

УДК: 811.111

Ширзадова Лятифа Вугар кызы
аспирант
г. Баку, Азербайджан
Азербайджанский университет языков
e-mail: shirzadovalatifa5@gmail.com

Latifa Vugar Shirzadova
PhD student
Baku, Azerbaijan
Azerbaijan University of Languages
e-mail: shirzadovalatifa5@gmail.com

РОЛЬ СИНОНИМИИ В СЕМАНТИЧЕСКОЙ СТРУКТУРЕ ТЕКСТА

Данная статья исследует ключевую роль синонимии в семантической структуре текстов. Синонимы рассматриваются не как простые взаимозаменяемые единицы, а как фундаментальный лингвистический механизм, жизненно важный для достижения семантической ясности, стилистического разнообразия, когезии и когерентности дискурса.

Основная цель – доказать, что синонимия не является тривиальной лексической заменой, а является основой семантической плотности текста.

В статье используется метод Дескриптивного и Сравнительного Лингвистического Анализа, который включает следующие этапы:

- Определение неабсолютной синонимии: оспаривается идея полных эквивалентов, поскольку все синонимы различаются по коннотации, регистру или контексту.
- Идентификация источников: Классификация их происхождения на Лексическое Заимствование (например, романские vs. исконные термины) и Лингвистическое Развитие.
- Анализ функциональных различий: Разграничение общих и контекстуальных синонимов, которые служат конкретным стилистическим целям (например, эмфазе или избеганию избыточности).
- Интеграция текстовой лингвистики: Рассмотрение синонимии как формы реинтерпретации (повторного наименования), которая строит лексическую когезию и обеспечивает общую когерентность текста.

Синонимия – это основополагающий текстообразующий ресурс, выполняющий важнейшие коммуникативные и эстетические функции.

Выбор синонима всегда уточняет смысл: исконные термины (*motherhood*) несут эмоциональные ассоциации, тогда как заимствованные (*maternity*) более нейтральны/клиничны. Писатели стратегически используют расхождения в тоне (*dad* vs. *father*) для создания риторических эффектов и избегания повторов. Синонимы создают лексическую когезию, которая необходима для поддержания логической последовательности. Они являются неотъемлемыми единицами, обеспечивающими выразительную многосторонность языка.

Ключевые слова: лексическая семантика; диахроническая лингвистика; языковая вариативность; экспрессивный язык; семантический нюанс; литературный стиль; кросс-лингвистический анализ.

THE ROLE OF SYNONYMY IN THE SEMANTIC STRUCTURE OF A TEXT

This article investigates the essential role of synonymy in the semantic structure of texts, asserting that synonyms function not merely as interchangeable lexical units but as significant tools for semantic clarity, stylistic nuance, and expressive variation. The primary aim of the article is to establish that synonymy is not trivial lexical interchangeability, but a core linguistic mechanism vital for semantic density, stylistic variety, and the achievement of cohesion and coherence in discourse.

The article uses a Descriptive and Comparative Linguistic Analysis method, proceeding through the following steps:

- Defining Non-Absolute Synonymy: Challenging the notion of perfect equivalents by noting that all synonyms diverge in connotation, register, or context.
- Identifying Sources: Classifying the origins of synonymy into Lexical Borrowing (e.g., Romance vs. Native English terms) and Linguistic Development (e.g., semantic broadening, analogical extension).
- Analyzing Functional Differences: Distinguishing between general equivalents and Contextual Synonyms that are only synonymous in specific settings to achieve stylistic goals (e.g., emphasis, redundancy avoidance).
- Integrating Text Linguistics: Placing synonymy within the framework of cohesion (specifically as reiteration which builds lexical cohesion) and coherence (the resulting semantic unity).

The article concludes that synonymy is a fundamental text-building resource that serves crucial communicative and aesthetic functions. Native terms (motherhood) carry emotive/cultural associations, while Romance-derived terms (maternity) are more clinical/restricted, proving that synonym selection refines meaning. Writers strategically exploit the divergence in emotional valence and tone (e.g., dad vs. father) to create rhetorical effects and avoid repetition, as seen in literary examples like Dickens's use of notoriously and immortal. Synonyms create lexical cohesion - a form of reiteration, which is essential for maintaining the coherence and logical sequence of the text (e.g., using important and necessary across sentences to link ideas). Synonyms are integral lexical units that help maintain a language's unique characteristics and offer considerable expressive versatility.

Key words: lexical semantics; diachronic linguistics; linguistic variation; expressive language; semantic nuance; literary style; cross-linguistic analysis.

Synonyms are lexical units that reflect nuanced semantic distinctions within a shared core meaning. In English, as in most natural languages, absolute synonymy is virtually nonexistent. Even when two lexemes enter the language independently to denote the same referent, diachronic semantic evolution invariably leads to subtle divergences in connotation, register and contextual appropriateness.

The emergence of synonymy can be primarily attributed to two overarching linguistic processes:

1. Educational and Cognitive Expansion: As scientific inquiry and human cognition advance, language incorporates new terms to accommodate increasingly abstract or refined conceptualizations.

2. Lexical Borrowing: Foreign lexemes are assimilated into the native lexicon as a result of socio-historical interactions such as conquest, trade or intellectual exchange.

In the formative stages of linguistic development, a tendency toward expressive diversification emerges, typically through three mechanisms:

a) semantic broadening

Originally monosemous lexemes frequently evolve into polysemous entities, acquiring multiple related meanings. This semantic expansion, while enriching expression, can introduce ambiguity, thereby necessitating the development of new lexemes or the narrowing of existing ones. For instance, the Old English word *dumb* initially denoted *stupid*, but gradually came to signify individuals who refrained from speech in public, and eventually those physically incapable of speaking. In contemporary English, *dumb* may also convey voluntary silence or emotional restraint. The semantic field of dumbness now includes associations such as quiet, uncomplaining, indifferent, forbearing, and forgiving, illustrating how a word's denotative meaning can shift toward an array of connotative interpretations.

b) analogical extension

Lexical items often undergo metaphorical or functional extension. For instance, while *middle* designates the center of a physical object, *heart* is metaphorically construed as the emotional or spiritual core - yielding idiomatic expressions like the heart of England. Similarly, *brightness*, which literally refers to visual luminosity, is metaphorically employed to denote intellectual acumen, establishing functional synonymy with intelligence. Such analogical transformations are especially characteristic of the English linguistic psyche.

c) associative shift

Words may acquire novel meanings through socio-cultural and contextual association. A king, for example, wears a crown and sits on a throne, allowing these symbols to metaphorically represent monarchical authority - as in expressions like loyalty to the crown. Similarly, the literary figure Lothario, originating from Nicholas Rowe's "The Fair Penitent" has become emblematic of a seductive libertine, owing to narrative association [1, p. 15].

Synonymy is fundamentally motivated by the pursuit of stylistic richness and lexical variety. Modern English exhibits an especially dense synonymic network, facilitating the articulation of refined semantic nuances. This is especially salient in the distinction between emotionally resonant and technically precise vocabulary. Consider the contrast between native English terms such as *motherhood*, *fatherly*, and *manly*, which carry emotive and cultural associations, and their Romance-derived counterparts *maternity*, *paternal*, *parental*, *male* and *masculine* which are generally more clinical and restricted in usage. For example, while *motherhood* connotes nurturing and emotional bonding, *maternity* is typically limited to biological childbirth. Similarly, *fatherly* implies kindness and moral presence, whereas *paternal* relates to legal responsibility or lineage.

These distinctions underscore the necessity for precise synonym selection in discourse, as different terms carry divergent stylistic, cultural and emotional implications. A notable trend in modern English prose is the preferential use of Romance-origin synonyms over native alternatives. However, language purists caution that such choices may undermine clarity and alienate readers unfamiliar with foreign-derived terminology, since native lexemes tend to resonate more directly with the linguistic intuition of the average speaker.

Therefore, synonymy is not merely a linguistic ornament but a core mechanism for semantic enrichment. Given that no pair of synonyms is truly interchangeable across all contexts, synonym selection demands heightened linguistic sensitivity and contextual awareness. Comparative literary analysis across languages - such as English and Azerbaijani - further demonstrates the cultural embeddedness of synonymic usage and the necessity of cross-linguistic understanding in semantic interpretation.

Language, being inherently dynamic, perpetually oscillates between form and meaning. If we consider the lexical field of *sad*, *encompassing sorrow*, *gloom*, *tragedy*, and *despair* or the semantic network surrounding *love*, *including charity*, *friendship*, *affection*, *passion*, *tenderness*, *devotion*, *amour* and *lust* we may see each term introduces a distinct emotional or stylistic shade and none can serve as a perfect sub-

stitute for another. Writers skillfully leverage this semantic range to enrich their textual expression [3, p. 156].

For example, the poet Robert Herrick's line - "*Bid me to live, and I will live, thy Protestant to be*" - deploys Protestant in a singular, poetic context that defies synonymic replacement. Likewise, Charles Dickens's phrase - "*as though they themselves were notoriously immortal*" - exploits the ironic juxtaposition of notoriously and immortal, creating a rhetorical effect unattainable through more neutral alternatives [7, p. 61].

Moreover, synonyms may exhibit divergence in stylistic tone and emotional valence. When differences in register or nuance are pronounced, such terms are classified as stylistic synonyms. Among these, contextual synonyms hold particular significance. Unlike dictionary-defined equivalents, contextual synonyms acquire synonymic function only within specific discursive settings. Context confers unique emotional and evaluative undertones upon a word, elevating its pragmatic function and facilitating both semantic precision and stylistic variety. This mechanism aids in avoiding redundancy and allows for more nuanced expression of the author's stance.

Contextual synonymy manifests through various stylistic devices. Synonym pairs frequently observed in English, they are employed for emphasis and rhetorical amplification. Additionally, synonymous clusters may appear within a passage, a technique known as semantic reinforcement. Writers also utilize synonymous variation, which permits differentiated articulation of concepts without repetition and even non-synonymous terms may acquire temporary synonymy in specific contexts, enriching the text's expressive depth [7, p. 125].

Strategic synonym use is especially encouraged in stylistic domains where personal expression and creativity are foregrounded such as literary prose, journalism and narrative nonfiction, though it is less applicable in rigid genres like scientific or legal discourse.

The abundance of synonymous resources in English enables authors to navigate multiple dimensions of meaning with precision and aesthetic sensitivity. Beyond the lexical level, syntactic synonymy further enhances expressive capacity, as varied syntactic constructions allow for flexible rephrasing of ideas. Poetic devices such as metaphor and personification often give rise to stylistic synonymy, especially within literary texts. For instance, describing flames rising toward the sky as reaching like a pole transforms a simple physical phenomenon into a vivid, figurative expression [2, p. 63].

Stylistic synonyms, while semantically proximate, differ in pragmatic, emotional and connotative dimensions. They are context-dependent rather than interchangeable and their inappropriate substitution may result in communicative distortion. For example, the lexical pairs *children* - *infants* or *dad* - *father* illustrate how choice of synonym can signal different levels of formality, intimacy or cultural framing.

Text is not only composed of sentences, text is also the unity of cohesion and coherence. If coherence and cohesion do not exist in the text, it can absolutely not be understood. If we look at I. R. Galperin's explanation of cohesion: "Cohesion is one of the rich and various means in literary works. The logical, psychological, and formal -structural types of cohesion are so numerous that in some texts, it is difficult to

give them a taxonomic character. To fully reveal the difference of cohesion in a literary text, it is first necessary to separate it into its components. Distant cohesion, in general, is characteristic only of literary works” [4, p. 75].

Cohesion, while based on formal relations between words and sentences, is divided into two groups: lexical and grammatical. M.A.K. Halliday and R. Hasan divide grammatical cohesion into four classes. These are: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction [5, p. 4].

Reference itself is divided into two types: endophora and exophora. Endophora relates to the situation, exophora relates to the text. Endophora also has two types: anaphora and cataphora. Anaphora is a reference to the preceding text, cataphora is a reference to the following text. As an example:

/The girl is cooking /// She is 18 years old // In the given example, the pronoun “she” in the second sentence refers to the word “the girl” in the previous sentence, and for this reason, it is called anaphoric reference. Let’s look at another example:

/After her arriving home, my sister cooked a cake// in this sentence, “her” is considered a cataphoric reference, because it refers to the phrase “my sister”.

Substitution is the replacement of one word with another, and ellipsis is the omission of words. For example, in English, /one/, /ones/, /same/, /do/, /did/, /so/, /not/ can be classified as substitution:

- Which flowers do you like? - The red ones.

“A large caravan was moving ahead of them - carriages, and many people walking behind the carriages”.

Conjunction arranges the elements in the text in logical sequence. The role of conjunction in creating cohesion is more significant.

Common nouns, reiteration and other lexical connections used to create cohesion are classified as lexical cohesion. Common nouns have references to the main noun class as small groups. As an example, the words /human/, /place/, /fact/ can be shown.

In general, one of the forms of lexical cohesion related to the repetition of lexemes, the use of common nouns for reference to the previous lexeme, and the use of synonyms is reiteration. Let’s look at the examples:

/There were lots of colourful flowers in her garden//

/One day she picked all pink flowers//

/Education is important for our future//

/It is necessary to study//

The word “flowers” is a repetition, and the synonyms “important, necessary” in the given examples play a role in the creation of lexical cohesion. If one lexeme refers to another lexeme it is related to by being a general referent, this is reiteration.

However, lexical cohesion is not only achieved through two lexemes with the same referent. For example,

/This child is very curious//

/Children like watching TV//

/On Sundays children play in the yard//

The words /child/ and /children/ in the given examples do not have the same referent. As can be seen, lexical cohesion is achieved with comparative reference.

Coherence, defined as the deep-seated semantic and conceptual connectivity of a text, encompasses both linguistic and substantially extralinguistic dimensions. It consistently manifests at the surface level through explicit linguistic markers. Under appropriate contextual conditions, even a seemingly disjointed sequence of words and sentences may be interpreted as a coherent discourse by the recipient, thereby facilitating its meaningful perception. Coherence is also the continuum and logical sequence in the text. The general principle of the interpretation of language in context is coherence. Coherence refers to the semantic unity created between the ideas, sentences, paragraphs, and sections in the writing and allows the reader to understand the text. Coherence is the semantic relation that is formed by the interpretation of each sentence in the discourse, which involves the connection between the text, the writer, and the reader, being consistent with the interpretation of the other sentences.

In textual composition, the realization of cohesion is contingent upon the dynamic interaction between cohesive devices and coherence, shaped by the communicative intent of the author. The structural components of a text maintain reciprocal connections, contributing to its overall unity. Within the domain of text linguistics, scholarly attention predominantly centers on the mechanisms that integrate individual elements into a cohesive and coherent whole.

In modern linguistics, every linguistic code is analyzed from the perspective of its communicative function. As a result, text is viewed not as a static unit, but as a communicative unit with shifting boundaries.

Every text has a manner in which it is written, and this is its style. Texts are clothed in a stylistic mantle. The problem of functional styles began to attract attention as a special direction in linguistic research from the beginning of the 20th century in the works of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, E.D. Polivanov, V.V. Vinogradov, L.P. Yakubinsky, and others. Work on functional styles was carried out as a result of the idea of the theory of language functional styles in the research of I.R. Galperin, I.V. Arnold, O.S. Akhmanova, V.A. Kukharenko, O.G. Rizel, M.N. Kozhina, and other linguists. The functionalization of language in various spheres of society's activities has become the subject of many recent studies, and the problem of differentiating the division of language into functional styles has been central to many works. Alongside this, a number of studies on style were conducted in the 20th century, and it was approached from the viewpoints of monism, dualism, and pluralism. Among these approaches, style - as "the dress of thought" and style - as a method of expression generate particular interest. The metaphor /Dress of thought/ generates interest. S. Wesley presents it like this:

"Style is the dress of thought, a modest dress" [8, p. 18].

Synonymy is not the trivial notion of lexical interchangeability, it is a fundamental linguistic process that facilitates semantic density, stylistic variation and communicative specificity. It is essential to the build-up of layered textual meaning, the transmission of cultural nuance and the establishment of reader engagement.

Finally, synonyms, as integral lexical units that form the foundation of a language's vocabulary and embody its unique characteristics, play a pivotal role in maintaining linguistic identity. They offer considerable expressive versatility – minimizing redundancy, enhancing semantic precision, eliciting emotional or stylistic

resonance, and clarifying nuanced meanings. Evidently, lexical synonymy occupies an essential place in the organization and stylistic enrichment of literary texts, underscoring its indisputable contribution to textual cohesion and expressive depth.

REFERENCE

1. Baker M. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London: Routledge, 2019. 698 p.
2. Chung Siaw-Fong. A corpus-based analysis of “create” and “produce” // Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences. 2011. № 4 (2). P. 399-425.
3. Cutting J. Pragmatics and Discourse. London: Routledge, 2002. 256 p.
4. Galperin, I. R. English Stylistics. M.: Higher School Publishing House, 1981. 334 p.
5. Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R. Cohesion in English. London: Longman. 1976. 180 p.
6. Jackson H., Amvela E.Z. Words, meaning and vocabulary: An introduction to modern English lexicology. London: Continuum, 2000. 256 p.
7. Laufer, B. Words you know: How they affect the words you learn. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990. Vol.30. P. 573–593
8. Wesley, S. An Epistle to a Friend Concerning Poetry, USA: Hard Press, 1700. 58 p.