

Tyshakova L.T.

candidate of pedagogical sciences,
associate professor of
the department of foreign languages,
*Luhansk State University of Internal Affairs
named after E.O. Didorenko,
Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine*

Khairulina N.F.

candidate of philological sciences,
associate professor of
the department of foreign languages,
*Luhansk State University of Internal Affairs
named after E.O. Didorenko,
Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine*

SYNONYMY IN ENGLISH FROM A STYLISTIC POINT OF VIEW

Human thinking reflects not only objective but also the subjective human reality in the process of speech. The lexical structure of the English language, like any other language, contains great expressive and expressive possibilities for the fixation of human subjectivity. Based on the fact that full-meaning words have denotative and connotative meanings, the vast majority of words in modern English has only a denotative meaning and is neutral in terms of expressiveness.

Stylistics pays attention to such words that can express both semantic relations and stylistic effects. This group of words includes neutral, emotionally evaluative words, book, official and other vocabularies, and synonyms.

From the vocabulary of the language, stylistics singles out such categories of words that serve not only to name various



concepts, phenomena, and objects but also to express the attitude of the speaker or the writer to the surrounding reality [3, p. 35].

Synonyms in journalistic and especially in artistic style are used to diversify the presentation, to avoid monotony and boring repetitions. Each component of the synonymous series, having greater or lesser semantic and stylistic differences, makes it possible to more fully reproduce the picture of the depicted, to reflect the essence of the phenomenon or concept.

Different types of synonyms can be distinguished based on the tasks of the created classification. The same concept or object can be called differently in different styles or language registers within one dialect or language variant (*gentleman/man/chap; thrifty/economical/stingy*), as well as differences between dialects and variants of the same language (*cowshed/cow house; haystack/hayrick; tap/faucet; windshield/windscreen*). The affiliation of synonyms to different styles and registers of the language, that is, the stylistic coloring of the word, is very essential, but it does not affect the conceptual side of the meaning. For example, the words *please* and *pray* convey a neutral and archaic outline of a request, respectively; stop talking and shut up differ in the degree of emotionality and, accordingly, the spheres of use. In this case, there is no conceptual difference between the denotations, but there are only stylistic restrictions, to which emotional differences can be added. For example, in the series *small/ little/ tiny/ wee* (girl), the synonyms *small* and *little* differ from each other in emotionality (*small - not large in degree, size, etc.; little - small, usually emotive, often preceded by another adjective, expressing feeling: a pretty little girl*), *tiny* reinforces the meaning of *small* (*tiny - extremely small*), and *wee* carries not only size and emotional value, but also a stylistic sign of belonging to a dialect (*wee - very small, Scottish*) [2, p. 78]. Synonyms representing the same concept in





different stylistic registers are called stylistic respectively and, as a rule, can be used interchangeably (especially aside from the neutral register). The differences between them are in the field of application, while the nuances of the content itself are purely stylistic.

The same objective relation is also manifested in the fact that synonymous relations can appear in the language between those words that are not synonymous in the language. Yes, the words *poet* and *swan* are not connected by any common meaning, but in the language, both these words are used synonymously in the sense of poet, if we are talking about W. Shakespeare (*the Swan of Avon*). The commonality of the context, in this case, allows us to call such synonyms contextual. Some contextual synonyms are fixed later in the language, speaking in the same context, and then we can talk about the contextual synonymy of a polysemous word. For example, the verbs *smash*, *condemn*, *stop*, and *fight* are not synonyms in the main meaning, but in *the context of racism* they are combined by the dominant *fight*.

Stylistically homogeneous synonyms should be called ideographic or conceptual, since, belonging to one (often neutral) stylistic sphere, they are correlated with the same concept, offering different aspects of looking at it (*power* - *force* - *energy* are correlated with the general concept, maximally expressed by the word *power* (*power* - *ability to do or act*; *force* - *power of body or mind*; *energy* - *force, capacity to do things and get things done*; *beautiful* - *handsome* - *pretty* describe the same sign, expressed in different degrees and characteristic of different denotations). The meaning common to all members of the series is called invariant, that is, unchanging, to which nuances are added in each of the synonyms. The clarifying function of synonymy begins to operate. The carrier of the purest invariant meaning, stylistically neutral, is the dominant of the series. In the above examples, the words *power* and *good* are dominant – looking accordingly.



Thus, a synonymous group is a microsystem of greater or lesser complexity, all of whose elements are organized in a certain way. The organizing center in this microsystem is the dominant or supporting word. The place of a particular synonym in its polysemantic lexeme is essential for determining the dominant.

A synonymous series or a synonymous nest is a synchronous group. However, the recognition of this fact cannot be evidence of a static certain microsystem. In the structure of the synonymous group, as in other elements of the language system, historical changes in the structure of this group. So, the synonymous group has formed historically and certain changes are taking place in it all the time. Since a synonymous group, like the structure of a polysemous word, is an open lexical group, it is quite natural that the number of words whose meanings are part of it can increase or decrease.

The authors can emphasize that within the limits of synonymous condensation, a word can become not only more expressive and powerful in its additional shades, but also capable of replacing its meaning in such a way that it has wider semantic possibilities in the context. The given meaning may bring it into syntagmatic relations with the new dominant words.

Differences in meaning and usage are essential in learning to use synonyms appropriately in language, especially when choosing a particular correct word in a particular context or language situation. That is why in dictionaries we find a paradigmatic description of synonyms, aimed at their specific features in differences in meaning, rather than similarities.

References:

1. Crystal David. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge University Press, 1995. 489 p.





2. Ivanenko S. M., Karpus' A. K. Linhvostylistychna interpretatsiya tekstu. [Linguostylistic interpretation of the text]. Kyiv, 1998. 176 p.
3. Mats'ko L. I. ta in. Stylistyka ukrayins'koyi movy. [Stylistics of the Ukrainian language]. Kyiv: Higher School, 2003. 462 p.
4. Rayevska N. M. English Lexicology. Kyiv. Vyshcha shkola, 1971. 332 p.

