Synonymy in semantics pdf

To continue to enjoy our website, we ask that you confirm your identity as a human being. Thank you very much for your cooperation. Jump to other articles: Up admissibility judgments Acoustic Phoneitcs purchase, second language, and bilingualism, psycholin ... Adpositions Affixation African Linguistics Afroasiatic Languages Agreement Algonquian Linguistics Altaic Languages Analogy Anaphora Animal Communication Aphasia Applications Arawak Language Argument Structure Artificial Languages Athabaskan Languages Australian Language Austronetic Linguistic Aids Balkans, Berber languages and linguistic languages Bilingualism and multilingualism Language blocking cadon language biology Caucasian languages Leads Celtic language Celtic mutations Chomsky, Noam Chumashan language classifiers clauses, Relative Clinical Clinical Linguistics Linguistics Linguistics Colonials Colonial Place Names Reconstructions Comparative-Historical Linguistics Complement Complexity , Linguistic Compositionality Compounding Computational Linguistics Conditionals Conjunctiononism Cosaska? Maximi conversational implicature Cooperation principle Coordination Copula Creole Creole, grammatical categories in critical periods Interlingual speech perception and production Definiteness Dene-Yeniseian Addictions, Long Distance Derivational Morphology Determiners Dialectology Dialog Diglossia Disfluency Distinctive Features Dravidian Languages Ellipsis Endangered English as Lingua Franca Ergativity Eski-Aleut Euphemisms and dišfemisms Evidence Of semia-based models in linguistics Existentially existential Existential Existential Wh-Constructions Experimental Linguistics Fieldwork Finite State Language First Language Attrition Formulaic Language Francoprovençal French Grammar Frisian Gabelentz , Georg von der Gender Genealogical classification General syntax Genetics and language gestures Grammar, Categorical grammar, Construction grammar, Descriptive grammar, Functional discourse grammar, phrase structure Grammar Harris, Zellig Heritage language english hmong-mien language history Honors Humor language Hungarian vowel Harmony icon idiophone idiopathic idiome idioms and Phraseology Imperatives Indefiniteness Indo-European Etimology Inflected Infinitives Information Innateness Interface Between Interface Phonology and phonetics Interjections Intonation IPA Iroquoian Languages , Roman Japanese Word Accent Jones, Daniel Juncture and Border Kiowa-Tanoan Languages Kra-Dai Valodas Labov, William Language Acquisition Language and Law Language Contact Language Documentation Language, Gender, and Sexuality Language Geography Language Ideologies and Language Attitudes Language in Autism Spectrum Disorders Language Language Change Language Standardization of African Languages american languages, world indigenous languages Lexemes Lexemes Lexical Access, Lexical Semantics Lexical-Functional Grammar Lexicography Linguistic Annthropology Areas Linguistic Linguistic Landscapes Linguistic Prescriptivism Linguistic Relativity Literature and Linguistics Loanwords Machine Translation Mande Languages Markedness Mass-Count Mathematical Language Mayian Mental Health Disorders, Language Meso-American Metaphor Metathesis Metonymy Minority Language Mixed Language Mixe-Zoquean Language Modification Mon-Khmer Morphological Changes Morphology , Deprivation movement Munda Language Muscovy Language Nose and Nasal Niger-Congo Language Non-Pama-Nyungan Languages North-East Caucasus Language Nostratic Number Figures Ocean language Papua-n language Penutian Language Philosophy Language Phonetic Phonetics, Articulatory Phonological Research, Psycholinguistic Methodology Phonology, computational phoneology, Early Child Pidgins Polarity courtesy language polysemia pragmatics, acquisition of pragmatics, computational pragmatics, Experimental Prague Linguistic Circle, Presupposition Pronouns Psycholinguistics Quechuan and Aymaran Language Questions Mutual Reduplication Reflexive and Reflexive Relevance Salish Languages Sausures Sausus , Ferdinand de Semantic Change Semantic Maps Semantic Roles sentence processing monolingual and bilingual speakers Note language linguistics Sociolinguistics Sociolinguistics, Variations Sonority Sound Change South American Indian Language Specific Language Impairment Perception Speech Production Speech Synthesis Suppletion Switch-Reference Syllables Syncretism Synonym Synctic Synctic Syntactic Knowledge, Child Acquisition Tense, Aspect, and Mood Tone Tone Sandhi Topic Transcription Transit and Voice Translation Trubetzkoy, Nikolay Tucanoan Languages Tupian Languages Tipology Usage-Based Linguistics Uto-Aztecan Languages Valentour Theory Words , Serial Visual Word Recognition Voice and Voice Quality Vowel Harmony Word Class Word Formation Japanese Word Stress Writing Systems Yiddy Zapotecan Languages Down Free online reading I. Introduction II. Problem II.1 Absolute Synonym II.2. Complete Synonym II.3. Cognitive synonyms II.4 Plesionyms III. Iv. Literature quoted in I. Introduction I asked several of my friends what they thought synonyms were. Almost everyone said that they thought synonymous had at least two words, which meant the same thing. However, this statement is too simplistic. Their definition would apply only to absolute synonyms (this term will be explained later). This document is an intention to provide an overview of the problems we face when dealing with synonyms and to solve the problem of synonymous rules. Problem To begin with, let's take two company's semantical insights. First, there are a few words that have a special semantical relationship. They are similar to each other in such a way that they are interchangeable in several contexts. These words are usually called synonymous. Secondly, there are obviously words that are more synonymous than others. For example, let's take a settee and a couch that is more synonymous than cunning and savvy. So synonymous seems to be a gradable phenomenon; thus introducing at least two different types of synonyms, absolute synonym and complete synonym. First of all, I decided to focus on the absolute synonym, because the problems of determining synonyms will become more obvious. II.1 Absolute Synonym Absolute synonym means that a pair of lexicons is completely interchangeable in all imaginable contexts and has the same distribution ratio. The first aspect means that two lexicon items a and b, if they are to be recognised as absolute synonyms, (a) must be normal in a context in which b is normal and (b) must be completely unusual in the context in which it is. This requirement has passed very few couples. This test shows this (+ indicates a more normal; - points to a less normal): 1a smoke vs smoke I'm going to smoke a cigarette. (+) I'm going to get a cigarette. (-) 1b big vs big He's a big boy. (+) He's a big boy. (-) 1c knock vs cream He knocked him unconscious. (+) He creams him unconscious. (-) 1d almost vs. almost She looks almost Chinese. (+) She looks almost Chinese. (-) This indicates that there may always be contexts in which the leksim is less common than the other. However, there are words that could be accepted as absolute synonyms. For example, an airport and an airfield that co-existed in English for some time. But due to the economic principle the airfield is outdated at all. The economic principle leads us to the idea that two words with the same reference object cannot exist for a long time in the same language (except for the cognitive synonyms that I will send later in the text), thus greatly weakening the idea of absolute synonymous. Another possibility that could be started is that one word develops other nuances in its sense, which would mean that a pair of lecsims is no longer synonymous in every context. If there are to be lexi-weights which have exactly the same meaning in all contexts, regardless of the economic principle (which I very much doubt), there is always a second point that must be met in order to qualify them as absolute synonyms. For both lexs, the distribution coefficient must be the same. This requirement, however, is much more difficult to verify because the language is not static. Methodological problems related to the design of the test object (language) and the sample size to be taken in order for such analysis to be valid (the sample must cover each social group in each part of the test. language) are indeed huge. II.2 Complete Synonym Let us take a look at the couple almost and almost again. As was shown above, this pair cannot qualify as absolute synonyms. But in a number of contexts they seem to be completely interchangeable. 2a I've almost managed to win the race. I almost managed to win the race. 2b He almost made me cry. He almost made me cry. In this context, both vocabulies are the same, they are completely synonymous. However, this synonym is limited in context because, as we have shown earlier, there are contexts in which they are not completely identical in their sense. Contextual limited synonym is relatively rare, but it exists. But can we tell why some leses are identical in one context, and one of them is strange in the other? It is even difficult to say whether there is a difference or not, and to find out what the difference is is not always clear. One is tempted to say that this is due to the subtle nuances that these differences exist. Let's try to explode these subtle nuances. How can we determine what these nuances are? One way to find out is to use componential analysis. In component analysis, we try to find properties that can be attributed to lesleplexs. The idea is that synonyms must have the same characteristics. If they don't they're not absolutely synonymous. The more they are common, the higher the semantic overlap, the synonymous they should be. But is this really the case? In this example, we will be given some insights. 3a Abbildung in dieser Leseprobe nicht enthalten 3b Abbildung in dieser Leseprobe nicht enthalten 3c Abbildung in dieser Leseprobe nicht enthalten Example 3c has more common characteristics than example 3a, so it must be synonymous. But that is not the case. There is no single context in which a bird can be replaced by a cat and which will retain its original importance despite its high semantic overlap. No matter how sub-split class we are, couples don't become synonymous. Why is this so? The answer is that synonyms not only require high semantic overlap, they also need low indirect contrast. One function of the word bird is to exclude other closely related items, in this example cat. Another reason why component analysis is not useful for determining synonyms is the choice of attributes that should be involved. What differences would still be possible to have in high semantic overlap, what differences make the difference a low indirect contrast? In other words, what characteristics are the contrast is low, what properties overlap high? The answer is as simple as disappointing. Completely synonymous are lexicons that are identical to the central semantical entrances and differ with smaller and peripheral ones. This statement, intuitively true, is still very difficult to describe because there is no scientific evidence to determine whether a feature is a central or peripheral one. However , there are signals that can recognise a complete synonym. Let's look at a few examples. 4a She wore black trousers, or rather shorts. We ate cereals or, more precisely, oatmeal. I drove with the sword, that is, the Gel. When these adjecants are used, it's almost sure we'll deal with the kind of synonyms. These specifiers cannot be used if we deal with words that differ in one central entrance or even antagonists. 4b? He was beaten to death, that is, life. ? I ride a sword or, more precisely, a bike. All these examples show that there are cross-leukemic that are obviously more synonymous than others. This leads to the assumption of a scale synonymous. But to determine the scale, we need at least one fixed end point. Since we already believed that absolute synonym is very difficult to show, if not impossible, the endpoint should be synonymous with zero. But zero synonym is not a common concept. The first point is c stack vs expensive and white vs fast, of course, not synonymous, but for various reasons. And the second thing is that it is impossible to draw an impractical line between synonymous and zero synonymous. 5a creep vs crawl; creep vs cringe; creep vs sneak; creep vs. grove; creep vs toady. Where does the above example end synonymous and the synonym of zero begins? Therefore, the scale cannot be determined. II.3 Cognitive synonyms Cognitive synonyms (sometimes referred to as descriptive synonyms, referential synonym or propositional synonym) have a special relationship between at least two leses. Examples of cognitive synonymous are: fade, die, die, take off off, kick a bucket. These expressions can be used in a single context without changing the truth of the sentence. However, they are not absolutely synonymous, because distribution is not the same for all these lelecs. There are obviously social taboos that prevent them from being absolutely synonymous. Imagine a judge in court talking about nibble off, not die. Even membership of a particular social group can be inferred by using certain words rather than others. Another cognitive synonym is the example: 6a This ice cream tastes good. I don't want you to kill me. The content of these outputs is perceived in the same way. The difference is the way they are expressed. The first sentence in this example gives us information semantic means. The message is delivered through the meaning of words. This is called propositional mode. The second expression expresses its importance through expression, and therefore it is called expression mode. II.4 Plesionyms Plesionyms or synonymous proximity are words that are almost synonymous. They differ from cognitive synonyms in that pairs are different and, consequently, give different truths in a particular context. 7a XY was a freedom fighter. XY was a terrorist. These sentences have different truths, although they relate to the same subject. The difference lies in pragmatic or interpersonal User. 7b It was foggy last Friday or, more precisely, it was foggy. It was foggy last Friday or, more precisely, it was foggy. This example shows that it is almost impossible to distinguish between two truth conditions. Both sentences refer to the same thing, but they seem to rule out each other, although it is impossible to say what a difference in the state of truth can be. It hints at the assumption that plesionyms rely much more on personal impressions than on the reality of the actual situation. Although there is a difference between the lexiot and the foggy difference, this difference exists only in the conotation and the speakers expressed an attitude. Other examples point to this observation. 7c We were not clobbered, we were battered. We didn't, we were rounded. 7d I wasn't ravished, I was excited. I'm not happy, I was devastated. IV. Summary I tried to show with this term in the paper that the linguistic phenomenon synonymous is a very vague area. The problem we face in this area is the development of language, which makes it difficult to have absolute synonyms. Only a few important statements can be made because there is no unambiguous test site and that the language is arbitrary in its use. The complete synonym is intuitive fact, but when trying to find a scientific method to generalized the rule of it, we see ourselves facing problems in looking for features that could make up a couple of synonyms. Same number of cognitive synonyms as well. The boundaries between the two leses are blurred and finding even an intuitive difference between synonymous and zero synonymous is harder than one would imagine. With plesionyms we have a problem of interpersonal differences when it comes to being used. Strictly, plesionyms can not be synonymous, because they could relate to different truth conditions, so they can not have the same meaning. If the synonymous problem is to be resolved, the problems of meaning should first be resolved. In order to create a link between leses, such as synonyms, you should truly know all the nuances that one word implements in all applications. The question here is not only if the same reference object is titled or if the lexemes are interchangeable, but a more subtle one: How words perceive and why individuals construct the analytical truths that make up the nuances of those differences in words. In other words, we should know the actual use of the words in all their details. But it is very impractical because words win their own nuances through and are not used because of their nuances. IV. Literature quoted in Cruse, Alan. Meaning of language: introduction to semantics and pragmatike. Oxford: University Press Cruse, Alan. Lexical semantics. Cambridge: University Press Lyons, John. Language and introduction to linguistics. Cambridge: University Press Quote paper Klaus-Bernhard Vomend (Author), 2002, various types of synonymous language, Grin Verlag, Lasét ebook ebook ebook ebook