

## The Ratio Of Variance And Synonymy In The Process Of Derivation

**Shomurodova Shahlo Jakhonovna**

Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor at Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan

---

**Abstract:** The article discusses the ratio of variance of the status of synonyms in the general classification. The ancient philosophers included three main features in the basis of synonymous relations of lexemes, which are recognized as leading by most modern semasiologists and lexicographers: belonging to one part of speech, semantic proximity of lexemes and their interchangeability. The approach to synonymy substantiates the division over several centuries of synonyms of one language into types: full, absolute, ideographic, grammatical, syntactic, stylistic and functional-speech synonyms.

**Keywords:** semantic structure of synonyms, linguistic synonyms, contextual synonyms, text, text discourse, nomination.

---

The greatest difficulty in distinguishing variance and synonymy is presented by various stylistic factors, such as expressiveness, emotionality, imagery, functional orientation and others, observed during derivational modification of the lexical composition of metaphorical units [19, p.80]. The attitude of researchers to the phenomena under consideration depends on how these factors are assessed. Those who see these factors as one of the main features of paremiological units, consider them incompatible with the concept of identity. As options they qualify as absolutely identical units [14, p.96]. They believe that the identity of phraseological units remains as long as there are no very noticeable semantic and stylistic differences between the options. Moreover, a particularly important role is assigned to the unity of the image between the options. In other words, the stylistic aspect is carried out by such researchers into the field of synonymy: the stylistic feature serves to differentiate synonyms.

Other researchers are characterized by a broader understanding of variance [5, p. 142-143]. In their opinion, variants are relatively identical units, which to one degree or another may differ in stylistic parameters. Certain modifications here do not violate the identity of the options. The stylistic aspect of

meaning for these researchers serves to differentiate options or both options and synonyms at the same time. Consequently, the typology of options is also significantly expanding [6, p.158].

Some supporters of this broad understanding of variance pay special attention to the degree of modification when classify the lexical composition of phraseological units, they divide the variants into completely identical, relatively identical and stylistic [4, p.6-7].

Others terminologically differentiate options, referring to them as options (equivalent options) and options (unequal options) [1, p. 31-32; 4, pp. 162-163].

Even broader understanding of variance is those who highlight variants in both aspects of phraseological units: both in terms of expression and in terms of content [13, p. 23]. Three types of variance are established: a) variants of the signifying idioms, b) variants of the signified idioms, c) two-sided variance, when both the form and the content of phraseological units vary at the same time. Along with the stylistic differences between the options, a complete mismatch in their lexical composition is also allowed.

In understanding variance and synonymy, it is advisable to be guided by the principle of invariance [1, p. 32], which not only most adequately reflects the essence of these phenomena, but also allows you to establish the identity of the options and see their difference from synonyms. Therefore, considering the variance we [14, p. 129] believe that the invariant must be present in both aspects of options, both in terms of their expression, and in terms of their content. Highlighting the invariant in terms of content, we consider the meaning of phraseological units as a complex concept, consisting of denotative, significative and stylistic aspects [17, p. 12]. Not only the first two aspects are important for phraseological meaning, but no less important is the stylistic aspect, which either dominates over the denotative and significative aspects, or is closely intertwined with them [19, p. 39-40].

Despite the heterogeneity of the composition, the stylistic aspect is still a constant value in the semantics of phraseological units. Therefore, we can speak about the identity of the options only when there is a maximum set of invariant features in each of the above aspects, which leads to the functional and semantic equivalence of the options. Moreover, the options should coincide both in quality and in the number of values [18, p.14].

For example, the phrase put the hard word (acid) on has two meanings: 1) "beg for money from someone", "ask for a favor" and 2) "molest the girls", which are implemented by both options. On the other hand, it cannot be considered variants of the unit like silly as a (cut) snake and mad as a (cut) snake. Both the first phraseological units and the second are used in the meaning of stupid as a stump." However, the phraseological units mad as a (cut) snake there is also a second meaning "angry, furious." [8, p.998] In this case, the concept of invariant does not duplicate the concept of identity, because invariance remains the guiding principle for establishing the degree of identity of units, their similarities and differences.

Inequality that does not violate the identity of the options [3, p.24-25], is observed in the linguist's theory only in three plans:

1) Variants may differ in quantitative terms as more frequent and less frequent. So, for example, the option for all the tea in China ("for nothing, for any good") has a higher frequency than the option for all the rice in China [8, p. 506].

2) Variants may differ in chronological indicators as later and early (but not archaic), existing in a given period of language development. For example, of the three options of phraseological unit poke borak (mullock, muck ) at ("ridicule, mock anyone") earlier, is an option poke borak at (from 1885). Recently, in paremiological unit stick one's bib in ("poke your nose into other people's affairs") a variant of poke one's bib in appeared, which is also recorded in dictionaries [7, p.798].

3) The options may vary by geographic indicators as a purely regional variants, widely spread in that particular area. Thus, Woolloomooloo Yank ("mod posing as American") is preferably used in Sydney, whereas its variant Fitzroy Yank used in Melbourne [8, p.616].

Of course, these factors (under certain conditions) can lead to a violation of the identity of the options and to the emergence of independent units. This tendency can be traced in the development of phraseological units' fair dinkum, which in the recent past had a variant square dinkum and functioned in the meaning of "true, real". However, due to its extremely high frequency, the fair dinkum variant acquired another meaning - "Honest word!", "By God!" and, consequently, here the splitting of the paremiological units PUs into two independent units is obvious.

Consequently, the structure of a variant phraseological unit consists of asymmetric quantities - relative (its external form) and absolute (its content). This makes it possible to qualify as variants such modifications of phraseological units that have two-sided invariance, which is minimally manifested in its form and maximally in its content, which are equivalent in their functional, semantic and stylistic parameters and coexist in a given period of language development.

Modifications of a different nature, entailing certain semantic and stylistic transformations, lead to the emergence of independent units, that is, synonyms [5, p. 191].

Consequently, synonyms have (in comparison with variants) fewer invariant features. It is not necessary for synonyms to have a lexical invariant: they must differ in their semantic and / or stylistic properties, even if they partially coincide in their lexical composition.

So, phraseological units: hen pen and sow pen, despite their lexical and semantic invariant (both phraseological units have the meaning "the place where women gather"), differ in the number of meanings. For example, phraseological units hen pen is also used in the meaning of "women's salon in a hotel".

The following types of phraseological units: game as the Ned Kelly and the game as with the Ginger Meggs are not variants which, if their common meaning coincides ("brave, courageous"), differ both in their origin and in style - the first is solemn, the second has a humorous shade [8, p.561].

By analyzing synonyms, we digress from a number of invariant features that are relevant to variants. Nevertheless, for all their differences, synonyms still retain the identity of the denotative meaning (within a given synonymous group, they all have the same referential correlation).

In understanding variance and synonymy, we are guided by the principle of invariance, which not only most adequately reflects the essence of these phenomena, but also allows us to establish the identity of the options and see their difference from synonyms. Therefore, when considering variance, we (following A.V. Kunin) believe that the invariant should be present in both aspects of the variants both in terms of their expression and in terms of their content. However, the ratio of formal and semantic invariants can be different. For the plan of expression, a minimal manifestation of invariance is sufficient, that is, the presence of one common component [11, p.234]. The need for an invariant in terms of expressing options is dictated by the following factors.

First, the presence of a common component in the formal structure of variants contributes to the establishment of their genetic commonality, because all variants of phraseological units go back to the same source, they are varieties of the same phraseological unit. Initially, at the moment of its appearance, phraseological units usually exist without variant.

Then, other options arise for various reasons on the basis of automated prototype, which necessarily have a material commonality with the prototype. For example, in the version based on phraseological unit *stone the crows! (Hell!! yah stop!)* (its first appearance dates back to the dictionary in 1918) were options: *starve the crows; stiffen the crows; stiffen the wombats; starve the lizards; starve the wombats; stiffen the lizards*. Because of a derivational change in its paradigm, variants of a meaning of a phraseological unit can be considered as a form and way of existence of phraseological units.

Secondly, the lexical invariant contributes to the variants to be in a relationship of mutually dependent orientation between the variants to the same object. The absence of a lexical invariant leads to a rupture of the formal unity of the variants, this can affect their semantic identity to large extent.

Thirdly, the absence of a lexical invariant makes it extremely difficult to distinguish variants from synonyms, if, for example, units are considered as variants that are stylistically unequal, because a number of synonyms are characterized by the same features. The necessity of a lexical invariant can be said only if all the components of phraseological units vary simultaneously, which leads to the emergence of a number of variants. Then, the extreme members of the variational series show a complete divergence of the lexical composition, however, their material identity is not lost, since they are interconnected through a chain of intermediate options.

So, phraseological unit “bad trot” (“streak of bad luck, a series of failures”) has the options tough trot: rough trot: rough run: bad run; since both components of a given phraseological unit vary, not all variants taken in pairs have a lexical invariant (for example, rough run - tough trot). However, their formal identity is established by means of other “neighboring” options.

In the field of verbal phraseology, variants with components arise: repose - to repose / rest / retire on one 's laurels; take, to have /ply / pull / take /tug the laboring oar; to put on / assume airs. The newest dictionaries reveal the first use of phraseological units (every) Tom, Dick and (or) Harry; in cold blood exactly in this form [9, p. 17].

Highlighting the invariant in terms of the content of the options, we consider the meaning of phraseological units as a complex concept, consisting of denotative, significative and stylistic aspects. For the phraseological meaning, not only the first two aspects are important, but the stylistic aspect is no less important, which either dominates over the denotative and significative aspects, or is closely intertwined with them. Despite the heterogeneity of the composition, the stylistic aspect is still a constant value in the semantics of phraseological units. Due to its constant nature in the semantic structure of phraseological units, it is advisable to identify variants in all three aspects of phraseological meaning. Therefore, we can talk about the identity of the options only when there is a maximum set of invariant features in each of these aspects, which leads to the functional and semantic equivalence of the options. The options should match both in quality and in the number of values.

Actively variation-synonymous relationship of functional - stylistic or emotional and expressive lines may be regarded as structural synonyms. Variation of lexemes in these phraseological units leads to renewal and revitalization of the figurativeness of the phraseological units, which is often combined with a decrease in the functional and stylistic status of these phraseological units: to keep one 's eyes open - to keep one 's eyes peeled; to shut one 's mouth - to shut one 's head [8, p. 346].

Thanks to this use, a structural synonym can serve as a means of conveying an emotional evaluative attitude to the depicted person, as well as characterize the installation of communication participants in easy communication. The following illustrative examples:

beat all → beat anything, beat creation or all creation, beat everything, beat the devil, beat the Dutch, beat cock-fighting // → beat hell, beat my time or beat the world [“surpass all expectations”], beat (all) creation [10, p, 249].

Thus, in such a block, you can show the variant displacement of one component by some other.

be (get or grow) too big for one 's [“be arrogant”, “put on airs”, “think too highly of yourself”, “turn up your nose] // boots → (breeches) // (britches): shoes or trousers, → pants.

Such a phrase-blocking technique allows you to bring in the dictionary data about different phraseological units against the background of their original fundamental principle: blow a fuse (or

gasket ; also blow one ' s cool or top) ← blow one ' s stack ; // blow one's boiler [“get angry”, “get mad”, “lose my temper”, “get angry”, “burst with anger”] // → blow one ' s top ;

not a cat (-in - hell) 's chance (also not a dog's chance, not the ghost of a chance, not an earthly chance; // as much chance as a snowball in hell, not a snowball s chance in hell [ in the meaning of " no chance "; " nor the slightest chance."]. More and following the diversion marked phrase-blocks:

(as) dead as a door-nail (or as a doornail) also as dead as a herring, as the dodo, as Julius Caesar, as mutton, rarely as Queen Anne; // as dead as a mackerel, as Moses; // as dead as a meat ax [ or as a mutton chop] [“without any - l. signs of life”];

get one's Irish up also: get one's rag out, one's shirt off or out, one's monkey up; // → get one's Indian up [“get mad”; “Get into the bottle”] [9, p. 449].

Such derivationally marked phrase blocking allows considering any other additional information about the ratio of different phraseological units with the basic source. Compare, for example, an indication of a stylistic and functional characteristic: cut a dash (a shine, obsolete a feather or a swath; Amer. Slang. Cut it fat ) [“flaunt, flaunt, show off, boast, show off”] → cut a dash // cut a shine [original source]; (as) easy as breathing (as failing or rolling) off a log , as kiss my or your hand , as lying , as shelling peas or as winking; See also: easy as pie , easy as damn it; easy as apple pie or as tea - drinking [colloquial style] [“easy,” “trivial business”].

A dictionary tendency is noted for the accumulation of new expressive units from stylistically reduced spheres in derivationally marked phraseological nests: to give smb. hell (Sam Hill)- to give smb. down the banks, to give smb. rats; to change base - to steal a base - to cut one ' s stick -to vamoose the ranch. Thus, in synonymous series, in contrast, the reduced character of phraseology appears more clearly.

However, the tendency to reflect folk speech is not constrained by the conservatism of the literary norm, it is eventually neutralized by the opposition of the dynamics of the developing language. First, the time factor contributes to an increase in the functional and stylistic status of linguistic means. Therefore, in a number of cases, the severity of the collision of functionally heterogeneous linguistic means turns out to be softened over time: it was under these the damaging conditions that he got up to "make good", as the vulgar say. Secondly, the active process of derivation of lexical and metaphorical units leads to significant shifts in the ratio of synonymous metaphorical series [ 16, p. 18].

## LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Bushuy T.A. Phraseological Equivalentation as a problem of contrastive Lexicography// Contrastive Linguistics. –Sofia, 1996.-№1. P.30-35.

2. Dahl O. Topic-comment revisited// Topic and comment. Contextual boundness and focus. - Hamburg, 2001.-P.10-39.
3. Dictionary of contemporary English. – Editor-in-chief P. Procter. -London: Longman,1998. –XXXIX.-1303p.
4. Dijk T.A. Text and context// Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse. – New York, 1996.-P.42-88.
5. Discourse studies in cognitive linguistics/Ed/ by van Hoek K.E.A.- Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamin’s, 1999/-187 p.
6. Jackendoff R. Foundations of Language. Brain. Meaning. Grammar. Evolution. -Oxford: University Press, 2004.-477p.
7. Johnson B. a Common English Sayings: A Collection of Metaphors in everyday usage. – London; New York; Toronto, 1998.1520p.
8. Cowie A., Mackin R. The Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1985.- Vol. 1.-576p.
9. Courtney, Rosemary. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. – Harlow (Essex): Longman, 1983.-734p.
10. Collins Dictionary of the English Language. Ed.by L. Urdang, P. Hanks, Th.H.Long. – London; Glasgow: Collins, 2006.-XXXV, 1690p.
11. Oh Dinner D.A. Syntax and semantics: Presupposition. – New York: Academic Press, 2005.-348 p.
12. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. –Ed. by T.B. Sykes. –Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.-1312p.
13. Бушуй Т., Сафаров Ш.Тил қурилиши: таҳлил методлари ва методологияси.-Тошкент: Фан, 2007.-274 б.
14. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка.-М.:Высшая школа,1986.-336с.
15. Кунин А.В. Фразеология современного английского языка.-М.: Международные отношения,1972.-288с.
16. Меликян А.А. Классификация библейских фразеологизмов английского языка на основе концептуальных моделей преобразования знания в семантические единицы языка: Авторефер.дисс...канд.филол.наук.-Пятигорск : ПГПИИЯ, 1998.-21с.
17. Селиверстова О.Н. Когнитивная семантика на фоне общего развития лингвистической науки// Вопросы языкознания. – М., 2002.-№6.- С. 12-26.
18. Сепир Э. Избранные труды по языкознанию и культурологии. –М.: Прогресс, 1993.- 654с.

19. Шаховский В.И. Эмоциональные культурные концепты: параллели и контрасты//  
Языковая личность: культурные концепты. - Волгоград: Перемена, 1996,-С.80-96

20. Шаховский В.И.,Жура В.В. Дейксис в сфере эмоциональной речевой деятельности//  
Вопросы языкознания. –М., 2002.-№5. –С.38-56.