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**Андатпа**

Мақалада шет тілi біліміндегі «синтаксистік синонимия» ұғымының динамикасы талқыланады. Осы лингвистикалық құбылысқа әр-түрлі көзқарастар ұсынылған. Сөздің өзгермелілігі мен экспрессивтілігі құралы ретінде синтаксистік синонимдердің маңызды қызметі көрсетілген және олардың тілдік тұлғаның сөздік қорын байытудағы практикалық маңыздылығы атап өтілген.

**Кiлт сөздер**: синонимия, кеңістік, семантикалық кеңістік, грамматикалық синонимдер, микрокеңістік, микрокеңістік.

**Abstract**

The article discusses the dynamics of the concept of “syntactic synonymy” in foreign linguistics. Different points of view on this linguistic phenomenon are presented. An important function of syntactic synonyms as a means of variability and expressiveness of speech is indicated and their practical significance in enriching the vocabulary of a linguistic personality is emphasized.
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**Аннотация**

В статье рассматривается динамика развития понятия «синтаксическая синонимия» в зарубежной лингвистике. Представлены разные точки зрения на это лингвистическое явление. Обозначена важная функция синтаксических синонимов как средств вариабельности и экспрессивности речи и подчеркнута их практическая значимость в обогащении словарного запаса языковой личности.
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Synonymy is one of the least studied areas of linguistics both in vocabulary and in grammar, and especially in syntax. Thanks to the numerous works that have appeared recently and devoted to individual issues of grammatical synonymy, it can now be said that the development of this issue has yielded a lot, both theoretically and in practical terms.

Synonymy is one of the sources of language enrichment by expressive means, therefore it is of particular interest for developing problems related to the struggle for the culture of speech, with the study of the language and style of fiction and public speaking, with the tasks of building stylistics.

The term “syntactic synonyms” was first used by A.M. Peshkovsky, who, first of all, was interested in what language means could express the same idea. Understanding grammatical synonymy extremely broadly, he defines grammatical synonyms as “... the meanings of words and phrases close to each other in their grammatical meaning” [1, p. 57]. However, the very understanding of syntactic synonyms is devoid of unity and certainty. In the definition of syntactic synonymy proposed by A.M. Peshkovsky, the initial requirement is the semantic identity of syntactic constructions. In subsequent works on syntactic synonymy of the idea of ​​A.M. Peshkovsky receive further development.

His examples illustrated the expression of the same thought by various linguistic means. The scientist, without putting forward a theoretical justification for assigning different syntactic constructions to one synonymous series, sought only to show the rich expressive potential of the language.

 Subsequently, linguistics developed different approaches to the study of syntactic synonymy: either the semantic characteristics of synonymous units or their grammatical specifics were revealed, or they sought to study both informative and formal features of syntactic synonyms. The choice of the basis of the synonymic paradigm depended on the objectives of the study; therefore, there was no consensus on the definition of syntactic synonymy and probably could not be [3–9].

M.K. Milly, not using the term “syntactic synonymy”, considered “semantic relations of similar meaning, but belonging to different grammatical categories and parts of speech of words and syntactic constructions similar in semantics” [2. S. 31]. Along with the synonymy of verb forms of tense and mood, case affixes, she pointed to the synonyms of the singular and plural, the synonyms of personal pronouns and proper nouns.

V.P. Sukhotin defined syntactic synonyms as “such compounds of the same words (phrases) differing in structure, as well as sentences, their parts and more complex syntactic formations of a given language in this era of its development, which express homogeneous relations and connections of phenomena of real reality” [ 3. S. 14]. So, for example, phrases like prekratit` igrat`- prekratit` igru are considered syntactic synonyms; ostavit` est`- ostavit` edu. It is hard to argue with the comments of E.P. Shendels about these and similar examples, which “can more likely serve as an illustration of lexical synonyms - verbs with different shades and their material meaning and word-building synonyms (igrat`-igra, chitat`-chtenie)” [4. S. 70]. But, speaking of the difference in units, V.P. Sukhotin had in mind, first of all, the difference in grammatical indicators and other means (prepositions, conjunctions), not fully touching on specific shades of meaning, which are determined by the composition and structure of word combinations [3. S. 22].

.N. Zeitlin identifies two types of syntactic synonyms:

1. Model synonyms when it comes to synonyms of syntactic models.

2. Concrete synonyms, when referring to specific sentences, the equivalence of which is ensured by the actual syntactic and lexical means [5, p.77.].

S.N. Zeitlin believes that the equivalence of sentences can be based on the synonymy of syntactic models and the identity of lexical morphemes (Oni vragi. – oni vrazhduyut, etc.), can be provided by purely lexical means when identifying syntactic models (v pole v`yuga- v pole metel`, etc.) and can be conveyed by lexical-syntactic means: sentences based on syntactic models are used, in which synonymous lexical morphemes are used (ya trevozhus` - ya v volnenii. – ya obespokoen.).

The purpose and objectives of this work dictate the definition of syntactic synonymy, according to which it should primarily include sentences that represent one cognitive situation, while being constructed according to different models and preserving the semantic identity of lexical morphemes.

For example, kogda vzoshlo solnce, my otpravilis` v pohod. – posle voshoda solnca my otpravilis` v pohod.

Such synonyms should be called specific syntactic synonyms. Various syntactic constructions, identical only in the deep semantic structure, i.e. only to reflect the typical situation, have the status of model syntactic synonyms. So, the sentences “ot dozhdya razmokli nogi, and vsledstvie dozhdya dorogi stali razmokshimi” are concrete syntactic synonyms, since their semantics reflect the same specific cognitive situation. The sentences “gazety raznosyatsya pochtal`onom” and “uchitel` proveryaet tetradi” should be considered as model syntactic synonyms, since they are united only by the commonality of the underlying semantic structures - the relationship between the subject and the object through action, with the difference between specific subjects, objects and actions. Of course, specific syntactic synonyms can be among the model syntactic synonyms, because they have a common type value, reflecting the same cognitive situation through a specific situation.

In the light of the doctrine of syntactic synonymy, it is believed that synonymous sentences reflect a single cognitive situation, that is, they have the same typical meaning. Based on this, we can talk about a syntax field, which is based on one typical value.

Many scientists are studying the field: A.V. Bondarko, Z.N. Verdieva E.V. Gulyga, E.I. Shendels, V.P. Abramov and others.

Different types of fields are distinguished from the point of view of the combined language means. If only lexical means are combined in a field, then it gets the name of the lexical or lexical-semantic.

Z.N. Verdiev, for example, considers the field as a collection of “words of various parts of speech, united by a common expression of one concept” [6, p.4].

A.V. Bondarko understands the field as “bilateral (substantial - formal) unity formed by the grammatical (morphological or syntactic) means of a given language together with the lexical, lexical and grammatical and word-formation elements that belong to the same semantic zone” [7, p, 40 ].

E.V. Gulyga and E.I. Shendels represent the field as a set of interacting grammatical and lexical means, united by a common meaning. These are grammar and lexical fields.

The term “functional-semantic field” has become commonly used since characterizes the field from the side of the content plan, i.e. value, which allows you to highlight it. The term “grammar and lexical field” defines a field from the side of the expression plan. In the early works of A.V. Bondarko called the functional-semantic field a functional-semantic category [7, p. 5-10], and since 1976 he has been using the term “functional-semantic field” (FSF) [7, p. 12]. If syntactic constructions, the components of which possess certain morphological features, are combined in the FSF, then it acts as a syntactic field. E.V. Gulyga and E.I. Shendels believes that the field has a heterogeneous and, as a rule, complex structure, which can be represented in the form of horizontal and vertical sections. The semantic sections of the microfield are located horizontally.

The constituents of microfields are located vertically, which at the same time are constituents of the macropolis [4, p. 9-10].

“The general value of the field is not uniform,” write Guliga and Shendels, “it splits into at least two values, which can be opposite or polar. Each of these values ​​forms a microfield ”[4, p. 9]. So, the FSP of time, in which temporary relations are expressed both by grammatical forms of the verb, and by lexical means, for example, the adverbs “yesterday”, “today”, “tomorrow”, “now”, “before”, “then”, etc. ., splits into three micro-fields - the micro-field of the present, the micro-field of the future and the micro-field of the past tense. The constituents of these microfields differ in semantic content, reflecting real differences in the temporal relations of actions at the time of speech. In the FSF of the considered type, microfields are distinguished on the basis of differences in semantic content in the presence of a common semantic identity (the general field of the generatrix of seme).

P.V. Chesnokov believes that in the language there are two types of functional-semantic field. FSF with ontological stratification is a field in which “semantic differences between microfields are qualified as substantial (as differences in the content of thinking units expressed by constitutions of different microfields); these differences reflect objective (ontological) differences between real facts united by a certain common attribute ”[8, p. 91].

In the second type of FSF, the semantic difference consists in the difference in reflection forms (forms of thought), but not logical forms, which are universal, universal, which are determined by the needs of the cognition process, but national mental forms, related to the grammatical structure of specific languages. These forms P.V. Chesnokov calls semantic forms of thinking.

FSF of this type P.V. Chesnokov called the FSF with epistemological stratification, since in it the differences between the microfields are caused not by differences in objective reality, but by the specifics of the cognitive process - the process of reflection of facts of objective reality.

Fields of the second type more often act as syntactic fields, since the common semantic factor uniting a number of syntactic structures in one FSP is the typical value of the sentence, that is, the general semantics of the class of sentences with the same and different structure, reflecting one typical situation and repeating in an infinite series of sentences with the same and different specific content. “... The typical value of the proposal,” writes G.A. Zolotova, is the general meaning of the many sentences representing this model, and at the same time, it is the general meaning of several synonymous models that match equivalent but differently designed components. For example, the typical value “subject and its quality” is expressed by a number of sentences representing one model: Sotrudnik userden; Ego lico vyrazitel`no; On samouveren, etc. The same value is expressed by a number of synonymous models that predictively correlate the same, but differently designed components with the value of the subject and quality: Sotrudnik otlichaetsya userdiem; Sotrudnika otlichaet userdie; Dlya sotrudnika harakterno userdie ”[9, p.25 - 26].

In foreign linguistics, the problem of syntactic synonymy was considered in the works of G. Sweet, O. Jespersen, Z. S. Harris, N. Chomsky, W. L. Cheyff, J. J. Katz and others. It is worth noting that in the theoretical framework proposed by these scientists, there was no clear emphasis on the term syntactic synonymy as such, but prerequisites were given for further deepening and studying this concept.

Representatives of classical scientific grammar were the first to identify syntactic synonyms, or, as they were called, “parallel functioning constructions” or “equivalents”. Thus, the first who noted that syntactic constructions carry a certain characteristic of equivalence was the founder of the classical scientific grammar G. Sweet [10, p. 123]

The term grammatical synonyms was first used by O. Jespersen, who considered units of this type, while not disclosing the term and not studying the conditions for its functioning.

The one who came closest to understanding the term syntactic synonymy was J.J. Katz, one of the proponents of "interpretative semantics." He distinguished between the phenomenon of synonymy, highlighting "synonymy" as such and "complete synonymy." Also important is the statement that it is not enough to consider only the meaning of the lexical unit. Since we are dealing with sentences, we must remember that a sentence can also be decomposed into components with separate values ​​[11, p. 170].

It should be noted that in English linguistics the scientific theory that laid the foundation for the study of syntactic synonyms arose thanks to the study of equivalents. One of the tasks that foreign linguists have recently been pursuing is the role of contextual and context-free syntactic synonyms. Having examined the foreign history of the concept of syntactic synonymy, we can note the underdevelopment or rather, some caution in identifying and branching syntactic synonyms from lexical synonyms.

Thus, a review of the scientific literature on this issue led to the conclusion that the phenomenon of syntactic synonymy is most fully disclosed by Russian scientists, which cannot be said about foreign studies in which syntactic synonymy is considered not as a separate phenomenon, but as a special case of synonymy, with she does not stand out in a separate grammatical education. We came to the conclusion that the main goal of our study will be that, based on the semantic types of elementary sentences (Bulatbaeva K.N.), we will conduct a systematic comparative analysis of potential synonymy in two languages ​​and correlate the results [12, p.116].

**Literature**

1. Peshkovskiy A.M. Printsipy i priyemy stilisticheskogo analiza i otsenki khudozhestvennoy prozy // Voprosy metodiki rodnogo yazyka, lingvistiki i stilistiki. M.; L.: Gosizdat, 1930. S. 133–161.

2. Milykh M.K. Voprosy grammaticheskoy stilistiki // K sinonimike chastey rechi. «Russkoye yazykovedeniye». Rostov n/D, 1945. Vyp. 1. S. 31– 96.

3. Sukhotin V.P. Sintaksicheskaya sinonimika v sovremennom russkom literaturnom yazyke. M.: AN SSSR, 1960. 160 s.

4. Shendel's Ye.P. Ponyatiye grammaticheskoy sinonimii // NDVSH. Filologicheskiye nauki. 1959. № 1. S. 68–81.

5. Tseytlin S.N. Sistema sintaksicheskikh sinonimov (na materiale russkogo yazyka) // Struktura predlozheniya i slovosochetaniya v indoyevropeyskikh yazykakh. L., 1971. S. 78–87.

6. Verdiyeva Z.N. 1984 Semanticheskoye pole v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke. M.: Nauka, 1984. - 119s.

7. Bondarko A.B. 1983 Printsipy funktsional'noy grammatiki i voprosy aspektologii. JL: Nauka, 1983. - 208s.

8. Chesnokov P.V. Grammatika russkogo yazyka v svete teorii semanticheskikh form myshleniya. Taganrog: Izd-vo TGPI, 1992. 168 s.

9. Zolotova G.A. Ocherk funktsional'nogo sintaksisa russkogo yazyka. M., 1973. 352 s.

10. Sweet H. A. A new English grammar. Logical and historical. Part 2, Oxford, 1955. 123 р.

11. Katz J. J. & Fodor J. A. The structure of a semantic theory. Language, 39(2), Apr-Jun. р. 170–210.

12. VESTNIK. Yevraziyskogo natsional'nogo universiteta im. L.G. Gumileva.- 2004. - №1. – Astana: ENU. – 116s.