

## COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LEXICAL SYNONYMS IN ENGLISH

Sayfutdinova Nilufar

Teacher of Andijan Academic lyceum of the Ministry of Internal Affairs

**Abstract:** The theme of article sounds as following: “comparative study of lexical synonyms in English”. This work can be characterized by the following: the actuality 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.

**Key words:** synonyms, English language, lexical equivalence, philology.

In modern science, two points of view on synonyms as a phenomenon of lexical equivalence can be distinguished: identity and difference. The first point of view is generally accepted in British philological tradition (for example, the definition of synonyms given by D. Crystal [1]).

The majority of Russian linguists support a completely different point of view. In the Russian philological tradition not identity, but some similarity in expressing meanings shades is considered as the basis of synonymy, and the primary attention is being paid to the differentiating function of synonyms. The comparison of synonymous words emphasizes not only the common in their meanings, but also the shades of meanings distinguishing the words being studied from each other.

The study of synonyms is initially only at the lexical level, “... usually, “the same meaningful words”, “words with similar meanings”, “words with similar meanings”, “Methodological colors, as words that differ in their level of application is defined. If we pay attention to the definition of synonyms in Uzbek linguistics, in defining them, first to the semantic homogeneity of the lexemes, and then to the generality of the meanings [3], and then to the spiritual similarity (exactly) is observed”. Synonymous meaning until the 70s of the last century by the 80s, the semantics of the word were defined on the basis of exact homogeneity structure has been studied by a number of scholars based on semantic analysis (Including Sh. Rakhmatullayev, H. Nematov, E. Begmatov, R. Rasulov).

Russian linguistic literature contains a completely different approach to the problem of lexical synonymy. For example, in the course of modern English lexicology Professor A. I. Smirnitsky refuses to consider this phenomenon, since lexicographical practice shows that there are no words in the language being absolutely identical in terms of content [2. 104].

One can agree with professor A. I. Smirnitsky in case of considering synonymy as semantic identity of two different language units. On the other hand, words can be close in meaning, and this is the cause of difficulties experienced by teachers, students, lexicographers, because it is necessary to display the differences between words, to explain and to illustrate them.

The synonymic method consists in the selection of one or more synonyms to the lexical unit being defined and usually functions to disclose the words’ lexical meanings by clarifying each of the word’s scope of use. In this sense, such a method of definition can only be considered conditionally precise. Synonymic way of describing the meaning of the word is both philological and lexical in nature [3.100].

Synonymous words in the dictionary definition perform the so-called metalinguistic function, characteristic not only of the dictionary. Modern logic distinguishes between an “objective language” speaking of an object and a “metalanguage” speaking of a language. Metalanguage is used not only in linguistics, but also in our everyday life. According to R. Jakobson, we use metalanguage without realizing the metalinguistic nature of our actions [4. 231].

When the speaker and the recipient of information somehow “verify” their semiological systems, the speech is aimed at verifying the content of statements and performs metalinguistic function. When analyzing the following statements: To be flunked is to fail at the exam. The sophomore is a second-year student. R. Jakobson explains their metalinguistic nature, noting that they are aimed at establishing equivalence between the units and bear information only about the lexical code of the language [5. 233].

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.)

Ex: The snakes crawled around the tree.

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

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

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

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

The problems of semantics on — former call the rapt attention to themselves by the leading scientists of the whole world. At the modern stage of development of linguistically science the important meaningfulness is gained both in the questions of the determination and revision of the background notions of semasiology, and the narrower problems of the concrete studies which are finally also directed on solving of the global philosophical problems of the correlation between the language, thinking and reality.

We analyze this chapter from the viewpoint of the Russian philologist E.V.Drozd. According to this work E.V. Drozd has denoted the study of the semantics and the peculiarities of the combinability of the English verbs “to amuse”, “to entertain”, “to grip”, “to interest”, “to thrill” .

The given group of verbs was chosen not accidentally. The verbs “to amuse”, “to entertain”, “to grip”, “to interest”, “to thrill” reflects the important social and psychological notions, connected with intellectual — cognitive and emotional sphere of human activity and this group differs in a rather big frequency of its usage. The interest to this group is also undutiful from the purely a linguistically standpoint because of its extent semantic structure, and the various possibilities for combinability.

Proceeding with the concrete procedure of analysis of semantic composition of the given verb, we put the following problems before ourselves:

- 1) clearly delimit and describe the verbal word as a nominative and structured unit of the language, to analyze the peculiarities of the semantic structure of each verb and match them;
- 2) to install on the base of semantic composition what the subject of the name comprises in itself: only the main verbal component of action, condition, motion or it comprises the accompanying features: the manner, the source, the purpose — and to compare the verbs on this parameters.

#### References:

1. Antrushina G. B., Afanasyeva O. V., Morozova N. N., English Lexicology, Moscow , 2004
2. Arnold I. V., The English Word, Moscow, 1973
3. Akhmanova O.S. Lexicology: Theory and Method. M. 1972 pp. 59-66