SYNONYMY AS A PHENOMENON OF LANGUAGE AND EXPRESSION OF SEMANTIC EQUIVALENCE OF LEXICAL UNITS

Abstract: the article deals with synonymy as a phenomenon of language, as an expression of semantic equivalence of lexical units is considered primarily in the proper semantic and structural (operational) plans corresponding to the first two approaches to its study. According to the author, the formation of synonymous units is based on three main cognitive processes: Association, categorization and lexicalization.
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Introduction
The essence of synonyms as words (word combinations) with the same or similar meaning and usage is understood differently by different researchers. We can talk about several approaches to the study of synonymy. In one approach, synonyms are considered in terms of their semantic content as identical words and words close in meaning.

From the position of individual knowledge, synonymy is understood as one of the mechanisms of formation and functioning of units in the space of mental lexicon, each lexical unit contains the energy capacity for synonymization. This situation removes the problem of non-coincidence of synonymous series represented in the language system and functioning in speech; leads to the destruction of the sign of partial unity of words entering into synonymic relations; deactualization of the dominant features of synonymous series: static and neutral, and the dominant is understood as a typical representative, stable Association within a natural category.

Synonymy as a phenomenon of language, as an expression of semantic equivalence of lexical units is considered primarily in the proper semantic and structural (operational) plans corresponding to the first two approaches to its study. These approaches, reflecting various correlated aspects of the consideration of meaning, do not deny each other, but they are consistent and should be considered in their unity; they are one of the manifestations of the postulated position that the identity (similarity) of the use of linguistic units is a reflection of their semantic identity (similarity). Therefore, the General definition of synonymy should take into account both of these characteristics.

Despite the General definition of synonymy as the semantic equivalence of all or part of the content of linguistic units, the concept of "synonyms" seems to be always relative and determined by the nature of the context, as well as the relevance of the information that these units carry as part of the whole statement. The only absolute synonymy (replacement, refinement, and so on.), its realization and division of words into "synonyms" and "non-synonyms" (language and speech, true or "approximate", i.e. quasi-synonyms) are largely conditional.

What is the main purpose of synonyms in the language? Possessing identical or similar meanings, they replace each other in the text, clarify the content of the designated, giving it a different assessment, forming together with other words one or another "stylistic system" statements (text).
Synonymy as a lexical category is a semantic relation of identical or similar meanings expressed formally by different words that implement functions of substitution, refinement, and stylistic functions in the text. Two (or more) are synonyms if they have different signs (lexemes), are able to replace each other in all or certain contexts due to the identity or similarity of meanings, without changing the content of the statement.

The formation of synonymous units is based on three main cognitive processes: Association, categorization and lexicalization. Synonymic relations arise in the area of intersection of several categories in the zone of semantic proximity. Words in synonymic relations in speech are not arranged linearly, and have common, overlapping semantic relations with other members of the synonymic series; due to the functioning within the common motivational space is able to synonymize in different situations. Synonyms form a network instead of a linear chain of concepts. This is especially important in the University practical course, as synonymous definitions are often more meaningful than lengthy explanations (fearful – timid; nasty — bad). It is impossible to absolutize synonymous definitions, they are not universal.

Working with lexical synonyms, in particular, familiarization with a new series, finding out the General meaning and shades of its components, can be simultaneously work on the synonymization of new words and their assimilation, activation. The question of introduction, explanation of the meanings of new words-synonyms is one of the most important in the University methodology. At the same time it is necessary to take into account the presence of a certain vocabulary.

From a cognitive perspective, the problem of synonymy is inseparable from the question of the relationship of language, thought and reality, identity and difference; symmetry and asymmetry. In practical terms, consideration of this problem is determined by the important role of the possession of human synomyic means to select from the dictionary and grammatical system of the language is the tools that accurately express his thoughts and feelings (Khantakova 2006). In this regard, the consideration of synonymy in the cognitive-discursive aspect from the standpoint of modern anthropocentric linguistics allows us to add to its traditional understanding. In addition, the issue of the status of intra-industry synonymy emerging and developing in discourse is seen as debatable.

Thus in modern works on the problem of synonymy (Ivanova 2006, Khantakova 2006, Khayrutdinova 2007) mentions the importance of using an integrative approach in her study, the need for interdisciplinary research. The linguist's attention should be focused "not on the particulars, but on the general and the nature of the integrative interaction of the parts of the objects of language and language as a whole, which corresponds to the first and basic premise of any linguistic research – the systematic understanding and explanation of linguistic phenomena in their interdependence and interdependence” (Khantakova 2006: 8). The cognitive-discursive approach can be considered as an approach that allows to integrate the existing theoretical developments in the field of synonymy.
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