

GENERAL THEORY OF SYNONYMS, CRITERIA OF SYNONYMS

Dilnoza Alisherovna Tursunova*

*Teacher,

Karshi State University, UZBEKISTAN

Email id: dilnozatursunova@mail.ru

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2022.00574.2

ABSTRACT

In this article, the general properties, usage and linguistic meanings of synonyms and their mutual equivalents have been studied by comparison. Also, while we have studied synonyms in many ways, such as syntax, lexicology, and semantics, the novelty is that in modern linguistics, the types and different meanings of synonyms are studied in more depth. The sources of synonyms and their application in the context are closely related areas, which are related to the meanings of words.

KEYWORDS: *Denotative Meaning, Phonemic Form, Connotation, Affective Value, Style, Emotional Coloring.*

INTRODUCTION

A characteristic feature of any language dictionary is the presence of synonyms, which are closely related to the problem of the meaning of the word. The most complex problem is the definition of the term “synonyms”. There are many definitions of this term, but there are no universally accepted definitions. Traditionally, synonyms are different in sound form, but are defined as words that have the same or similar meaning. But this definition has been severely criticized in many ways.

Russian and foreign scholars have different approaches to the problem of synonymy. Among the many definitions of the term in our linguistics, the most complete and complete definition is I.V. Arnold: "Synonyms - are two or more words of the same meaning, belonging to the same part of speech, possessing one or more identical meaning, interchangeable at least in some contexts without any considerable alteration in denotation meaning, but differing in morphemic composition, phonemic shape, shades of meaning, connotation, affective value, style, emotional coloring and valence peculiar to one of the elements in a synonymic group."¹

This definition describes the concept of “synonymy”, gives some criteria of synonymy (specificity of meaning, interchangeability), shows some differences in connotation, emotional coloring, style and so on. “Similarity” or “similarity” or are not objective criteria of uniformity of meaning. They are all based on the linguistic instincts of scientists.

It follows from the definition that members of a synonymous group in a dictionary should have their own common denotative meaning and therefore interpret it with the same words; they may have some differences in impressive meaning, shades of meaning, idiomatic usage, and so on.

Hope, expectation, anticipation are synonymous because they all mean "having smth in mind which is likely to happen..." But *expectation* may be either of good or of evil. *Anticipation* is as a rule an expectation of smth good. *Hope* is not only a belief but a desire that some event would happen. The stylistic difference is also quite marked. The Romance words *anticipation* and *expectation* are formal literary words used only by educated speakers, whereas the native monosyllabic *hope* is stylistically neutral. Moreover, they differ in idiomatic usage. Only *hope* is possible in such set expressions as *to hope against hope, to lose hope, to pin one's hopes on smth*. Neither expectation nor anticipation could be substituted into the following quotation from T. Eliot: "You don't know what hope is until you have lost it".²

Synonymy is used to mean "uniformity of meaning." Apparently, for a dictionary creator, many phrases have the same meaning; they are synonymous or synonymous with each other. This allows them to designate a gala as a ceremony or a blue spruce, but this method is of little use if the reader does not know a word, that is. g. if the hoatzin is defined as a stink-bird; or neve like firn. Of course, dictionaries rarely rely solely on synonyms, but add descriptive details to illuminate the reader.

It is often argued that English is rich in synonyms for historical reasons, and that its dictionary is derived from two different sources, on the one hand from Anglo-Saxon and on the other from French, Latin and Greek. Since English is historically a Germanic language, Anglo-Saxon is the first stage of its development, so the words "Anglo-Saxon" are often considered "native", while French, Latin or Greek are "foreign" from these languages. "Borrowed." But the terms "local" and "foreign" are misleading. Regardless of their origin, most words are an important and absolutely natural part of the English language; In addition, some of the words "mother" may have been "borrowed" from another language in the distant past. Unfortunately, there are often attempts to remove the "foreign" element from languages. . The French are dissatisfied with the word "Français" (now commonly used English words in French), and the Welsh are very happy to keep the word "Latin", but substitute the word "English" in the language. Spend time and scholarship to find the words. It entered the earlier form of language during the Roman Empire.

However, it is true that there is a pair of words "native" and "foreign". So we have brotherhood and fraternity, acquisition and acquisition, the world and the universe, and so on. The words "native" are often shorter and less studied, and the four-letter words (literally) are mostly derived from the Anglo-Saxon language. There are also examples of the trinity, one from "native", one from French, one directly from Latin - kingdom, kingdom, kingdom (although with this collection it is of French origin, the word royal bo although it is more widely used today).

However, it should be noted that there are no real synonyms, no two words have the same meaning. In fact, two words with the same meaning are unlikely to be preserved in the language. If we look at possible synonyms, there are at least five ways that they differ from each other:

First, some sets of synonyms belong to different dialects of the language. For example, the term fall is used in the United States and some western districts of Britain, where others use autumn. The works of dialectologists are rich in such examples. They are especially interested in words related to farming; depending on where you live you say cow, barn or byre, hay, hayrick or hay. Even a household faucet is a faucet or pipe in most parts of the United States. But these phrases are not interesting at all for semantics. Their status is no different from English and French

translations. It is simply a matter of people speaking in different forms of language with different phrases.

Secondly, there is a similar situation, but more problematic with words used in different “styles” or “registers”. A foul odor, under appropriate conditions, can be an unpleasant discharge or a “terrible odor”. The first is, of course, very “luxurious” in terms of humor, and the second is in colloquial language. Similar trios (although they do not have the same stylistic features, but differ in the level of formality) - Mr., Male and Left, pass through the world, die and spread. They are more difficult to solve because there is a much clearer difference between the styles than in the geographically defined dialects. We don’t usually switch from one dialect to another, but we can change our style during a single conversation, in particular by changing dictionary elements to achieve different effects. The question is, should a change in style be seen as a change from one “language” to another, or as a change within a language? If it is the first, then stylistic synonyms are no more interesting than dialectal synonyms or equivalent words in English or French. If the latter is the case, we must say that stylistic differences may be semantic. There is some credibility in the idea that this is a semantic feature if we move from style to style to achieve an effect. But there is a big objection to that. When changing style, we can change not only vocabulary but also grammar and phonology, and it is difficult to incorporate stylistic differences as part of a phonological or grammatical system. They are easier to consider in terms of different but interrelated “languages,” such as dialects. If this applies to stylistic synonyms, we do not include them in the semantics, but leave them for a separate examination of the style.

Third, as we have seen, some words may differ only in their emotional or evaluative meanings. The rest of their meaning, the “cognitive” meaning, remains unchanged. Examples are statesman / politician, hide / seek; another trinity - thrifty, thrifty, stingy. Such words are often discussed in detail in semantics books. They are really interesting in that they are used to persuade or influence others, to promote, and so on. However, it is a mistake to try to distinguish such an emotional or evaluative meaning from a “basic” “cognitive” meaning. Words for five reasons:

First, as mentioned above, it is not easy to determine exactly what a cognitive meaning is, and it is certainly unreasonable to try to define such a meaning in terms of reference physical properties. In particular, it should be noted that many verbs and adjectives in this sense do not have cognitive meaning or do not exist at all.

Secondly, there are words in English that are used PURELY for evaluative purposes, most obviously the adjectives *good* and *bad*, but it is not normally assumed that they have no cognitive meaning. Such words are of interest to moral philosophers, but should not, I believe, have any special place in linguistics.

Thirdly, we make all kinds of judgments and do not merely judge in terms of 'good' and 'bad'. We judge size and use the appropriate terms -*giant/dwarf*, *mountain/hill*, etc., and we make other kinds of judgments in our choice of words. The meaning of words is not simply a matter of 'objective' facts; a great deal of it is 'subjective' and we cannot clearly distinguish between the two.

Fourthly, *some* words are collocationally restricted (see 5.2), i. e they occur only in conjunction with other words. Thus *rancid* occurs with *bacon* or *butter*, *addled* with *eggs* or *brains*. This does not seem to be a matter of their meaning, but of the company they keep. It could, perhaps,

be argued that these are true synonyms - differing only in that they occur in different environments. But, on the other hand, as we shall see shortly, some scholars have actually thought that the test of synonyms is whether they occur in identical environments!

Fifthly, it is obviously the case that many words are close in meaning, or that their meanings overlap. There is, that is to say, a loose sense of synonymy. This is the kind of synonymy that is exploited by the dictionary maker. For *mature* (adjective), for instance, possible synonyms are *adult, ripe, and perfect, due*. For *govern* we may suggest *direct, control, determine, require*, while *loose* (adjective) will have an even larger set - *inexact, free, relaxed, vague, lax, unbound, inattentive, slack*, etc. If we look for the synonyms for each of these words themselves, we shall have a further set for each and shall, of course, get further and further away from the meaning of the original word. Dictionaries, unfortunately (except the very large ones), tell us little about the connections between words and their defining synonyms or between the synonyms themselves.

REFERENCES:

1. Arnold, I. V. 1986. *The English Word*. Moscow: Vyssajaskola.
2. Dilnoza Alisherovnaturesunova, Sabohatmannonovashermatovna, Hilolaumirovabaxritdinovna. 2021. *General Characteristics Of Synonyms And Analyze Their Meaning* "Экономикаисоциум" №5(84)
3. Berndt, R. 1984. *A History Of The English Language*. Leipzig: Verlagencyklopadie.
4. Cruse, A. 1997. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
5. Cruse, A. 2000. *Meaning In Language. An Introduction To Semantics And Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Dilnozaturesunova, &Jumaeva, N. (2016). *The Translation Of Metaphor Andmetonymy From English Into Uzbek In The Works Of E. Hemingway*. In *Young Scientist: Challenges and Perspectives* (Pp. 541-546).
7. Dilnozaturesunova. May 15, 2022. *The Meaning And Usage Of Family Related Quotes In English Language*. *Current Research Journal Of Philological Sciences*.
8. Dilnozaturesunova, *Theoretical Bases Of Lexicology*, Scientific Progress: 2022
9. Dilnozaturesunova, "Diferrences Between Synonyms", *Modernization and innovative technologies in foreign languages*, 2020
10. Dilnozaturesunova, "Classification Of Synonyms", *Modernization and innovative technologies in foreign languages*, 2020