propositional synonyms are ‘more synonymous ‘ than plesionyms, which , in turn, are ‘more synonymous ‘ than non – synonyms. Among propositional synonyms, full congruence, in general, gives the closest relationsdip, followed by inclusion, then overlap, and ,finally, disjunction. Within plesionymy a similar order of degree of synonymity applies, except that fully congruent items actually belong to the more synonyms larger category of propositionslsynonyms. Within the whole class of cognitive synonyms, or the whole class of plesionyms, the correlation between degree of synonymity and congruence type is not perfect, because semantic traits differ in their differentiating power. Within a group of items which are all synonyms of one another of the same type, however, the correlation is perfect. It sometimes happens, in a set of items consisting of a superordinate is close enough to each of its hyponyms to be considered a plesionym, but the hoponyms, because of their disjunct relation re too distant to be plesionyms of each other. This appears to be the case with ***horse ; stallion: mare.*** By our criteri**a,** ***horse*** and ***stallion*** are plesionyms**,** as are ***horse*** and ***mare,*** whereas ***mare*** and ***stallion****,* because of the highlighted sex difference, are not.

2.4. Synonymy and collocative meaning

They have been considered similar in meaning but never fully synonyms. They belong to the same categorical concept:

Collocations by Leech: girl, boy, woman, flower, pretty garden, color, village, etc.

Boy, man, car, vessel, handsome overcoat, airliner, typewriter, etc.

Collocations found in the Lob and the British Corpora:

Pretty, Batman, Case, Co-ed, Dress, Headdresses, Girl, Piece of seamanship, Quilt, Range of pram sets, Shoe, Shop, Sophie

Street: Teacher (female ref.), Trick, Woman, Handsome, Cocktail cabinet, Connor Winslow, Face (male ref.), Man, Mayor, Offer, Pair of salad servers, Person (male ref.),(Red brocade) curtains, Son, Staircase, Sub-Alpine gloom, Trees, Vessel, Volume (book), Woman, 'pretty' female nouns, 'handsome' male nouns.

This is the first division we could make but there are more differences. It cannot be based on terms of male / female words.

The idea, then, is that if an adjective tends to collocate to certain nouns means that its partner is slightly different to it. So when they are applied to the same noun, the same rule is applied.

- Ex: pretty: handsome
- Mary is a pretty woman
- Mary is a handsome woman

A handsome woman is more elegant that a pretty woman. She also has stronger facial features. A handsome woman isn't a pretty woman at the same time and vice versa. So they are exclusive terms.

Pretty Street' but 'handsome avenue'

If they are exclusive terms, they are nor synonyms but co-hyponyms

If two items are closely synonymous, a coordination test will lead to a tautology.

Ex: Scientists have so far failed to find for this deadly and fatal disease.

However if we coordinate 'pretty' and 'handsome' what we have is a contradiction:

That woman is pretty and handsome

(Photocopy of definitions of 'deep', 'profound', 'handsome', 'lovely' and 'beautiful')

Some of the dictionaries specialize it more deeply than others.

Profound' in the Longman is defined as deep but not vice versa. This also happens in 'lovely' and 'beautiful'.

Uninformative; it doesn't give really the sense of the words.

This isn't correct because 'profound' emphasizes stronger that 'deep' and this isn't true. There is a contradiction there.

Introduction of the notion of 'delicacy' for defining a pretty woman.

This is the only dictionary which says that something pretty isn't something beautiful. They exclude each other. 'Grand' is a feature of 'handsome'.

- handsome -'making a pleasant
- lovely - impression on the pretty
- senses' -beautiful

Here, 'beautiful' and 'pretty' appear as co-hyponyms so they have to exclude each other. The CC is actually the definition given for 'beautiful', so it's the generic word for the four words. 'Lovely' is slightly more intense than 'beautiful'. (It's the same relationship 'deep' and 'profound' have)

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

Ex: Steed (poetic) Horse (general) Nag (slang) Gee-gee (baby language)[22]

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

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

[22] "World Book Encyclopedia S part" Macmillan Publisher 1996 p 134

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

Componential analysis of conceptual synonymy.

It is an analysis very popular in the 1970's and turned itself to be very useful in the identification of atoms of meaning of words. One of the applications of componential analysis is in the identification of synonyms, because if two words share atoms of meaning, they are synonymous.

Ex: John is a bachelor

John is an unmarried man

Componential analysis serves quite well for the analysis of fairly uncompleted words (nouns, adjectives, some verbs), but there are whole areas of the vocabulary of the language that don't lend themselves for componential analysis.

Barbara Warren makes a distinction between synonyms and variants. She says that we have synonyms if the words have similar meaning and if they are interchangeable without affecting meaning in some context or contexts. Variants are words which have similar meaning but without the interchangeability in some contexts.

Ex: extending Deep far below; profound the surface.

'Deep' and 'profound' has always been considered synonyms and it's true they are interchangeable but it's also true that in some contexts one cannot replace the other.

He had a deep / profound understanding of the matter

This river is deep / profound. They are not interchangeable in this context.

Ex: Sweet: candy dialectal variants

Decease: pop off stylistic variants

Lady: woman connotative variants

In one context you use one word and in the other you use the other one.

Human

1) lady adult woman

2) female'

The point here is to try and prove that synonyms exist. The result of this research is quiet distressing. There are no synonyms following Warren's definition. What Person did was to scrutinize the use of 'deep' and 'profound'. His research is especially valid because he bases his research on lexicographic words, corpus data and importance. The wide range of sources and the number of them is what makes this valid.

The conclusions: 'Deep' and 'profound' show a difference in collocability, that is, they tend to collocate with different words. Deep tends to collocate with words of affection, conviction, feeling, regret, satisfaction, sorrow… Whereas 'profound' tends to collocate with words of difference, distaste, effect, failure, influence… They enter different collocations because they mean slightly different things. They specialize in certain areas of meaning and that makes them slightly different. He also talks about metaphorical status. Metaphorically speaking, they can mean position on the one hand or quality of depth on the other. Only 'deep' enters for the position metaphor, but the quality of depth can be expressed by both of them.

Ex: deep structure (profound structure)

He was deep (profound) in thought

It was deep (profound) in the Middle Ages

Deep / profound learning

Deep / profound sleep

Intellectual - emotive dichotomy: 'deep' and 'profound' tend to relate respectively to intellectual and emotive words. The idea is that 'deep' tends to

collocate with emotive nouns, whereas ‘profound’ tends to collocate with intellectual words.

There is a difference in the degree of depth and intensity of these words. ‘Profound’ is deeper that ‘deep’. When both are possible, then there is a distinction.

Ex: He has a deep understanding of the matter (‘pretty good’)

He has a profound understanding of the matter (‘very good’)[23]

English words associations give us a very useful way to prove this. There are nouns whose inherent meaning is superlative. With such a noun you can only have ‘profound’ because it means deeper.

Ex: profound distaste *deep distaste

Profound repugnance *deep repugnance

Of course in terms of truth-conditions one entails the other one but not vice versa, that is ‘profound’ includes ‘deep’ but not vice versa.

Ex: His profound insight into human nature has stood the test of centuries

His deep insight into human nature has stood the test of centuries.

His deep insight into human nature has stood the test of centuries.

His profound insight into human nature has stood the test of centuries

Synonymy is understood within mutual entailment (A-B) but ‘deep’ and ‘profound’ doesn’t correspond to this. Native speakers feel that ‘profound’ is stylistically more elevated or more formal that deep? So with all this evidence it is impossible to say that they are synonymous. This is why Person gives the following figure as the analysis for them.

Concrete ‘situated, coming abstract; abstract from, or extending intellectual; emotive far below the strongly; surface emotive.

Stylistic Attributes (SA): informal SA; formal.

[23] Maurer D.W. , High F.C. New Words - Where do they come from and where do they go. American Speech., 1982.p.171

In Person's model we have three categories: CC, TA, SA. The thing is that not all words include SA box, so it's left open. Person also reviewed other examples analyzed by Warren.

Ex: child / brat child CC brat TA

Child' and 'brat' are an example of connotative variant in Warren. They are given as variants but if we apply the test of hyponymy we see that it works. 'Brat' is a kind of 'child' but not vice versa. 'Brat' includes 'child' plus the feature 'bad-mannered. Person finds the collocation in which 'brat' appears; it tends to appear with adjectives that reinforces this feature of bad-mannered what proves that that atom of meaning

The same happens with 'woman' and 'lady'.

Ex: She is a woman, but she is not a lady.

She is a lady, but she is not a woman

Person questions the fact that two words can be synonymous out of the blue. He defends contextual information as the key to determine if two words are synonymous or not.

Ex: readable: legible

At to what extent can we say that they are synonyms?

- readable:

(of handwriting or point) able to be read easily'

pleasurable or interesting to read'

- legible:

(of handwriting or print) 'able to be read easily'

They are only synonymous when they mean 'able to be read easily'

"The child, quite obviously, would not be expected to produce a composition, but would be expected to know the alphabet, where the full stops and commas are used, and be able to write in a readable / legible manner, something like, 'The cat sat on the mat'."

“It is not easy to see why her memory should have faded, especially as she wrote a most readable / *legible autobiography which went quickly through several editions.”

Legible; readable; able to with pleasure; be read’ and /or; interest.

They share senses number 1 but to ‘readable’ it’s also added sense number 2. This claims that in some contexts they are fully interchangeable, but we have also to take into account their stylistic feature and the register.

In principle, scientific words have discrete meanings.

Ex: mercury: quicksilver

They appear as full synonyms because they say that their relationship is that of mutual inclusion (A-B)

Conceptually, the concept ‘mercury’ can be expressed with both words. However, style draws the line between both words. Native speakers and corpora of data give us what we have in the following figure:

Mercury: formal, quicksilver; scientific whitish; fluid informal; metal.

Mercury formal, scientific (Romance origin): Quicksilver informal (Saxon origin)

However something peculiar has happened with this words. The popular word ‘quicksilver’ is starting to disappear and what usually happens is that the formal words are the one that disappears. But in this case, it is the contrary.

Cigarette: fag

Cigarette fag

Tube with

General tobacco in slang’

It for smoking’ ‘narrow, made of finely cut tobacco rolled in thin paper’

CHAPTER III semantic peculiarities of English synonymy

3.1. Semantic and functional relationship in synonyms

This chapter is devoted to the analysis of semantic and functional relationships and words and their synonymy in modern English. V.G. Vilyuman, in detail analyzing all signs of synonymy, comes to conclusion that necessary and sufficient for confession of the words as the synonymic 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 synonymic 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 synonymic verbs analyzed. The

matrix presentation of the semantic structures serves not only as a demonstrative depiction of the material, but it also creates the picture a unit systems in a language - we mean synonymy, since the semantic structure of each word in the matrix is represented by itself as a ranked ensemble of importance's interconnected and opposed to each other.

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

The problems of the comparative study of lexicon in different languages have found their reflected images in the works of such kind famous lexicologists as A.V. Scherba, R.A. Budagov, V.G. Gak, B.A. Uspensky, V.N. Yartseva, Sh. Balley, S. Uliman, U. Veinrich, A.V.Smirnitsky and the others.[24]

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

[24] Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды. М. 1977 стр. 119-122

(Russian and Uzbek are included) exist, and if yes, what kind of peculiarities and laws are observed for this.

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

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

Semantic peculiarities of synonymy

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

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

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

Model of focal points.

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

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

Ex: Even / only

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

3.2. Interchangeability and degree of synonymy

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

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

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

E.g. Sir Valiter Scott is the author of "Veverley"

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

In the linguistic literature on synonymy we can read that the interchangeable character of lexical units is considered as the effect to generalities of their lexical and grammatical importance. For support of this idea we can take the works of A.L. Demidova,[25] who, concerning with synonymic pretext, comes to conclusion that some synonyms differ in their semantically meaning and cannot be interchanged to each other, while the others are of stylistic shade and can be interchanged into each other. I agree with A.L. Demidova's idea is that there also exists the third group of synonyms, which combines in itself the features of the first two previous groups.

[25] Internet: http://www.wikipedia.com/English/articles/synonyms.

And, consequently, such synonyms are interchangeable in one case and not interchangeable in another.

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

'Absolute', 'propositional' and 'plesio –'relations outside synonymy

The category of 'absolute', 'propositional' and 'plesio – ', which we have utilized for the description of different types of synonymy, can in principle be extended to all lexical relations, although it appears that, outside of synonymy, 'plesio-' relations are of little interest. Absolute synonymy was shown to be a somewhat rare phenomenon; but whereas there is reason to believe that absolute synonymy is in some sense unnatural, and very probably unstable, there is no reason why a language should 'abhor' absolute antonym or absolute hyponymy. However, it is easier to define absolute synonymy than it is to define other absolute relations.

Any difference of meaning whatsoever disqualifies a pair of lexical items from being absolute synonyms; but a hyponym and a superordinate, for instance, or a pair of antonyms must obviously display some differences of meaning. So we need to specify what differences of meaning are permissible for absolute relations, and what are impermissible. One way of doing this is to use propositions synonymy as a model, and say that, for instance, X is an absolute hyponym of Y if (i) X is a hyponym of Y, and (ii) X does not differ in meaning from Y in any of the ways that non – absolute cognitive synonyms may differ. That is to say, they must not differ in respect of register or dialect (relatively unroblematical); they must not differ in respect of expressive meaning (also relatively unproblematic); they must not and they must not differ collocationally. This last criterion is more difficult, since items

with different criterial traits will inevitable differ in their patterns of co – occurrence.

What is to be outlawed from absolute relations is a difference of co – occurrence not sanctioned by differences in criteria traits. This is easy to state, but in practice might present problems.

None – the less, a pretty convincing case could probably be made for considering, say, ***dog*** to be an absolute hyponym of ***animal***, and ***long*** an absolute antonym of ***short***. Generally speaking, if X is an absolute R of Y, then anything that is a propositional synonym of X will be a propositional R of Y.

Thus, for instance, ***clean*** and dirty are absolute antonyms; mucky is a propositional synonym of dirty, so clean and mucky are propositional antonyms. With synonymy, our survey of the systematic aspects of word – meanings comes to a conclusion; the majority of any one of them, even at the descriptive level, still lies in the future. It should be borne in mind, however, that present investigation has been severely circumscribed by the search for structure and system in the vocabulary; a great deal that is important about the meanings of word – to lay users of language, at any rate – is particular and idiosyncratic. The contextual approach employed I this book is capable of yield much valuable information about the individual semantic properties of words – but that path has not been pursued here.

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. Synonymy may be studied synchronically and diachronically. Diachronically it studies the history of the synonyms while synchronically we study those of synonyms which characterize the present day English linguistic system.

Synchronically is the most important features of synonymy are:

1. Kinds of synonyms and their features.
2. Combinability of synonyms.
3. Synonymy and collacative meaning.
4. Semantic and functional relationship in synonymy.
5. Semantic peculiarities of synonymy.

A word can belong to several fields depending on the organizing concept.

Speakers of the language clearly identify the central example but not the peripheral ones. This doesn't mean that it would never happen that. The degree of flexibility in the discrepancy of the categorization of words is smaller.

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

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

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

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

More examples of English synonyms:

- baby and infant (noun)

- student and pupil (noun)
- pretty and attractive (adjective)
- sick and ill (adjective)
- interesting and fascinating (adjective)
- quickly and speedily (adverb)

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

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

Synonyms are words different in their outer aspects, but identical or similar in their inner aspects. In English there are a lot of synonyms, because there are many borrowings,

E.g. hearty / native/ - cordial/ borrowing/.

Noun after a word is borrowed it undergoes desynonymization, because absolute synonyms are unnecessary for a language. However, there are some absolute synonyms in the language, which have exactly the same meaning and belong to the same style,

E.g. to moan, to groan; homeland, motherland etc.

There are also phraseological synonyms, these words are identical in their meanings and styles but different in their combining with other words in the sentence,

e.g. «to be late for a lecture» but «to miss the train», «to visit museums» but «to attend lectures».

When speaking about the sources of synonyms, besides desynonymization and abbreviation, we can also mention the formation of phrasal verbs,

e.g. «to give up» - «to abandon»,

«To cut down» - «to diminish».

Grouping of words is based upon similarities and contrasts and is usually called as synonymic row. Taking up similarity of meaning and contrasts of phonetic shape we observe that every language has in its vocabulary a variety of words, kindred in meaning but distinct in morphemic composition, phonemic shape and usage, ensuring the expression of the most delicate shades of thought, feeling and imagination. The more developed the language, the richer the diversity and therefore the greater the possibilities of lexical choice enhancing the effectiveness and precision of speech.

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

a) The problem of synonymy in Modern English is very actual nowadays.

b) There are several kinds of analysis of synonyms: semantically, stylistic and componential.

c) A number of famous linguists dealt with the problem of synonymy in Modern English. In particular, Profs. Ullman and Broal emphasized the social reasons for synonymy, L. Lipka pointed out non-binary contrast or many-member lexical sets and gave the type which he called directional opposition, V.N. Comissarov and Walter Skeat proved the link of synonymy with other kinds of lexical devices.

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

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

THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Каримов И.А. Гармонично развитое поколение – основа прогресса Узбекистана. – Т: 1998. - “The further improvement of the system of learning English” стр. 156-168.
2. To’xtasinov I.M., Muhiddinova H.S., Omonov P.H. “linguistics and the efficient strategies of learning languages”-Toshkent: iqtidorli talabalar ilmiy-amaliy anjuman materiallari, 2015. Стр.276
3. Abayev V.I. “Synonyms and their Semantical Features” T. O’qituvchi 1981 pp. 4-5, 8, 26-29.
4. Akhmanova O.S. Lexicology: “Theory and Method”. M. 1972 pp. 59-66.
5. Arnold I.V. “The English Word” M. High School 1986 pp. 143-149.
6. Апресян Ю.Д. “Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства языка”. М. Изд-во МГУ 1974. стр.46.
7. Buranov A. Muminov J. “Readings on Modern English Lexicology” T. O’qituvchi 1985 pp. 34-47.
8. Burchfield R.W. “The English Language”. Lnd.1985 pp. 45-47.
9. Canon G. “Historical Changes and English Word-formation”: New Vocabulary items. N.Y., 1986. p.284.
10. Cruse D. A. « Lexical Semantics» Cambridge 2001.
11. Dubenets E.M. “Modern English Lexicology” (Course of Lectures)
12. Ginzburg R.S. et al. “A Course in Modern English Lexicology”. M., 1979 pp.72-82.
13. Halliday M.A.K. “Language as Social Semiotics. Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning”. Lnd. 1979.p.53, 112.
14. Howard Ph. “New words for Old”. Lnd. 1980. p.311.
15. Jespersen O. “Linguistics”. London, 1983, pp. 395-412.
16. Jespersen Otto. “Growth and Structure of the English Language”. Oxford, 1982 pp.246-249.

M., Moscow State Teacher Training University Publishers 2004 pp.17-31.

17. Maurer D.W., High F.C. "New Words - Where do they come from and where do they go". American Speech. 1982.p.171.
18. Potter S. "Modern Linguistics". Lnd. 1957 pp.37-54.
19. Schlauch, Margaret. "The English Language in Modern Times". Warszawa, 1965. p.342.
20. Sheard, John. "The Words we Use". N.Y.., 1954.p.3.
21. Smirnitsky A.I. "Synonyms in English" M.1977 pp.57-59, 89-90.
22. Арнольд И.В. "Лексикология современного английского языка". М. Высшая школа. Изд-во МГУ 1959. стр.212-224.
23. Беляева Т.М., Потапова И.А. "Английский язык за пределами Англии". Л. Изд-во ЛГУ 1971Стр. 150-151.
24. Виноградов В. В. "Лексикология и лексикография. Избранные труды". М. 1977 стр. 119-122.

Dictionaries

25. "Bloomsbury Dictionary of New Words". M. 1996 стр.276-278.
26. "Hornby the Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English". Lnd. 1974 стр.92-93, 111.
27. "Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English". Longman. 1981pp.23-25.
28. "The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English". Oxford 1964. pp.147, 167, 171-172.
29. "World Book Encyclopedia" N. Y. Vol. 8 1993 p.321.
30. 1978 pp. 23-24, 117-119, 133-134.
31. Arakin V.D. "English Russian Dictionary" M., Russky Yazyk
32. Трофимова З.С. "Dictionary of New Words and New Meanings". Изд. 'Павлин' ,1993. стр.48.

Internet sources

33. Internet: http://www.wikipedia.com/English/articles/synonyms.htm

34. Internet: http://www mpsttu.ru/works/English philology/ Э. М. Дубенец. Курс лекций и планы семинарских занятий по лексикологии английского языка.htm
35. Internet:http://www.freeessays.com/english/E.Cruse Quantitive and Qualitive synonymy.htm