

LINGUAPRAGMATICS OF SEMANTIC RELATIONS

Sabirova Nodira Karimbaevna

Docent of the English philology department

National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Abstract:

This article gives information about synonymy as semantic relation in many different languages. It is considered necessary for a speaker with a certain competence to know not only the meaning of a word but also its interaction with other words in the language, that is, antonymic, hyponymy, and synonymic relations. The expression and fixation of these relations are often regarded as one of the main tasks of lexical semantics. Paradigmatic relations of synonymy, antonym, and hyponymy represent the harmonization of lexical elements. Hyponymy is one-sided, which means that the signs of a superior word are expressed in the meaning of a subordinate word.

Keywords: synonymy, phenomenon of synonymy, denotative or connotative effects, lexical unit, paradigmatic relations, discourse, semantic, contextual, and pragmatic relations, communicative-pragmatic strategy

Synonymy can be observed as semantic relations in many different languages. Scientific works and studies devoted to synonymy in English linguistics indicate a deep study of this phenomenon observed in existing lexical and speech units of the language. The views of the English linguist J. Lyons on synonymous relations deserve attention. He stated that two (or more) items are synonymous if the sentences, which result from the substitution of one for the other, have the same meaning. [2; 428] That is, even in the case when a linguist replaces each other in a sentence, he indicates that two (or more) units, in the sentences in which they participate, mean the same meaning, are synonyms.

Scientists who conducted research in the field of Uzbek linguistics described how speech becomes fluent and influential, one of the important methodological tools that provide a clear and imaginative conclusion of thought, meaningless words with the same or similar meaning are given as synonyms. For example, *чиройли, гўзал, барно; бахтсуз, бахтмуқаро, бадбахт*. Questions of studying the phenomenon of synonymy in Uzbek linguistics S.Isamukhamedova, I.Siddikova, A.Danilov, U.Tursunov, N.Rajabov, E.Tajiev, R.Yunusov, B.Daniyarov and such scientists as M. Vafoeva are the main source of research for their works.

Academician A.Khodzhiev stated that synonyms are words whose pronunciation, and spelling are different, whose unifying meaning is the same (which is common), and which differ from each other in several features, such as the subtlety of additional meaning, emotional coloring, and applicability. Such a group of words that relate to a common (unifying) meaning forms a synonymous series.

The Ph.D. work of the Uzbek linguist M.Rakhmatullayeva is devoted to the study of Alisher Navoi's skill in using synonyms, in addition to dividing *nutqiy (speech)* verbs,

such as *zanupuyb*, *cykym* (speech, silence) in the Uzbek language, into lexico-semantic groups, I. Kochkortoev considered the semantic analysis of phrases that make up each lexical-semantic group.

Synonymy is the relation of equality and reciprocity of the meanings of words. Synonymy is taken into consideration among individual lexical units, as well as lexical synonymy consisting of more than one unit, as well as consisting of mutually expressive relations of meaning. Semantic identification is considered a fragment of a native speaker's metaphorical stock, and usually, words with the same meaning are called synonymy. R. Hudson and other linguists argue that the essence of meaning and similarity of grammatical features are also required. [1; 439]

Synonymy is a type of semantic connection between lexical units, in which the common meaning of two or more lexical units is considered as the use of "one-to-one" in a certain context, without denotative or connotative effects. According to L. Murphy, the *Baggage/luggage* pair corresponds to the meaning of the *bag*. [4; 169] The word *pupil* is synonymous with the word *student* as a human meaning taught by the teacher. The words *boy* and *son* are synonyms that have a mutual semantic connection.

According to S. Ullman, the synonymy of words contradicts all views on language. [6; 288] When analyzing different words, it is assumed that some differences in meaning may exist instinctively. Once their combined environment is fully explored, the lexical synonyms presented often turn out to be incorrect. The words *almost* and *nearly* in the sentence *I very **nearly/almost** forgot my appointment*, also confirm the above statement. Most often, the difference between lexical synonyms is observed not in denotation, but in connotation, that is, in the emotional meaning and associations of the word. The lexical unit's *doctor* and *quack* can denote a practicing doctor, and in a certain context, one is used instead of the other. Examples of this are the words *lunch* and *luncheon*, *fag*, and *cigarette*.

Understanding the meaning of a word implies understanding not only its definition or its specific lexical and semantic meaning. It is considered necessary for a speaker with a certain competence to know not only the meaning of a word but also its interaction with other words in the language, that is, antonymic, hyponymy, and synonymic relations. The expression and fixation of these relations are often regarded as one of the main tasks of lexical semantics. Paradigmatic relations of synonymy, antonym, and hyponymy represent the harmonization of lexical elements. Hyponymy is one-sided, which means that the signs of a superior word are expressed in the meaning of a subordinate word. Considering that synonymy is a phenomenon of a double relation, in which the attributes of the lexical unit *A* in the sense of the lexical element *B* and vice versa, the attributes of the word *B* in the sense of the word *A* are necessary. Usually, a communicator is faced with a choice of lexical elements in the structure of a phrase. The following sentence *A* corresponds to sentence *B* according to different paradigmatic relations. For example, the adjective *Many* is synonymous with the word "*numerous*" with the meaning while the noun *sushi*, a hyponym of *Japanese food*, in a sentence *A* is a hypernym, while the words *restaurants* and *kitchens* are co-hyponyms of the hypernym *eating establishments*.

The restaurants often have a sort of pan-Asian flair and there are many sushi bars.

The kitchens rarely have any sort of pan-Asian flair and there are numerous Japanese food bars.

However, instead of the hypernym of *Japanese food* in the examples above, the hyponym *sushi* is not used, the Japanese word *okazu* is also a hypernym of hyponym words that represent the name of *Japanese food* such as *tofu*, *kaiseki*, *tempura*. There are also co-hyponyms of the *sushi* hyponym, such as *sushi nigiri*, *sushi temaki*, *sushi inari*. If the speaker uses the lexical element *B* instead of the lexical unit *A* was given above, this leads to the expression of statements with different meanings according to different paradigmatic relations. Although synonyms are words with the same meaning, the choice of their synonym is not solely based on the meaning.

Antonyms, synonyms, and hyponyms are the most important of the lexical relationships that can be identified in a language dictionary. V.Nyckees believes that the study of antonyms, synonyms, and hyponyms is important because lexical units play a crucial role in the pragmalinguistic relations between them. [5; 365] In particular, to understand each other in the speech of members of society, it is necessary to establish relationships between different expressions.

If two words are synonyms, they are considered the same in meaning in all contexts. The problem of synonymy and grammatical context raises another problematic issue. To date, the paradigmatic system of the language is focused on synonymy, leaving the place of synonymy in its use in the language free. An initial comment on this topic is considered good style, so as not to repeat the same words in similar contexts in many types of written discourse in a given language. As a result, lexical units with similar meanings are often used as equivalents rather than semantically differentiated. Equivalent words considered in the context are assigned the status of a non-permanent, temporary synonym. Hence, the previous equivalent terms may have a contrasting relation *J. Lyons* generalizes this question in all lexical respects. In his opinion, any established semantic relations are created not for the general totality of the language, but for specific contexts or ranges of contexts. [2; 481] There are also not only contextual synonyms but also contextual antonyms. In the context of its *қизил* color, there are different antonyms. That is, *қизил вино-оқ вино*, *қизил чироқ-яшил чироқ* and etc. By the difference in the mutual taste, color, and shelf life of the quoted *қизил вино* (red wine) and *оқ вино* (white wine) drink, in the case of a contextual antonym of *оқ* (white) and *қизил* (red), a *қизил чироқ* (red traffic light) indicates a stop in traffic, and its *яшил чироқ* (green light) is a sign of movement, in which red and green lights can be a contextual antonym.

Absolute synonymy is considered a rather rare phenomenon, and with contextual synonymy, the meanings of words in context converge. The difference between contextual and linguistic synonyms is that contextual synonyms are often expressed in a certain context of the convergence of the meanings of words. While contextual synonyms appear only in context, linguistic synonyms appear in a separate form and

in the scientific linguistic literature are quoted as part of speech, noting that phrases and phraseological units are closely related in meaning and are considered words with a single synonymic series in this context.[10; 195]

Contextual synonyms create a variant of the expression of meaning in the language. The use of contextual synonyms changes the monotony of the speaker's speech. In addition, the use of contextual synonyms clarifies the idea, characterizes the specific situation in more detail, and is considered one of the tools that convey additional information about the referent to the recipient. Given the functional nature of contextual synonyms, it can be concluded that they most optimally realize the communicative and pragmatic potential of speech. They clarify the idea, create consistency in the text, and express the emotionality of the initiator of communication. A.I.Ivanova person who has explored the complex nature of contextual synonymy. quoted that, contextual synonymy is a linguistic, psychophysiological, communicative-pragmatic, linguophilosophical, and cognitive phenomenon. [9; 186] The study of contextual synonymy as a phenomenon of nominative variability shows that it has many characteristics.

In linguistics, we observe that the composition of the meaning of a word consists of lexico-semantic and pragmatic components. The lexical-semantic meaning of a lexical unit is a lexical meaning out of context, in a state unrelated to a specific addressee. A pragmatic meaning arises when a word is used in a certain discourse. Also, in the second case, the meaning of the word is interpreted by the addressee or the person being dropped and can completely change the content of the sentence. In particular, in a contextual situation, the meaning of lexical units expressed in a sentence changes semantically, and the recipient of the information fills it with information that is revealed to him.

The lack of a clear classification of contextual synonyms in modern linguistics makes it difficult to clarify them. The complexity of the systematization of contextual synonyms has been recognized by several researchers, and some consider this task unsolvable. I.N.Vursta and G.V. Romanova argue that contextual synonyms should be based on an integrated approach. [7; 16] They analyze contextual synonymic series and determine their following properties. In particular, in the lexical system of a language, their members are not considered linguistic synonyms and are not used interchangeably outside of a certain context. The proximity of the meanings of the members of this series is determined by the addressee's attitude to the surrounding reality. In this contextual environment, the meaning of each member of the dominant and synonymous series varies depending on the secular concept of the addressee and the addressee. In this case, the meaning of the contextual synonym expressed by the addressee may not be clear to the addressee without additional explanations. In addition, all the members of a series can be used as synonyms and replaced by each other only in a certain discourse, but each synonym represents one of the components of its meaning. Contextual synonyms perform their distinct functions. Each series is a flexible system, the components which can be overstated taking into account cultural

characteristics or excluded from it. In a new speech situation, any member of the synonymous series can play the role of a dominant.

I.N.Wurst noted the contextual synonymic series with the cited properties as 'irrational'. [7; 15] An irrational contextual synonymous series is considered to be a culturally expressed association of heterogeneous lexical units that are used interchangeably in certain speech contexts.

When using synonymy and for a better understanding of the communicative and pragmatic nature, they are considered in different contexts. It is observed that the changes occurring in the synonymy event are associated with extralinguistic factors. Social and cognitive-pragmatic factors play an important role in the use of language units in communication. A.Mamadov notes that *"This is because the language as a whole, the same element performs an important social task – to ensure communication between members of a social group by transmitting information through ordinary signs"*. [3; 14] That is, language elements represent information using simple lexical symbols among members of a social group, which is considered an important social task. One of the main goals of communication is to influence the interlocutor, and this phenomenon is the pragmatics of the language unit, within which the influence of the lexical unit on the listener is studied. Consequently, pragmatics is always directed cognitively. V.I.Zabotkina explores the problem of synonymy, referring to the fact that synonymy was originally programmed to implement the speaker's communicative intention. [14; 3] The linguist also claims that a person seeks to express his intention by making his lexical choice in speech, and also implies the rights of a particular listener. This state indicates a person's awareness of pragmatic properties.

In modern linguistics, great importance is attached to language in the discourse of communication participants. In the study of modern functionalism, communication focuses on the choice of linguistic means, the social context, and the interaction of participants. When choosing synonyms, the main factors of such a pragmatic feature as the state of communication, the intentionality of the initiator of communication, and the communicative-pragmatic strategy are observed.

The correct use of the meaning of some synonyms depends on the context. Some limitations can be seen in the choice of the appropriate synonym in the synonymic series used in a specific new context. In this case, we see that there is a choice of linguistic means corresponding to communication, and pragmatics studying their application, that is, a specific speech situation or context.

Even though synonyms have a similar meaning, they are not used in the same contexts. In a particular context, it is observed that the meaning of the chosen lexical unit has a completely different meaning when applied in a different context.

The study of the problem of synonymy made it possible to combine the theoretical knowledge contained in linguistics and the opinions presented during this season about the nature of synonyms. This allows us to establish patterns and principles of a certain choice synonyms in different systematized language. Synonyms are considered

to be the most important component of the text, providing semantic and compositional construction. In world linguistics, the main emphasis was placed not only on the semantics of a lexical unit but also on its pragmalinguistic content. As a result, ample opportunities were created for the manifestation of the meaning of language, thinking, and lexical element in the language. The study of semantic, contextual, and pragmatic relations between synonymous words is one of the urgent problems of linguistics. Synonyms are of particular importance for more pronounced expression and colorfulness of speech. The choice of synonyms in text and speech is influenced by many factors related to semantic and pragmatic aspects. The pragmatic nature of synonymy allows the communicator to choose a unit in the synonymic series by the intended intention, and the listener to correctly understand that it is applied contextually, to find a worthy expression of thoughts and attitudes. In particular, highlighting not only the problems of synonymy themselves, but also the pragmalinguistic properties of antonymy also requires effective linguistic research.

References:

1. Hudson R. Rosta A. Holmes J. Gisborne N. Synonyms and Syntax, *Journal of Linguistics* 32: 1996. P. 439–446.
2. Lyons J. *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968. – P. 428.
3. Mamadov A. *Discourse and translation: Functional-cognitive approach*. – Baku: Letterpress, – 2012. – P. 14-15.
4. Murphy M.L. *Semantic relations and the lexicon. Antonymy, synonymy and other paradigms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2003. – P. 169-215.
5. Nyckees V. *La sémantique*. Paris: Belin, 1998. – P. 365.
6. Ullmann S. *Semantics: An introduction to the science of meaning*. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1962. – 288p.
7. Вурста И. Н. К вопросу о контекстуальных синонимах / И. Н. Вурста, Г. В. Романова. – Текст: непосредственный//Юный ученый. – 2022. – № 3 (55). – С. 15-18.
8. Данияров Б. Проблемы лексической синонимии узбекского языка: коннотативный аспект семантики номинативных единиц. – М., 1994. – С. 15-93.;
9. Иванова А. И. Контекстуальная синонимия как проявление номинативного варьирования в тексте: дис... канд. филол. наук. Тверь, 2006. - 186 с.
10. Моисеенко А.В. Лингвэкологические и структурные особенности контекстуальных синонимических рядов в английском и русском языках // Известия РГПУ им. А. И. Герцена. 2008. № 60. - С. 195–198.
11. Таджиев Ё. Синонимия словообразующих аффиксов со значением «наличие-отсутствие» в узбекском языке: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – Ташкент, 1974. – 23 с.;
12. Таджиев Ё. Аффиксальная синонимия в узбекском языке: Автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. – Ташкент, 1991. – 48 с.;

13. Юнусов Р. Полисемия и синонимия имен существительных места в современном узбекском литературном языке. Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – Ташкент, 1974
14. Заботкина В.И. Когнитивно прагматический подход к неологии. Когнитивно-прагматические аспекты лингвистических исследований. – Калининград: Калининградский университет, – 1999. – С. 3.
15. Вафоева М. Ўзбек тилида фразеологик синонимлар ва уларнинг структурал-семантик таҳлили: Филол. фан. ном. ... дис. – Тошкент, 2009. – 127 б.
16. Дониёров А. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилидаги синонимлар сўзларнинг стилистик функциялари: Филол. фан. ном. ... дис. – Самарқанд, 1967. – Б. 5-29
17. Исамухамедова С. Ҳозирги замон ўзбек адабий тилида синонимлар: Филол. фан. ном. ... дис. – Тошкент, 1963. – Б. 4-24