LEXICAL SYNONYMS

Lexical synonyms constitute one of the best-studied semantic categories. Thousands of theoretical articles are devoted to them. They are described in hundreds of dictionaries of synonyms in greatest detail. If, despite all this, we again turn our attention to this subject, we are doing it only because we would like to consider it from a new point of view by introducing the notion of lexical synonyms in the broader framework of a general theory of the synonymic means of language.

A DEFINITION OF LEXICAL SYNONYMS

The State of the Problem

Two main approaches to the definition of synonyms may be identified: purely semantic and operational-semantic.

Within the framework of the former, synonyms are defined as words which have the same lexical meaning but differ in the nuances of the meaning (cf. Očerki 1966). There are many terminological variants of this definition which differ only in the area (linguistics, logic or psychology) whose notions are preferred (cf. Humboldt 1859: 92, Pokrovskij 1896: 12, 20, Potëbnja 1912: 83, Ogden & Richards 1927: 126, Brunot 1936: 79, Brøndal 1943: 25, 118, Ohman 1951: 151, Wells 1957, &c.).

An attempt to combine the natural notion of synonymy as semantic identity with the notion of synonyms as words which may differ from each other in meaning lead to the conception of neutralization of semantic distinctions of synonyms in strictly defined positions determined by semantic, lexical, syntactic etc. features. It was suggested to regard as synonyms only those semantically similar words whose distinctions, can be neutralized (Apresjan 1957: 87-88, Ivanov 1957, Smelëv 1969: 18-19).

Let us note two common features of most of the definitions of synonymy.

First, they cannot be regarded as perfectly precise since comparison of meanings is not based on any formal
procedure and the notion of the shade of meaning is not clear enough (on shade of meaning in more detail, see pages 229ff.). If we want to give an effective definition of synonyms, based on the possibility of formal comparison of their meanings, we must have at our disposal an exhaustive description of the meanings of words of the language (an interpretive dictionary), performed under a number of conditions. These may be e.g. conditions imposed by us on the metalanguage of the description, on the logical structure of interpretations and on the syntactic structure of the interpreted expression (see p. 49ff.).

Secondly, most definitions emphasize differences among synonyms, rather than their shared semantic properties. Words whose meanings are completely identical are increasingly treated as lexical doubles, variants and the like, whereas only words whose meanings differ are regarded as genuine synonyms. Characteristic in this respect is the following statement from an article by A. B. Sapir, which strongly (and, in other respects, fruitfully) influenced later works on the theory of synonymity: "...there is a general consensus that synonyms are words of different sound composition which completely coincide in their meaning...synonyms are words...which contain certain differences in their meanings which are on the whole similar" (Sapir 1955: 72).

A consistent development of views similar to these generated the conception according to which synonymy is a relative notion (Saumjan and Soboleva 1965, Heller and Macris 1967: 42). The degree of synonymy can even be zero (for language units which do not have any components in common).

The point of view according to which "only semantic identity (and not closeness of meanings...) allows one to regard words as synonyms" (Grigorieva 1955: 7-8, see also Mel'čuk 1968: 435-436, Leech 1969: 5) has fewer supporters. Nevertheless, this point of view not only reflects the reality of language, namely the fact of the presence in language of a sufficiently large number of words which have completely identical meanings, but also gives the term its original content.

Further we will speak of exact synonyms, if interpretations of two words are completely identical; and of inexact synonyms, or quasisynonyms, if they have a large common part (see p. 169 ff.). It should be noted here that the subdivision of synonyms into exact and inexact ones does not mean that only exact synonyms constitute the proper object of the theory of lexical synonymy. Rather, the theory of semantic transformations requires that the two be clearly distinguished when entered in the lexicicon, because otherwise differences in their relations vis-a-vis the system of paraphrasing cannot be shown.

The standard definition of synonyms as words whose meanings are identical or similar is not based on a rigorous theory of interpretations (meaning definitions) and therefore does not secure formally establishing the fact of synonymy—nonsynonymity of expressions. This has always been perceived as a serious flaw of the theory of lexical synonyms, and even the earliest attempts to find a secure operational basis for establishing the fact of synonymy lead to the formulation of an essentially distributional criterion of synonymy, namely interchangeability of synonyms within the same context with no (noticeable) difference in meaning, although with possible stylistic and other differences (see e.g. Pokrovskij 1966: 21, Bloomfield 1933: 145, Ullmann 1953: 74, Zvegincov 1963, Dubois 1964 and many others).

The criterion of interchangeability is known in two variants, the weak and the strong. S. Ullman, who defined synonyms as words "identical in meaning and interchangeable in any context" (op. cit.)5, operated with the strong criterion of interchangeability. He found out very soon, however, that not one pair of words normally classified as synonyms satisfy the condition he had formulated6. This led him to conclude that any investigation of synonyms not confined to the problems of their origin and occurrence among other lexical items is impressionistic (Ullman 1953: 233). In our view, it would be more natural to conclude that the criterion of synonymy, chosen by the investigator, is too severe.

The weak distributional criterion of synonymy (the condition of partial interchangeability of synonyms in certain contexts or types of contexts) appealed to many investigators as more realistic (see Apresjan 1957, Jones 1964, Lyons 1968). In this respect, J. Lyons's ideas deserve special mention. J. Lyons proposed to distinguish between (a) complete and incomplete synonymy (identity—partial
similarity of semantic and emotional-expressive properties of synonyms; (b) global and local synonymy (interchangeability in any contexts-interchangeability in some contexts). As a result, the following classification of synonyms is obtained: (1) complete, global; (2) complete, local; (3) incomplete, global; (4) incomplete, local. An interesting property of this classification is that it embodies the idea of the independence of sameness—non-sameness of meanings of words on the one hand and their ability— inability to interchange in the same contexts on the other. True, this ideas has not been implemented radically enough; partial interchangeability, as a minimum, is considered an obligatory property of synonyms.

A more sober evaluation of the role of interchangeability for lexical synonyms can be obtained if we turn to the notion of lexical parameter as proposed by A. K. Zolovskij and I. A. Mel'čuk. As has been pointed out (see p. 18), a lexical parameter is a typical meaning which is expressed by different means with different words. Lexical correlates of a given parameter may turn out to be synonyms which are in strictly or almost complementary distribution; cf. proizvodit’ (proizvodienie) ‘to make (an impression),’ but okazvat’ (vlijanie) ‘to exert (influence).’ Thus, recognition of the idea of lexical parameters entails rejection of the principle of (even partial) interchangeability as the obligatory property of synonyms.

It must be pointed out that the limited nature of the principle was understood by practicing lexicographers long ago. Thus, the introduction to the Webster dictionary of synonyms of the English language states the following: "...Interchangeability is not the final criterion (of synonymy—Y.A.), since idiomatic usage stands in its way" (Webster 1968: 25a; first edition 1951). Due to this, the compilers of the Webster dictionary proposed a different operational criterion of synonymy, namely the possibility of defining synonyms in an identical or almost identical way: "The only satisfactory criterion of synonyms is their coincidence in denotation. This coincidence is rarely so complete that meanings of words be absolutely identical, but it is always sufficiently clear for the definition of two or more synonymous words to be brought to some point in the same terms" (ibid.). The point, however, to which the general definition must be brought, is not established rigorously; for instance, "complete definitions" given in the beginning of every entry of the Webster dictionary of synonyms, are in most cases so vague that not only the words which the authors consider to be synonymous can be easily made to fit these definitions, but also those which they treat as "analogical" (topically related); however, the principle of definition itself appears to be highly reasonable.

Let us sum up the ideas which will guide us in what follows. In the set of words, usually regarded as synonyms, one must distinguish between lexical synonyms in the narrow sense of the term and quasisynonyms: they behave differently with regard to the system of paraphrasing. Both must be defined in purely semantic terms; in all natural languages, due to idiomaticity of lexical combinability, the possibility of complete or partial interchangeability is not directly entailed by the fact of identity or similarity of lexical meanings. The definition of synonyms must allow for an effective procedure of testing for the fact of synonymy; one of the possible operational procedures of this kind is comparison of definitions on the condition that the definitions are done according to a number of formal requirements.

LEXICAL SYNONYMS: ANALYSIS AND DEFINITION

The first condition on lexical synonymy has already been formulated: synonyms in the narrow sense of the word must have the same definition in the lexicon, i.e., they must be translatable into the same expression of the semantic language.

However, this condition alone is not sufficient for establishing the synonymy of two lexical units. In a sense, pairs of verbs stroit’ ‘build’ and stroit’sja ‘be built,’ vxoedit’ ‘to fit (in)’ and vmešat’ ‘to contain/ have room for’ and the like in the phrases Rabochie stroja dom ‘The workmen are building a house’—Dom strojt’sja rabochimi ‘The house is being built by the workmen,’ V butyku vxoedo tri litra ‘Three liters fit in the bottle’—Butylka vmeša tri litra ‘The bottle contains/ has room for three liters’ have the same lexical meaning, respectively. Indeed, the sentences in each pair are situationally isosemantic; further, it is
obvious that all coinciding words in each pair are used in the same meaning (raboci, dom, butylka, etc.); it follows that the words in which the sentences differ from one another (stroit'-stroit'sja, vazdit'-vnesit'), are at least denotatively isosemantic as well. This is supported by the fact that passive forms are never defined independently: their meaning is indicated by "strad". ('pass.') and a reference to the active form of the respective verb. Yet, no one would even think of characterizing stroit'-stroit'sja and the like as lexical synonyms.

The difference between the pair stroit'-stroit'sja on the one hand, and the pair sooružat'-stroit' on the other, can be described in two ways. First, stroit' and sooružat' have the same "role" structure, whereas stroit' and stroit'sja have different ones: stroit' and sooružat' have subject valency as their first valency, whereas stroit'sja, on the contrary, has object valency as the first and subject valency as the second. In order to exclude stroit' and stroit'sja from among the class of lexical synonyms, it is sufficient to introduce the condition according to which role structures of synonyms must coincide. This definition will be quite workable if we accept two rather natural conventions with regard to the description of role structures of predicates such as byt' bol'se than bol'se, byt' mene' than mene', presvoshxodit'-ustupit') on the one hand, and predicates of the type pokupat'-'prodavat' (snimat'-'udavat'), on the other.

Predicates of the first type, which give synonymic paraphrases of voice (Petr vyše Ivana 'Pyotr is taller than Ivan'—Ivan vyše Petra 'Ivan is shorter than Pyotr', On vser prevosxodit v masterstv 'He excels everyone in mastery/craftsmanship', Vse ustupajt emu v masterstv 'Everyone is inferior to him in craftsmanship'), are pairs of antonyms, and antonyms do not have equal rights, semantically: some are semantically simpler than others (see Chapter 6). For instance, in pairs of parametric adjectives such as bol'soj-malen'kij 'large—small', vysokij-nizkij 'tall/high—low/short' and the like, the antonym which designates the larger pole of the respective scale is semantically simpler (see page 43 ff.). Due to this reason, the predicate byt' bol'se, not byt' mene', was selected as basic for the lexicon of the semantic language. If the predicate byt' bol'se is said to have the role structure 'subject—counteragent—quantity' (X is bigger than Y); then its semantic derivative byt' mene' is quite naturally said to have the role structure 'counteragent—subject—quantity'. Then pairs such as byt' bol'se—byt' mene' have different role structures, and this difference is in principle similar to that between pairs such as stroit'-stroit'sja; thus they are excluded from consideration as lexical synonyms.

Now consider converse predicates of the type pokupat'—prodavat' 'buy—sell'. At first glance, their role structures are identical: 'subject—first object (merchandise)—counteragent—second object (price)'. A more careful analysis shows, however, that, if the predicate pokupat' is selected for the description of the situation, its first participant is presented as subject and receiver, and the third, as counteragent and source (see p. 125 ff. for an explanation of the terms); if the predicate prodavat' is selected, its first participant is presented as subject and source, and the third, as the counteragent and receiver. Thus, the role structure of predicates turns out to be different in this case as well, and pairs of words of the type pokupat'—prodavat' are also excluded from consideration as lexical synonyms.

Now, consider another possibility. The difference between pairs of the type stroit'-sooružat' on the one hand and pairs of the type stroit'-stroit'sja on the other can be described as differences not in the role structure, but in the actant (= participant) structure of the predicates: in stroit' and sooružat', places (valences) with the same number are occupied by names of the same actants (actual participants of the situation), whereas in stroit' and stroit'sja places with the same number are occupied by names of different actants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stroit', sooružat'</th>
<th>stroit'sja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = A</td>
<td>1 = B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = B</td>
<td>2 = A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, stroit' has A in the first place and B in the second, whereas stroit'sja has B in the first place
and A in the second. From this point of view, the second condition of synonymy can be formulated as the condition of the sameness of actant structures of any two words (or other lexical units).

Let us now consider the last group of facts whose interpretation has direct impact on the definition of lexical synonymy. The condition of the sameness of lexical definitions and valency structures is satisfied not only by words of the type *kidat*-brosat' 'fling—throw' but also pairs of purely syntactic derivatives, e.g. *podderživat'—

*podderžka* 'to support—support', *ravnýj—ravenstvo* 'equal—equality', *bystrý—bystro* 'quick—quickly', and the like (see p. 178). It is obvious that regarding such derivatives as synonyms is not expedient. Synonyms are an irregular, purely lexical category: in natural language, they are givens and cannot be formed by any productive models. By contrast, derivatives are a regular and in a sense grammatical category. Since pairs such as *ravnýj—ravenstvo* 'equal—equality' can be in principle presented as regular, they must be described despite the fact that they differ from other types of derivatives by the sameness of their lexical meaning—a property that in fact bring them close to lexical synonyms.

The result (namely, the exclusion of syntactic derivatives from the number of lexical synonyms) is attained by introducing the condition that they must belong to the same part of speech. Then pairs such as *stoit—kak toľko* 'just as—as soon as' (Stoit *emu vojtij* 'Just as/the moment he walks in'—*Kak toľko on vxođit* 'As soon as he walks in'), *sam—lično* 'personally, in person' (Skažite *em u samomu* 'Tell him this in person'—Skažite *eto lično emu* 'Say this to him personally'), *odin—toľko* 'alone—only' (Ja *skažu ob etom emu ochnom I will tell' (about this) to him alone'—Ja *skažu ob etom toľko emu* 'I will tell (about this only to him)') must be treated as suppletive derivatives (see pp. 189).

Thus, to recognize any two words (or syntactically indivisible idiomatic units) A and B as lexical synonyms, it is necessary and sufficient (1) that they have a completely identical definition, i.e. translate into the same expression of the semantic language, (2) that they have the same number of active semantic valences such that valences with the same number have the same roles (or adjoining to the predicate names of the same actants), (3) that they belong to the same (deep) part of speech7.

Note that this definition does not require that synonyms have the same, or at least partially similar, combinatorial properties or constructions in which they are used, or that their stylistic properties be the same.

There is a widely held opinion that natural languages do not have "absolute" synonyms. We do not know what exactly is meant by this term, and therefore dare not judge the correctness of this statement. It is possible, however, to assert that, if exact synonyms are understood in the sense defined above, then natural languages have quite a number of them8.

Data which illustrate this thesis can be best presented as a survey of certain processes by which the language may be enriched with semantically exact synonyms.

**SOURCES OF LEXICAL SYNONYMY**

Every literary language has a characteristic tendency to overcome "non-functional differences among units" (Panov 1986: 55); this tendency is strengthened as the normalization progresses. It is noted, usually, that this is one of the main differences between literary language and dialects which are said to possess, typically, an abundance of in no way semantically differentiated means of expressing the same thought. It should be added that even inside the literary language, especially if its nonstandard varieties are included, there are different layers of words which react to this tendency differently. First and foremost, the tendency dominates over stable, i.e. long existent in the language (original or fully assimilated) stylistically neutral highly frequent derivationally simple or simplified (non-derived) units in their main meanings. Processes of semantic differentiation, which continuously take place in this layer of the lexicon, lead to the predominance of quasisynonymy, while exact synonymy is reduced. The following rather rare examples may give an idea of exact synonymy of such units: *brosat'—kidat* 'throw—fling', *gasit—tušit* 'extinguish—put out', *glatjet—smotret* 'gaze—look', *zret—spet* (frukty) 'mature—ripen' (fruit), *isčezat—propadat* 'vanish—disappear', *kastrirovat—oskopit* 'castrate—geld',
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etc., vzodor-cest 'rubbish, nonsense', gorlod-gorlopan 'bawler', d'javoščina-ceterovina 'devilment; mess', kalanča-versta 'bean-pole', obodranec-obovranec 'bum, scruffy person', proiza-pronyra 'eel, snake', pustomejlu-pustovon-pustoběl-pustoslov 'windbag, bez-golovij-bezmožglij 'brainless, idiotic', mozglatvij-'treskuvnj 'feebler, krupica-kapelka (ni krupicy talanta) 'grain—drop (not a grain of talent)', propast'-'tma (mum) 'zillion (flies)', čut-čut-'kaplja (Zalosti) 'a little, drop (of pity)'. It is curious that one of the most interesting semantic processes, namely the process of synonymic analogy, alias synonymic derivation or synonymic irradiation, is more forcefully manifested precisely in the sphere of expressive vocabulary. The essence of this process is well described by S. Koresch: "Word X with the meaning A develops meaning B. Analogically, word Y which also has the meaning A and is a synonym of X develops meaning B" (Kroesch 1926: 39). If, as we assume, the tendency under consideration resulted in the rise in the word bit' bit' of the new meaning STREJAT' 'shoot' (e.g. bit' po nastupajuščim korotkimi očeradiami 'to shoot at the advancing troops with short bursts'), this meaning can develop also in its (quasi)synonyms kolotit', lupilj, and the like, cf. "Paštitskaia artillerija lupilja po nim s utra, no pramogo popadenija ni v odin iz domov... ne služilos' (A. Ejsner) "Fascist artillery kept pounding them since that morning, but there was no direct hit in any of the houses'. Synonymic analogy in expressive vocabulary is so strong that at times it acquires the status of a productive process; G. Stern regarded it as a semantic law.

Idiomatic units easily enter synonymic relations due to their expressive markedness, cf. bezdelačat—bit' balulj 'to be idle, play hookie', brat' v oborot—brat' v reboto 'work on, take care of', bit' na veršok ot gibeli—bit' na volosok ot gibeli 'to be close to death/in mortal danger', zagnat' v ugoj kogo-libo—priporet' k stene kogo-libo 'to corner somebody', navesti kogo-libo na um [na razume]-naučit' kogo-libo umu-razumu 'to talk sense into someone', namjati' boka komu-libo—nalomati' boka komu-libo 'to give somebody a sound thrashing', trepat' jazykom—čestat' jazykom 'to prattle/blather, wag one's tongue', blagim matom—vo vju ivanovskuju (kričat') 'to scream' at the top of one's lungs, vo ves' dux—vo vse lopati—so vse neg—eto est' duux
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Development of figurative and idiomatically bound meanings is yet another process which generates semantically exact synonymy. The very mechanism of metaphoric sense is conducive to this, for one of the most widespread types of metaphorization of meanings consists in neutralizing its semantic distinctive features (see p. 197), e.g. Casy ubegaty [uxodiat] na pjad ni minut 'The watch/clock is five minutes fast'; cf. the direct—non-synonymous—meanings of the verbs ubegat' 'run away'—uxodit' 'go away'.

There is one more circumstance (closely connected with the mechanism of metaphorization considered above) which is conducive to synonymization of figurative and idiomatically bound meanings, namely that, on the whole, they are semantically poorer than direct meanings (cf. vsplyt' 1 surface = PLYIJA KVERXU, POJAVIT'SJA NA POVERXNOSTI ZIDKOSTI 'to appear on the surface of a liquid after freezing'; vsplyt' 2 (Vspylit' tonyme maximacil 'Sinister dealings have surfaced' = OBNARUZIT'SJA SEBJA 'to be found out'; vyxodit' 1 in A = IDJA, PERESTAVAT' NAXODIT'SJA V A 'by walking, to cease to be in A'; vyxodit' 2 iz-pod A (e.g., vlasti 'power') = PERESTAVAT' BYT' OB'EKOTOM A 'to cease to be object of A'). This is especially characteristic of idiomatically bound meanings which represent the final stage in the development of figurative meanings.

Note that both figurative and idiomatically bound meanings are much more strictly tied by constructive conditions of realization konstruktivnymi uslovijami realizacii than free meanings (cf. vyjti iz komnaty 'go out of the room', vyjti iz-pod naves 'go from under the awning', vyjti na ploshad' 'go out in the square', vyjti v zal 'go out in the hall/conference room/etc.', vyjti k reke 'go out to the river', vyjti za okolicu 'go out on the outskirts of the village', vyjti poobedač 'go out to have lunch/dinner', and the like, but only vyjti iz-pod vlasti 'cease to be under the sway of'); this also restricts possibilities of the semantic differentiation of the synonymically bound meanings.

Lexical Synonyms

Synonymy of figurative meanings can be illustrated by means of the following examples: bešaat—idi 'run' (Sosse idiat [bezixi] k Leningradu 'The highway runs towards Leningrad'), vletet—dostat'sja—nagore—popast (ot otca 'to be punished by one's father'), vrodit'—vlezat' 'fit in' (Novaja vležet 'in vležet' in dnom 'Some of the things won't fit in the suitcase'), vsplyt'—vykazyt'sja (nedežně 'surface—be discovered (defects)', vypadat—vylezat 'fall out' (šerst' na spine vypadaet [vylyzeat] 'The fur on the back is falling out'), vypadat'—vydavat'sja 'turn out' (Den' vypl vydal'sja 'The day turned out to be beautiful (weather)', vydavat'sja—sojti—alezat' (v Odessе 'to get off (in Odessa'), vyxodit'—polužat'sja 'make' (Na nego vyjelet [polužat'sja] pervoklassnyj spintner 'He will make a first class sprinter')/come out' (On ploto vjele [polužat'sja] na fotografii 'He came out poorly in the picture/photograph'), gadit—pakosti (sosedu) 'to spit (one's neighbor)', kovyjat'sja—kopat'sja 'sink' (Dolgo teč' buđeč kovyjat'sja [kopat'sja] 'How much longer will you be sinking?'), nagmat—naverstit (upšennoe) 'to catch up with/make up for (one's losses)', nesít—jetet (po ulice) 'run/rush (through the street(s))', obleč—obložit' 'overcast' (Tuži oblegli [obložili] nebo 'The clouds overcast the sky'), obskatat—obstavit' (kogo-libo) 'to get the better of (somebody)', piš'—tošit' (mužu) 'to nag (one's husband)', prozevat—promorgt (vygodnyj služba) 'to miss (a profitable chance)', rvat—dérkat (zuby) 'to pull (teeth)', tačit'sja—plestis' (po ulice) 'to drag oneself (along the street)', usilivat'sja—usugubljat'sja (protivorečija) 'to deepen (contradictions)', vandal—varvar 'barbarian' (fajlsčistke vandaly [varvary] 'fascist vandals [barbarians]', nauka—urok 'lesson (to be remembered for the rest of my life)', beskončenaja—bezmnernaja (blagodarnost') 'infinite (gratitude)', blizka—skoraja (razluka) 'imminent (parting/separation)', bukval'nyj—prjamoj (smys slova) 'literal—direct (sense of the word)', kovanjy—litoj (stix) 'precise/surface (verse)', poljarnyj—protopoljarnyj (menjenja) 'polar—opposite (opinions)', gde—kuda (tebe s nim ravnjet'sja) 'how on earth [lit. "where"]—"where?"' (can you compare with him), začem—kuda (tebe stolj ko knigu?) 'what for (do you need so many books)?', goraszo—kuda (bole dostojnyj 'much (more worthy/whileworth)').
The following examples illustrate the notion of the synonymy of idiomatically bound meanings: **brat-zabrat** (Doroga berët [zabiraet] kruto v storonu 'The road turns abruptly to the side'), **brat-stavit** (kogo-libo na učët 'to put someone on the list/register someone'), **čto-libo pod kontrol'** (to place) something under (someone's) control), **brosatsja-udarjat** (Xmel' brosaetsja [udarjaet] v golovu 'Alcohol rushes to (one's) head'), **byt'-naxodit'sja-stojat** (u vlasti) 'to be (in power)', **vzvinit'-vzdat'** (cezy) 'to inflate (prices)', **vyxodit'** (iz terpenija)-terpenie 'to lose (one's) patience', **glodat'-gryzit'** (toska) 'to gnaw (anger/demons)', **zaklit'-zalepit'** (poklečënno) 'to slap (someone's face)', **zapotit'-zaxlestit'** (Volna zabastovok zatopila [zaxlestenula] južnye štaty 'A wave of strikes swamped the southern states'), **ispytvat'** (vljaniye)-podvergat'sja (vljaniju) 'to be under (the influence)', **ložit'-padat'** 'to rest on/with, fall on' (Na nego leglo [palo] podozrenie 'the suspicion fell on him'), **Na nego lokištja** [padet] tjakajka otvetstvennost' The weighty responsibility rests on him'), **nesti-terpet'** (poteri) 'to bear—suffer (losses)', **otbit'-otšibit'** (pamjat') 'to fail (memory)', **približit'sja-podkodiit'** (k 5 kg) 'to be close/weigh almost (5 kilograms)', **snesti-sterpet'** (obidu) 'to bear/suffer/take (an insult)', **sozdavat'sja-sklyadvat'sja** (večestvenie) 'to be formed/be under (an/the impression), **stimnut'-ulejšja-veter** 'to die down (wind), **terjet'-utračivat'** (vlast) 'to lose (power over something)'), **beszat'moe-neutešlomoe** (goro) 'inconsolable (grief), **dolgovnyj-bukval'nyj** (perevod 'literal/word for word (translation)', **zaklajtjy—zležjy' (vrag) 'sworn-arch (enemy)'), **izbytjy-zaežennyj (ostrota) 'benal (witticism)'), **napusknoj-delennyy (vesdlost') 'phony (joviality), **nevynosimyy—nesterpimyj (bol') 'unbearable (pain), **nesmertne-nesčetnye (pol'ca) 'countless (hoards), **skutjčetistyj-pravda (nakazaniye) 'God's honest (truth), [real pain in the neck], lit. 'punishment'); **bezzastenčivo-bessovestno (vrat') 'to lie shamelessly'.

Out of reach for regulation by semantic differentiation processes are also many derivational processes which lead to the rise of the so-called homothematic [odnokorennoj, odnokornevoy] synonyms. In Russian, homothematic synonyms are particularly numerous among verbs; they are formed most regularly by means of preverbs from verb stems denoting change of position in space or change of condition of an object or a subject: **svergnut’-nizvergnut’** (samoderžavie) 'to topple (autocracy), **otvarit’-svartiv’** (kartofel) 'to boil (potatoes), **obognat’-peregnot’** (beguna) 'to overtake (a runner), **našel’-otšel’** (reběnka za šalosti) 'to speak (the child for naughtiness), **oboždat’-podobdat’** (druga) 'to be waiting (for a friend), **zakočenet’-okočenet’** (ot xoloda) 'to grow numb (from cold), (figurative) vlež-zažot’ (komu-libo v dušu) 'to get (under someone's skin), lit. 'into someone's soul'), **zamolknut’-smolknut’-umolknut’** 'to fall silent', **ispugat’-napugat’** (kogo-libo) 'to scare (someone), **zasnut’-uznut’** 'to fall asleep, zataočit’-otnočit’-nočit’ (noz) 'to whet/sharpen (the knife), **poxoronit’-szoronit** (kogo-libo na kladbische dija bednyx) 'to bury (someone in the cemetery for the poor). A widespread morphological variety of this type is represented by pairs 'verb without preverb'—'verb with preverb', cf.: **varit’-otvarivat’** (kartofel) 'to boil (potatoes), **gotovit’-podgotavlivat’** (polku dija seva) 'to prepare (the soil for seeding), **zret’-sozrevat’** (fruity) 'to ripen (fruit), končat’-okončivat’ (institut) 'to graduate from (an institute), menjat’-obmenivat’ (kvartiru) 'to exchange (flats), mesti’-podmetat’ (komnatu) 'to sweep (the room), **mnogost-umnožat’** (pja’na dva) 'to multiply (five by two), vrat’-narastat’ (Volna zabastovok) 'to grow (a wave of strikes), **rvt’-vzyvat’** (most) 'to blow up (a bridge), **sablat’-ozlabvat’** (vjes) 'to weaken/weak (ties/connections), **šel’-podšel’-tyvat’** (den’gi) 'to count (money), točit’-zatačivat’ (noz) 'to sharpen (the knife), **čistit’-očistit’ (apel’siny) 'to peel (oranges) (an correlations in pairs as mnogost-umnožit’ see page 193.1).

The other regular type of derivational synonymy is represented by prefixed verbs with synonymous or quasisynonymous stems, cf.: **vzvivat’-vzdvynat’-vzmetat’** (pył) 'na doroge' 'to raise (dust on the road), **vyvoračivat’-vyvorkrivat’** (lampotčku) 'to unscrew (a lightbulb), **zagladit’sja-zasmotret’sja’ 'to keep standing/admir', **nabrasyvat’sja-nakdyvat’’sja ‘to go for (something), **ovgorit’sja-ombolvit’sja’ ‘to make a slip, **odolet’-oslit’’ (vraga) ‘to overcome (an enemy), **oporotst’** (vedro) ‘to empty (a bucket), **otvati-otčal’’ to heave/pout off, **otkryvat’-otkryvat’’ (pick off, **podbit’-podšibit’’ (glaz) ‘to bruise/give someone a black (eye), **podsterek’t-podkarunit’’ ‘to ambush, preempt’ja-
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prefixes or the variance of stems, much less frequently due to prefixation or, in compounds, to synonyms of stems. These are even less regular, cf. bolezn'-'zabolevanie 'illness', vetrogon-vetrennik 'empty-headed/frivolous person', zaglavlje-zagolovok 'headline/caption', zakałka-zakaljivanje 'tempering' (a rather regular type), izviv-izvilina (reki, poti) 'bend (of a river, road)', kitaevedenie-kitáistikia 'sinology', molodec-moldochina 'brave boy/girl, at a boy/girl', naplastovanie-nasloenie 'layer/deposit/stratum', nasledie- nasledstvo (prológo) 'heritage (of the past)', obmudirovan'obmudirovaniye 'uniform', osnova-osnovanie 'foundation/basis', sem'ja-semesj'tvo 'family'; bezzabotn'y-bezpečn'y 'carefree', varénn'y-otvarnoj 'govjazina' 'boiled (beef)', zlopoluchn'y-zločastn'y 'ill-fated', kol'skij-koljučij 'prickly', kroxochn'y-kroščený 'tiny', okno-stojkoi-ongneporny 'fireproof', optimističeskij-optimističn'y 'optimistic', sosový-sosolovýj 'daed/zonked', szodný-szok'j 'similar'; vidim'-po-vidimomu 'apparently', vsjudo-povjudo 'everywhere/all over (the place)', nikt'-niskolkó 'not a bit'.

The status of such units (synonyma or morphological variants of words) has long been and still remains problematic (see e.g. Axmancova 1957, Filin 1963, Grekko 1966). In our view, it is reasonable to interpret them as morphological variants when one can formulate a sufficiently simple and general rule capturing the use of one or another variant. In the cases which cannot be described by simple and general rules (such as all of the above examples), they should be regarded as different but exactly synonymous words, rather than variants of one word.

Let us conclude this list of sources of the semantically exact synonymy with loanwords. Recent or peripheral loanwords, or those prone to be special terms, often turn out to be exact synonyms of words, inherited or borrowed, which already exist in the lexicon; e.g. avtonomija 'autonomy'-samoupravlenie 'self-rule', akkauzativ-vininfý padež 'accusative, accent 'accent'-udarenie 'stress' (as a linguistic term), baza 'basis'-fundament-'osnova (teorii) 'foundation (of a theory)', degeneracija-vyroždenie 'degeneration', import-import'importation', kannibal-jjudoed 'cannibal', kriptografija-tajnopsia 'cryphography', kugur-puma 'cougar', magnetin-musul'manin 'Muslim', makrel-skumbria 'mackerel', monogamiya-edinobračie
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monogamy, monoteizm—edinobóz; monotheism, okulist—
glaznik 'ophthalmologist', plebiscit—referendum 'referendum',
poligamija—mnogobraće 'polygamia', ekspert—vyvrs
'exportation'); koncentrirat—sosredotočvat' 'to
concentrate', prevládat—preobladat' 'prevail',
summárovat—sldjávat' 'to sum up', translírovat—peređávat'
(koncert po radio 'to broadcast (the concert on the radio)';
absolutnyj—neograničennyj (vlast'), identičnyj—toldjestvennyj
'identical', moralnyj—pravstvennyj 'moral/ethical'.

Lexical synonyms belonging to most of the groups
enumerated above have become the subject of detailed
analysis only in recent years. Only this can explain the
reductiveness of many linguists to acknowledge that even
such highly normalized and polished literary languages
as Russian possess a large number of semantically exact
synonyms; the predominant theory of synonymy was based
on the lexical data (see pp. 269-270) which did not allow
for any other conclusions.

COMBINATORIAL DISTINCTIONS AMONG SYNONYMS

Leaving aside the question of stylistic, genre and
other distinctions among exact synonyms, we shall
concentrate our attention on combinatorial distinctions
among them. Our consideration will be confined to semantic,
lexical and morpho-syntactic combinatorial properties.

In addition to the types of properties, lexical synonyms
may differ in the degree of identity [sovpadenie] of
combinatorial properties. In each of the three types are
possible: (1) total identity of combinatorial properties
(a rare case not considered further in detail), (2) inclusion
of combinatorial properties, (3) intersection of combinatorial
properties and (4) total absence of identity of combinatorial
properties. Thus there are 3 x 4 = 12 types of basic
distinctions among lexical synonyms in all.

It is possible, of course, that, in a given pair or group
of synonyms, several basic distinctions may be represented
at once. There is no need, however, to consider possible
combinations of basic distinctions separately; these can
be easily calculated based on the basis of the already available
definitions.

Lexical Synonyms

The problem of interchangeability of exact synonyms
is closely connected with the question of combinatorial
distinctions. It follows from the above remarks on the
types and degrees of combinatorial distinctions among
lexical synonyms that interchangeability is a frequent,
although not obligatory, property of these. The rule of
substitution of word X with its exact synonym Y in a given
non-metalurgical text T, given lexicon V where all of
the types of combinability C of X and Y respectively are
described, can be formulated very easily: X can be
substituted by Y if, for every type of combinability, Cxy
(X) Cxy (Y) is true (i.e. if the combinatorial properties
of X in the given text are narrower or equal to combinatorial
properties of Y as they are described in the lexicon).11
It is obvious that, in the case of total non-identity of at
least one kind of combinability, X and Y are not
interchangeable in principle.

It is essential to note, however, that, under certain
conditions, interchange becomes possible even when synonyms
are in complementary distribution. It is obvious, for example,
that, despite total dissimilarity of morpho-syntactic
properties of synonyms, they could still be used
interchangeably if, in substituting a word with its synonym,
one simultaneously changes the construction in which it is
used (see e.g. p. 263). The case of complementary
distribution of synonyms vis-a-vis lexical combinability
is more subtle. Here, substitutions are possible only when
word A is used in combination with its lexical parameter;
in replacing A with its synonym B one must simultaneously
replace the lexical expression of the given parameter (cf.
below th synonyms nalicie and prsuvštie [both 'presence']
in combination with the parameter Loc, see p. 1). Here,
in fact, two words are simultaneously replaced by their
synonyms.

Let us now consider the basic combinatorial distinctions
in more detail.

The perfect identity of semantic and morphosyntactic
combinatorial properties is characteristic of the synonymy
of free non-figurative meanings and can be illustrated
by pairs such as kidat—brosat' 'throw', zagnat' v
ugol—pripeset' k stene 'to corner' [lit. 'to drive (someone)
into the corner—to press (someone) against the wall'],
sxktnej—sxktij 'similar', vezde—vsjedu 'everywhere', edva—s
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trudom 'barely'. The perfect identity of lexical combinatorial properties characteristic mostly of the synonymy of idiomatically bound meanings is a much rarer phenomenon, because rules of lexical combinatoriality are largely uncommitted, in any case insofar as synchronic description is concerned. One of the few examples is represented by adjectives such as bespardonnyj, bezzastenčivyi and besosvesťnyj (all 'nameless') which, in the meaning of "high degree" combine with the noun loć 'lie', obman 'deceit', vran 'lies' and the respective agent nouns (lžec 'liar', obmančik 'cheater', vruč 'liar').

As to the inclusion and especially intersection and total non-identity of combinatorial properties, these are usually met with in the case of the synonymy of figurative, expressive and idiomatically bound meanings.

More often than not such meanings are those of inchoation, termination, causation, liquidation, high degree, full degree and some others, viz. the meanings which correspond to the respective lexical parameters, as well as terminological meanings.

In the examples adduced below, M1(X) and D1(X) are used to designate deep places of the predicate and their surface realizations respectively (see p. 467); G(X) is the word on which X depends; thus, M1(veličivat'sja 'to grow large') = VELIČINA 'magnitude' signifies that the first deep place with the verb veličivat'sja can be realized by a noun with the meaning of magnitude, e.g. Temperatura [ves, skorost'] veličivat'sja 'The temperature [weight, speed] rises [grows].'

Inclusion of Combinatorial Properties (Combinability)

1. Semaic combinability. M2(dostigat' 'to reach/attain') = VELIČINA 'magnitude' (exact or inexact), M2(dosxodit' do 'to reach') = TOČNAJA VELIČINA 'exact magnitude': dostigat' or dosxodit' do 40°C 'to reach 40°C Celsius' (of freezing cold), 10%, 40 meters '40 meters', but dostigat' (not *dosxodit' do) rosta čeloveka 'to reach human height' (said of wheat), vysoty doma 'to reach height' of a house' (said of a tree), M1 (prekrasnočet'sja 'cease') = VYPADENIE OSADKOV 'precipitation' or DEJATELNOST' 'activity', M1 (pereštavat' 'cease') = VYPADENIE OSADKOV
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'precipitation': Dožd', liven', sneg prekrasnočet'sja or pereštavat' 'The rain [shower, snow] ceases', but Zanjatija, igry, spletni prekrasnočet'sja (not *pereštavat') 'Classes [games, gossip] cease/are over'. M2(xodit' to play' [ftr.] = FIGURA 'chessman/pawn/draughtsman' or KARTA 'card' M2(delat' xod 'make a move/play') = FIGURA: xodit' or delat' xod ladješ, ferzješ, damkoj 'to move/play the rook [queen, king of draughts]', but xodit' (not *delat' xod) tuzom, semečkoj, damoj 'to play the ace [seven, queen]'.

Glakirovannyj 'lacquered/varnished; patent leather' = OBUV 'footwear' or MEBEL 'furniture', G(lakovoj 'patent leather') = OBUV: lakirovannye or lakovyje botinki, sandali, telui 'patent leather shoes, sandals', but lakirovannyj (not *lakovoj) but, stil, stil, skaf 'lacquered cupboard [table, chair, dresser]'..

2. Lexical combinability. G(osnova/osmovanie 'foundation') = byt', služit' (osmovoj) or byt', ležat', imet' (v osnovu) or klast' (v osnovu) be founded on, serve as the foundation', etc.; G(baza, fundament 'basis/base, foundation') = byt' 'to be', služit' 'to serve (as)'; byt', služit' osmovoj, osmovanie 'to be, serve as, the foundation' or baza 'as the base/basis', fundamentom gipotezy (as the foundation of the hypothesis), but ležat' v osnovu, v osnovanii gipotezy 'to be [lit. "to lie in"] the foundation of the hypothesis' (not *ležat' v baze, v fundamente gipotezy), klast' fakty v osnovu, v osnovanii gipotezy 'to found the hypothesis on facts' [lit. "to put facts in the foundation of the hypothesis"] (not *klast' fakty v bazu, v fundament gipotezy). It may be suggested that the words osnova and osmovanie are more freely governed by prepositions in idiomatically bound syntags. G(bol'soj 2 = LINEINJY JACIETIR 'linear size', G(vysokij 2 'tall') = rost 'height': bol'sogo or vysokogo rosta 'of great height', but: bol'saja dina 'great length', bol'saja širina 'great width', bol'saja glubina 'great depth' (not *vysokaja dina, širina, glubina; this description crucially utilizes ideas stated on p. 74).

3. Morphosyntactic combinability. D2(kazat'sja 'to seem') = Sinstr. A, conjunction 'Sent', D2(sdevat'sja 'to surrender') = conjunction + Sent.; Mne kazat'sja or sdevat'sja, čto všehlust' v sčetě [čto ja vas gde-to videš] 'It seems to me that you've made a mistake in the calculation/bill [that I've seen you somewhere (before)]', but On kazat'sja (mn)dobrjakom 'He seems (to me) to be a nice guy', Ty kazat'sja nennogo vyš 'You seem a little
taller' (not *On sadaštja(mene) dobrjakom, and the like). Usages such as Tok nederedo slučajeta na maloznakomoj doroge, čemo nekotore učastki iščetajati iz pamjati i ves' put' toga sadaštja korode, čemo na samom dele 'It often so happens on a little-known road that some of its sections disappear from memory and the entire route then seems much shorter than it actually was!' (V. Bykov), apparently, deviate from the norm. Đ2 (prinimaj'sja 'to start', lit. "take up") = za Sacc., or infinitive, Đ(brat'sja 'id. ') = za Sacc. ćrivim princmaj'sja or brat'sja za rabotu, za delo, za kartinu 'to start work, an enterprise, a painting', but prinimaj'sja rezat' xleb 'to start cutting the bread/loaf' (brat'sja rezat' xleb is either incorrect or synonymous with objazivat'sja rezat' xleb 'to take upon oneself to cut the bread/loaf', i.e. it realizes a different meaning of brat'sja). G(menee 'less') is a verb with the meaning of a graded state or a qualitative adjective, G(menee 'less') is a verb with the meaning of a graded state: menee or men'še ljubit', stradaju, uvažať to love, suffer, respect less', but menee (not *men'še) važnij, interesniji, privilikanij 'less important, interesting, attractive'. G(očen) 'very (much)' = verb with the meaning of graded property, a qualitative adjective or an adverb of degree, G(sil'no 'id.') = verb with the meaning of a graded property: očen' or sil'no kartav, smukasteja, ustal, vatrevožen, obespozhen, smučjen (he) buras, is being shy, is tired, worried, vexed, embarrassed, but očen' molot' (adv.) 'very young', očen' malo 'very little' (adv.) (not *sil'no molot' (adv.), *sil'no malo). G(tol'ko 'only') = noun or verb, G(edinstvenno 'solely') = noun: Tol'ko or edinstvenno Petru my objazavaj vsem etim 'Only to Peter are we obliged for all this', Deržal'sja Tol'ko or edinstvenno siloj duxa 'He held onto only/solely by the strength of his spirit', but Fiziki-teoretiki Tol'ko dumajut, a fiziki-praktiki Tol'ko eksperimentirujut 'Theoretical physicists only think, whereas practical physicists only conduct experiments' (not *Fiziki-teoretiki edinstvenno dumajut...).}

One case deserves special mention, namely when one of the synonyms is fixed in a negative, interrogatory exclamatory or some other modal construction while the other synonym is syntactically (or perhaps semantically) freer. Such are the pairs of synonyms ponimati—smyslit' 'to understand', pojavit'sja—brat'sja 'to get', lit. "appear" (= NAcINAT' IMET'SJA U KOGO-LIBO 'to begin to be in someone's possession'), ponjat'—vzjat' v tolk 'to understand', e.g. Mnogo to ponimaj'sja or smyslit' v etom! 'What do you know about this!' [lit. "How much do you understand in this!'], Čto to v etom ponimaj'sja or smyslitaj 'What do you understand in this?'. Niče to v etom ne ponimaj'sja or ne smyslitaj 'You don't know anything about this!' ["You understand nothing"], Otkuda pojavil'sja or vzjalsja u nego den'ji? 'Where did he get the money?', Otkuda to u nego pojavil'sja or vzjalsja 'He's got money from somewhere', On nikak ne mog ponjat' or vzjat' v tolk, čto ot nego trebuetsja 'He just couldn't understand what was demanded of him', but 'on vse smyslit' (recte: On vse ponimaj 'He understands everything'), *U nego vzjalsja den'ji (recte: U nego pojavili'sja den'ji 'He got some money'), etc., e.g. Kogda podnešal Ananjev, ja nikak ne mog vzjat' v tolk, čto slučilos' i čto emu ot menja nado 'When Ananjev came running over, I couldn't understand what had happened and what he wanted from me!' (V. Bykov).}

**Intersection of Combinatorial Properties**

1. Semantic combinability. M2(prinimaj'sja 'to start') = DEJATELNOST' 'activity' or TIPIČNYJ OBVEKT KAK SIMVOL RABOČEJ DEJATELNOSTI 'typical object as a symbol of an activity', M2(brat'sja 'id. ') = RABOČAJA DEJATELNOST' 'working activity', TIPIČNYJ OBVEKT KAK SIMVOL RABOČEJ DEJATELNOSTI 'typical object as a symbol of a working activity' or TIPIČNYJ INSTRUMENT KAK SIMVOL RABOČEJ DEJATELNOSTI 'typical instrument as a symbol of a working activity' or prinimaj'sja or brat'sja za rabotu 'in order to do something', za delo 'to start working [studying, reading, working]', prinimaj'sja or brat'sja za kartinu 'to start a painting' (object of painting), za knigu 'to start a book' (the object of reading or writing), za pis'mo 'to start a letter' (the object of writing), za pis'mo 'to start a letter' (the object of writing); but prinimaj'sja (not *brat'sja) xoxotaj 'to start giggling' (not a working activity) and brat'sja (not *prinimaj'sja) za věsła 'to iglo, za oružje, za pera, za rull' 'to take up/to the oars [needle, weapons/arms, pen, steering wheel]' (instrument as a symbol of a working activity). Note the irregularity of clauses such as *prinjalsja zabavljatsja v
1. Semantic combignability. M₁(G(vo ves) opor 'at full speed') = ZIVOE SUSCETVO 'living being', M₁(G(na vsex parax 'at full speed') = TRANSPORTNE SREDSTVO 'means of transportation': Lokad (begun) mještaj na ves' opor (not ?na vsex parax), but Sudno [sostav, pozef] mještaj na vsex parax 'The vessel [train] is traveling at full speed' (not ?vo ves' opor). Similar, although less rigid, restrictions apply to other expressions with the meaning of full degree of speed, cf. vo vo vse lopetki (mostly of running of a human being), na polnom ina vsaščniku (chiefly of an animal or a rider).

2. Lexical combignability. D₁(nedomogat 'be ill/feel sick') = S'nom, D₁(nedzorovit'ja 'feel unwell') = S'dat: Otec nedomoguet 'Father is unwell', but Otec nezdorovit'ja (id.).

D₂(pobedit' 'to win a victory, be victorious') = S'bac, D₂(vozobladat' id.) = nad Sinstr: Cuvstvo doža pobedilo strax 'The sense of duty won over fear', žalost 'regret' negajoval 'Pity won over hostility', but Cuvsstvo doža vozobladalo nad strax, žalost 'regret' vozobladalo nad negajovalju. D₂ (utravinat' 'to lose') = S'bac, D₂(likat'ja id.) = S'gen: utračivat' avtoritet [vlijanje, prežaljno svojstvo] 'to lose (one's) authority influence, erasrthwhile qualities', but likat'ja avtoriteta [vlijanja, prežalnih svojstev]. D₂(vrjad II) + edva II 'it is unlikely' = Sentence, D₂(somnitel'no id.) = cotov + Sentence: Vrjad II in edva II on pridit 'It's unlikely that he will come', but Somnitel'no, čtoby on pridit (id.).

QUASI-SYNONYMS

The three characteristics of synonyms have been defined above. Quasi-synonyms differ from exact synonyms by the first characteristic (their definitions have a major common part, but are not completely identical) and are not different with regard to the second and third characteristic.

Such understanding of quasi-synonyms admits among them not only the so-called "idosyncratic synonyms" but also words called "analogue" in Webster, Robert 1967 and some other dictionaries. We concede that in an investigation of the problems of quasi-synonymy more detailed than ours it would be useful to make a distinction
between these two categories. Only lexical units whose semantic differences can be neutralized in a number of positions, can be regarded as quasi-synonyms proper. In this book, however, the distinction is not drawn.

The two main distinctions among quasi-synonyms are: generico-specific (inclusion of meanings, e.g. boleť—sadinť 'to hurt—to ache' [approximately—A. L.]), and specifico-specific (intersection of meanings, e.g. želňa—nyť—notatś—svidť—svetla—svetlť—strelatś (all designating different kinds of pain, approximately: burning, throbbing, ranking, stinging, shooting, and the like). Despite its triviality, this statement is not superfluous because different semantic types of quasi-synonyms form classes with different inner structure and behave differently vis-à-vis neutralization. It is the generico-specific distinctions that are usually neutralized; neutralization of specifico-specific distinctions, albeit quite possible theoretically, is in practice a very rare phenomenon.

Only those elements of compared meanings which are essential to a quasysynonymic distinction are emphasized in the definitions added below. For this reason, the definitions cannot be claimed to be complete.

Generico-Specific Distinctions

Vykopat—prokopat 'to dig (through)' = VYKOPAT' I VYKOPANNYM SOEDINITN 'to dig and connect by what has been dug'; cf. vykopat or prokopat kanal [kanavu, dorugu v snegu] 'to dig a canal [ditch, path in the snow]', but vykopat pruđ 'to dig (out) a pond' only.

Vymiť—umytyj 'to wash = VYMYT KOMU-LIBO LICO, ŠEJU I RUKI 'to wash (some)one's face, neck and hands'; cf. vymiýt or umytyj reběńka [lico, šeju, ruki] 'to wash the child [face, neck, hands]', but only vymiýt spinu [palubu, pol, lampe, posudu] 'to wash (one's) back [the deck, floor, lamp, dishes]; vymiýt reběńka can describe the situation VYKOPAT' REBAĽKA 'to bathe the child', whereas umytyj reběńka points unambiguously to the fact that what is being washed is the child's face, neck or hands.

Delat'—prodelat' = DELAT' IZJATIEN IZ ČEGO-LIBO ČASTI MATERIALA 'to make by taking out of something a part of its material', cf. delat' or prodelat' otmo v stene 'to make a window in the wall', but only delat' statuetku iz gipsa 'to make a figurine out of gypsum/plaster'.

Dobivat'sja—domogat'sja = DOBIVAT'SJA, PROJAVLJAJA IZLJUTNUU NASTOJCHIVOST 'to try to achieve something by acting with/showing unnecessary insistence', cf. dobivat'sja or domogat'sja prinjatja svoego plana (češ-li libo ljubvi 'to try to force acceptance of one's plan [to try to force someone's love]).

Zakryvat' [lico vugal [golou rukami, konja poponjo rebčinka odejalom] 'to cover [one's face with a veil [one's head with one's hands], the horse with the horse-cloth, the child with the blanket]—ukryvat' = ZAKRYVAT' DLJA KAUZACI TEPLA 'to cover for causing heat', cf. ukryvat' konja poponjo 'to cover the horse with the cloth' [rebčinka odejalom 'to cover the child with a blanket'].

Zamajat'sja—izmajat'sja = SOVSEM ZAMAJAT'SJA 'to become completely exhausted from work'; cf. also zamotat'sja—izmotat'sja, zamužit'sja—izmužit'sja, zamyatat'sja—izmyatat'sja (all meaning 'to be worn out, exhausted'), napolih—zapolni ' (NAPOLNIT' VŠE PROSTRANSTVO 'to fill the entire space')'; cf. Zritel napolil—zapolnil zal 'Spectators filled the entire hall', Narod napolil—zapolnil polščad 'People filled the entire square' (The square was full of people), Studenty napolil—zapolnil auditoiriu 'The students filled the auditorium' (The auditorium was filled/packed with students), Voda napolil—zapolnil kotli 'The water filled the tank' (The tank was filled with full of water).

Nestī—tāčit' = NESITI S USILJEM 'to carry with difficulty'—something that is too heavy or from a lack of strength, cf. tāčit' melok 'to drag a sack'.

Opirat' (nogi na zemli [ruki na koleni, podborodok na grudi], ruku o stvol dereva, visok o pritoloku) 'press/leam (feet against/on the ground [hands against/on one's knees, chin against one's breast/chest, hand against/on the tree trunk, one's temple against the lintel])—upirat' cf. upirat' veslo v bereg, čtoby ottolknut'sja 'to press the oar against the shore in order to push off'.

Otryvat'—otdirat' = OTRYVAT' S SILOJ ILI PREDOLOVAJA BOL'ŠE SOPROTVLJENIE MATERIALA 'to tear off with force or by overcoming great resistance
of the material, cf. otryvat' listok kalendarja 'to tear off a page from a calendar'—otdirat' oboi 'to tear/rip off wallpaper'.

Ostupat'—ostupat'sja = OSTUPAT' POD DAVLENIEM 'to back down/g3 back on (something) under pressure', cf. ostupit'—ostupit'sja ot svoix vzgljadov [imenii, trebovanii, svoego slova] 'to back down from one's views [opinions, demands, to go back on one's own word (of honor)]'.

Razrušat'—likvidirovat', uničtožat' = POLNOST'JU KAUZIROVAT' PERESTAVAT' IMET' 'to cause to completely cease to take place', cf. Zdanie bylo nemnogo [osnovatel'nno or polnost'ju] razrusheno 'The building was somewhat [utterly or completely] destroyed', but Bandy byli polnost'ju (not *osnovatel'nno, *nemnogo) likvidirovany ili uničtoženy 'The bands/gangs were utterly destroyed'.

Sdirat' (polosku oboev so steny [berěstu so stvolom]) 'to tear off (a strip of wall paper from the wall [birch-bark from the trunk]—obdrat' id. (from the entire diameter or surface, cf. obrat' oboi so steny 'to tear off wallpaper from the wall', obrat' berěstu so stvolom 'to tear off (all the) bark from the birch').

Skrepljat' (listy bumagi 'to attach/staple together (sheets of paper); the objects are equal)—prikrepljat' bant k platu 'to attach the bow to the dress'; the second object is regarded as the support).

Utonut' 'to drown/sink' (not said, from what position: Portfel' s bumagnymi utonul 'The briefcase with the papers (fell in the water and sank)', Kater sorval'sja so stapelej i utonul 'The cutter broke loose from the stocks and sank')—zatonut' id. (from a floating position, cf. Peregruzennyj korabl' zatonul pri vyxode iz gavan'i 'The overloaded ship sank on leaving the harbor', Zatonuli dve sekci pontonnogo mosta 'Two sections of the pontoon bridge have sunk').

Žalost'—sostradanie = ŽALOST', VYZVANNAJA ČUŽIM STRADANIEM 'pity/empathy caused by someone else's suffering'; žalost' 'pity' is felt not only with regard to someone who is in trouble but also towards someone who may get into trouble, even if the potential victim does not suspect it; one feels sostradanie 'compassion' only with regard to someone who already is suffering.

Kist' (vinograda [rjabiny, sirenii, smorodiny]) 'bunch (of grapes [rowan-berry, lilac, currants])'—grozd' id. =

TJAŽELAJA ILI KRASJAVA KIST' 'heavy or beautiful bunch/cluster'; kist' is used freely, while grozd' isn't.

Obšedinenie—sojuz 'union' = DOLOVREMINNOE TESNOE OBŠEDINENIE S OBŠICÍM CELJAMI 'long-term close-knit union with shared goals' (sojuz goсудarstv 'union/alliance of states')—federacija 'federation' = SVOBODNOE OBŠEDINENIE NATIONAŁNYX TERRITORIJ V RAMKAX EDINOGO GOŠUDARSTVA 'free association of national territories within one state'—blok, koalicija, os 'block, coalition, axis' = VREMENNOE OBŠEDINENIE ORGANIZACIJI DJJA ŠESNJAJA OSOBNEJ POLITYČESKOJ ILI VOENNOJ ZADACI 'temporary alliance of organizations for carrying out a common political or military task'.

Vysokij 'tall'—rostoj = DOVOJNO VYSOKIK, S KREPKIM I KRASIVYM TELOSLOŽENIEM 'rather tall, with a strong and handsome build'; cf. nizkij 'low/short'—vyšedůvnyj 'feeble/short' = NEVYSOKIK, SO SLABYM I NEKRASIVYM TELOSLOŽENIEM 'short, with a frail and homely build'.

Iskusstvennyj, neeskstvennyj (smex) 'phony, unnatural (laughter)—aftektirovannyj 'affected', delannyj, nalagnnychym, narodnyj 'unnatural, insincere' (prenebreženje 'scorn, contempt', udvlečenje 'surprise'—with an element of pretense/insincerity).

Iskusstvennyj (volosy [ruby, naga, ruka, alma, maksi]) 'artificial (hair [teeth = dentures], leg, arm/hand, diamond, fur]')—falšivyj = SDELANNYJ NAPODOBIE NASTOJAJSCEGA S CELJU OBMANUT' 'made to look like the real thing with the aim of deceiving', cf. falšiva volosy [denji, dokumenty] 'fake/false hair [money = counterfeit], documents], falšiva pasport 'false passport'.

Istinnyj 'truthful/veritable'—pravdyj = ISTINNYJ; U SUBJEKTA INFORMICI PREDPOLAGAETSA NAMERENIE GOVORIT ISTINU 'true/truthful; it is presupposed that the subject of the information has the intention to speak the truth'. Thus, the proverb Ne radi pravdy, a radi istiny 'Not for the sake of the truth but for the sake of verity' is not at all tautological.

Ložený (spečatlenie [pokazanja, svedenija, teorema, utverždenije]) 'wrong/false (impression [testimony, information, theorem, statement]')—žalost' = LOŽNYJ; U SUBJEKTA INFORMICI PREDPOLAGAETSA ŽELANIE OBMANUT' 'false; the subject of the information is
presupposed to have the desire to deceive', cf. Izivye pokazanija 'false testimony', Izivjev razkaz 'false/untrue account (of an event)', but not *Izivje vpečatlenie, *Izivaja teorema.

Neustojčivji 'unstable'—valjki = NEUSTOJČIVIJ V DVIŽENIJ 'unstable in motion', cf. valjka kbitka [lodka] 'unsteady wagon [boat]'.
Ploxoji 'bad'—drjajno 'trashy'—parljivji 'lousy'—nikušnji 'no good', nikuda ne godnji 'good for nothing'—z ruk von ploxoji 'hopelessly bad (bad to the point of uselessness); lit. "out-of-the-hands bad'"—užasni 'terrible'—otvratiteljni 'disgusting' (difference of degree),

Poxoži na X 'similar to X'—analogni X-u = OČEN' Poxoži na X po svojih sestnosti 'very similar to X in its essence', cf. analogni javlenija 'similar phenomenon' [čereti povedenija 'features of behavior'],

Blizko ot X-a 'near X/close to X'—rjedom s X-om 'next to X' = BLIZKO OT X-A, I MEĐU NEKIM Y-OM I X-OM NET DRUGIh ODNORODNIh S NIMI PREDEMETOV 'close to X, and between some Y and X there are no other objects of the same kind'.

Specifico-Specific Definitions

Bereči 'to protect' (from a potential threat, e.g. bereči detej ot prostudi 'to protect children from congestion')—oborjanj 'to defend' (from an actual threat, cf. oborjanj 'gorod to defend the city'),

X garantiruet Y-u Z = X UTVERŽDAET, ČTO NUŽNYI Y-U Z, NAXODJAŠČIŠA POD KONTROLEMI X-A, IMETE ILI BUDET IMET MESTO, I X SOOBSČAET Y-U O SVOJH GOTOVNOSTIH MESTI PERED Y-Om OVTSTVENNOSTI, ESILI OKAZETSJA, ČTO Z NE IMETE ILI NE MOZET IMET MESTA 'X states that Z, needed by Y, which is under X's control, is taking or will take place, and X informs Y concerning X's readiness to be responsible before Y if it turns out that Z is not taking place or cannot take place' (cf. garantirovat komu-1, pročnost materii [nadžnost tormozov] 'to guarantee the durability of the material/cloth [reliability of the brakes]', garantirovat komu-1, pravo vybora 'to guarantee the right of choice' [svobodu peredviženja 'freedom of travel', pržičniki 'minimum

'substences wage')—X ručašja Y-u za Z = X UTVERŽDAET, ČTO NUŽNYI Y-U Z IMET MEŠTO ILI UDOVLETVOJAJET TROBOVANIJAM Y-A, I X SOOBSČAET Y-U O SVOJH GOTOVNOSTIH MESTIH, PERED Y-Om OVTSTVENNOSTIH, ESILI OKAZETSJA, ČTO Z NE IMETE MESTA ILI UDOVLETVOJAJET TROBOVANIJAM Y-A 'X states that Z needed by Y is taking place or satisfies Y's requirements, and X informs Y of Y's readiness to be responsible before Y if it turns out that Z is not taking place or does not satisfy Y's requirements' (cf. ručašja za pročnost materii [za nadžnost tormozov], ručašja za rekonomušegnog rabotnika [za syna] 'to vouch for the recommended worker/employee [for one's son]'.

Zanositi, zataskati 'to wear out' (severe dilapidation and untidy appearance of the whole object)—iznositi, istaskati (complete dilapidation, unusability), cf. zanositi—iznositi blazu 'to wear out a blouse' [plati trest, štezi 'trousers']

Zasypati 'to bombard' (in large amounts, wishing to obtain something from the addressee, cf. zasypati kogo-I, vprosom [čalomi, trebokolm] 'to bombard someone with questions [complaints, demands]—osyati 'to shower' (in large amounts, as a sign of pleasure or displeasure, cf. osyati kogo-I, branju [laskami, milostjami, nasmeškami, oskorbenjami, podarkami, poceljami] 'to shower someone with curses [caresses, favors, ridicule, insults, gifts, kisses]').

Myt = 'to make clean by means of a liquid, treating the object with a substance or instrument; the liquid itself can be this substance'; stirať = 'to make clean by bringing parts of the object in contact with each other in a liquid milieu'. This analysis entails that the distinctions between myt and stirať are not combinatorial (one stirať 'washes' cloth, and moot 'washes' everything else) but semantic; the canvass top of a convertible can be not only washed (stirať) but also washed (myt)—if one does it with a wet cloth, when the top is put up.

Naborati = 'to collect/pick up with the aim of using, as a compact mass or one by one (cf. naborati vodu 'to get water', naborat dve oxapki drov 'to pick up two armfuls of firewood')—sobrati = '...with the aim of using or throwing out, but only one by one' (cf. sobrati cvety [griby, stržički, gevodi, musor] 'to gather/pick (up) flowers [mushrooms, shavings, nails, trash]'; thus, naborati is narrower than sobrati'
by the feature of goal, whereas sobirati' is narrower than nabirati' by the feature of manner.

Obrat' 'to burn' (badly, but not completely)—skeč 'to burn down' (completely, cf. On obrat-sebe sebiš spunu na solnce 'He burnt—completely burned his hand in the sun' [his skin in the frost] (i.e. his back was completely frostbitten or the like)—A. Lajčak.

Ostrič = 'to take off (hair, wool, etc.) completely'=pustrič! '...partially'=pustrič = '...just a little' (= 'to trim), cf. ostrič=pustrič=pustrič kogo-libo or komu-libo volosy borodu, (kôst) '...someone's or '...someone's hair [beard, wool].

Otvorevat' == POVYSJAT TEMPERATURU TOGO, ČTO ZAMĚRZLO 'to raise the temperature of something frozen/very cold'=sovrat' == POVYSJAT TEMPERATURU S CELJU USTRANJIT OSUCŠENJE XOLODA 'to raise the temperature with the aim of removing the feeling of cold', cf. otvorevat' zaměržške, onemovške ot xoloda ruki 'to warm one's hands, frozen and numb from cold'=sovrat' ruki 'to warm one's hands', sovrat' reběnka, kotorogo bět oznob 'to warm the shivering child'; characteristically, when one's hands become warm again (sovratjutaju), they stanovjutaje těplem, and when they otvorevatjutaje, they otjedajt 'heal', 'become well'.

Pronestis' 'to rush through/fly by/spread' (in one direction)—raznestis' id. (in many directions), cf. Novost' [vest'] pronestis' po gorodu 'The news spread through the city'—Sluz raznězje po gorodu 'The rumor spread throughout the city'.

Smažyat' 'to grease/lubricate; to spread' = KŁAŚ'T NEMNOGO SMAZKI ILI POKRYVAT' EJU NEBOLOŠE POVERXNOSTI 'to place a little lubricant/spread or cover little surfaces with it', cf. smazat' dveneč petli žirom [carapini jodom, volosy maslom] 'to lubricate hinges with grease [to treat, lit. "lubricate"] the scratch with iodine, hair with grease', gusto smazat' mjaso gortonje 'to spread the mustard thickly on the meat'=namazyvat' = KŁAŚ'T MNOGO SMAZKI ILI POKRYVAT' EJU BOLŠE POVERXNOSTI 'to place a lot of lubrication/spread or to cover large surfaces with it', cf. namazat' volosy maslom [pol mastikom, dom izvestkovom rasparcami, steny kraskoi] 'to put grease on one's hair [to spread/rub] butcherwax

all over the floor, (to cover) the house with mortar, the walls with paint'.

Topit' 'to melt' = PEREVOZIT' V ŽIDKOE SOSTOJANJE PUTEM NEBOLOŠEJO NAGREVANJA 'to transform into liquidity by heating a little', cf. topit' led [maslo, vosk, stearin] = PEREVOZIT' V ŻIDKOE SOSTOJANJE PUTEM SIĽNOGO NAGREVANJA 'to transform into liquidity by intense heating', cf. plavat' metal 'to melt metals [porody 'rock/or', less frequently vosk 'wax'.

Gorst' 'handful' = OČEN' NEBOLOŠE ČISLO 'a very small number', e.g. gorst' otnašený zaklínkov krepodstoj 'a handful of brave defenders of the fortress' kaplja 'drop' = OČEN' NEBOLOŠAJA STEPEN' SVOJSTVA 'a very small degree of a quality/property', cf. Est' u vas xot' kaplja žalosti [njuvbi k ljudjani 'Do you have even a drop of compassion [love of humanity]?

Konvoj 'armed escort/convoy' (mobile)—karaul 'a group of armed guards' (stationary).

S'ezd, kongress = VSTREČA PREDAVITELEJ ORGANIZACIJ, OBČNO S CELJU OBEMNA POLITÈČEKOJ INFORMACIJE 'a meeting of representatives of an organization, usually with the aim of exchanging political information'—slež, srodina = VSTREČA PREDAVITELEJ ORGANIZACIJ ILI OBČESTVENNYX GRUPP, OBČNO S CELJU OBEMENA OPITUM 'a meeting of representatives of organizations or community groups with the aim of exchanging information about their experiences'—spletni plenum = VSTREČA ČLENOV ORGANIZACIJ, OBČNO S CELJU OBEMENA POLITÈČEKOJ INFORMACIJE 'a meeting of members of an organization usually with the aim of exchanging political information'—konferencija, simpozium = VSTREČA ČLENOV KORPORACIJ, OBČNO S CELJU OBEMENA NAUČNOJ INFORMACIJE 'a meeting of members of a body ["corporation"], usually with the aim of exchanging scientific/scholarly information'.

Žadniy 'greedy' = ODERZIMIJY STRAST'U ZAXVYITY VAT' CUZOE 'possessed by the passion of seizing the property of others'—skupoj 'stingy' = NEOKOTNO OTDALUJECIJ SVOE 'unwillingly giving (away) his own'; the other meaning of the adjective žadniy, clearly expressed in the children's teaser žadna—povjadina!, where žadina means 'miser', will not be considered here.
Neprijatnýj A 'unpleasant A' (an explanation of the reason(s) why A evokes negative emotions should be sought in the qualities of A himself, e.g. neprijatnoe lico s begajúshimi gliazkami 'an unpleasant face with shifty little eyes', neprijatnýj tolstogubýj rot 'an unpleasant fat-lipped mouth')—antipatiýnýj X-u A id. 'to X' (an explanation of the reason(s) why A evokes negative emotions should be sought rather among the characteristics of X—his taste and other personal preferences; e.g. Moi simpatii i antipati ñ 'My likes and dislikes')

Neutralization of Semantic Distinctions

Generico-specific quasi-synonyms can participate in implicative transformations. Besides, quasi-synonyms of both semantic types can participate in isosemantic transformations, if their semantic differences are neutralized.

The main and most interesting content of the linguistic theory of neutralization is a formal description of the conditions in which it takes place. In what follows, we will be concerned precisely with this aspect of neutralization.

As we have already noted, neutralization in most cases has to do with generico-specific distinctions. It can take place either by deletion (začerpihanie) of a part of the meaning of a specific (vidovogo) quasi-synonym (A == 'XYZ', B == 'XY', 'Z' being the component neutralizable in context T) or by the enrichment of the meaning of a generic quasi-synonym (A == 'XYZ', B == 'XY', where 'Z' is the component neutralizable in context T).

The first possibility is most frequently (but not exclusively) actualized in the case of the disjunctive organization of the meaning of a generic quasi-synonym: A == 'XY' or 'Z'... Let us consider some examples.

Kopat' 'to dig' == RAZRYXLAT' ORUDIEM... 'to loosen (e.g. the ground) with a tool...', ryt' id. == 'to loosen with a tool or an organ...' (normally Lisa roet (not *kopeetl) noru 'The fox is digging a hole'. Consequently, conditions for interchangeability arise in the case when the action is performed with a tool, cf. ryt' or kopat' zastupom [lopatoj] глубокую жму 'to dig with a shovel [spade] a deep pit'.

Ulučštaja == STANOVIṬ'SJA LUCSE 'to become better', ispravljat'sja == STANOVIṬ'SJA LUCSE ILI XOROSIM 'to become better or good'. On page 69, where the verb ispravljat'sja was considered, the rules of deletion of the various components of its meaning were already formulated for the conditions when it is used with adverbs of small degree of a quality (nemnogo 'a little', sležka 'slightly', šuť-'šuť' 'barely') and full degree of a quality (absolutno 'absolutely', vapone 'quite', soveršenno 'perfectly', sovsem 'completely'). In the former case, the component ILI XOROSIM 'or good' is deleted because adverbs like nemnogo cannot be used with maximal adjectives (*nemnogo xorosij [*'a little good'] is impossible), whereas in the latter it is LUCSE ILI 'or better' that is deleted, because adverbs like sovsem cannot be used with non-maximal adjectives (*sovsem luče 'completely better' is impossible).

Consequently, in the former case the distinction between ulučštaja and ispravljat'sja is neutralized and they become interchangeable (Ego povedenie nemnogo ulučšil'sja or ispravil'sja 'His behavior has improved a little' —...STALO NEMNOGO LUCSE '...became a little better'), and in the latter, there arise conditions for a maximum semantic opposition: Ego povedenie sovsem or vapone ispravil'sja == ...STALO VPOLNE XOROSIM 'became quite good', while *Ego povedenie sovsem or vapone ulučšil'sja.

The same exact distinctions, neutralized under the same exact conditions, are found in the verbs uxcuštajsta = STANOVIṬ'SJA XUŽE 'become worse' and pordiš'taja = STANOVIṬ'SJA XUŽE ILI PLOXIIM 'become worse or bad'.

The other type of logical organization of meaning which allows neutralization by deletion of a semantic component is that of the meanings with probable, but not obligatory, semantic components, i.e. those preceded by quantifiers such as OBYČNO 'usually', ČASTO 'often', and the like.

Prekračtat'sja 'to stop/cease' and konačtat'sja 'to end' have the same generic meaning of finiteness, but konačtat'sja indicates attainment of the natural limit of an action, whereas prekračtat'sja indicates that the natural limit has not been reached. Therefore in cases such as Zanjatie [poxod, putešestviye, robota] prekračtat'sja—konačtat'sja 'The class [trip/military campaign, journey, work] is over' there is a clear semantic contrast: classes, trips,
etc. require completion. On the other hand, natural processes do not presuppose any natural limit, and when combined with names of such processes, neutralization takes place: *Dokol'* (smegl) tak* 2* nezasnapo končišja or prekratlišja, kak i našalja 'The rain [snow] stopped as suddenly as it had begun', *Purga končišja* or *prekratliša* toliko na drugoj den' 'The blizzard ceased only the following day', etc. Note that the semantic component which is possible, but not obligatory, for *končišja*, acquires permanency in other verbs, e.g. *začevati*, *zakancišvat* and the like (all *finish*).

The adjective *smelyj* 'brave/daring' presupposes an active and enterprising actor more frequently than does *xrabrij* 'brave/courageous': as a rule, one attacks (napadajut) smelo 'daringly' (rather than *xrabri*) but defends/fights back (zaščitajut) *xrabri* 'courageously/courageously'. This element of the meaning of *smelyj* clearly shows even in metaphorical meanings such as *smelyj issledovatel* 'daring researcher/investigator' (*xrabrij issledovatel* is impossible), smeljaj (derzaj) myšl 'daring thought', smeljaj poša 'daring/provocative pose', smelyj maner 'daring/provocative manners' (BROSAUSCIE VYZO OBSESTVENOMU VKUSU 'those that challenge/provoke public taste'), etc. However, in many situations which, apparently, do not have any semantic features in common, this element of the meaning of *smelyj* is not actualized and interchange becomes possible: *On byl xrabri i xorosho znal te ostrov minuty boja, koqda komandiru daja rešajuciego oksa nužno posutil' so smrčju* 'He was brave and knew well those critical moments of the battle when the commander, to make the decisive move, must toy with death' (A. N. Tolstoj, SAD).

Now, the second possibility of neutralization of quasi-synonymic distinctions. Let B = 'XY', A = 'XY→Z', where i is the index of a syntactic connection. The distinction between A and B can be neutralized if a word with the meaning 'Z' can be joined, by means of syntactic connection i, to word B. In this case, as one can easily surmise, neutralization happens in the portions of text longer than one word.

We shall now turn to examples and consider first quasi-synonyms with the conjunctive organization of meaning (→ symbolizes connection). B = 'XY', A = 'XY and Z'; in the majority of cases, component 'Z' conjoined to 'XY'

has the form of a sentence containing formulation of a certain requirement on participants (aktancy) of the situation designated by A.

Zapasati! *X to stock/poored X* = NAKAPLIVAT* X* V KOLICESTVE, PREVYSNJESMV KVANT POTREBLENJA, DLJA POTREBLENJA V BOLE POZDNEE VREMJA 'to store X in the amount surpassing the quantum of consumption, for consumption at a later date', e.g. zapasti *prodotku v dorogu* 'to stock up on supplies for the journey', zapasti *dia podeli drov* 'to save some firewood for the neighbor'; zapasat'sja X-om = ZAPASAT* X*, X I X PREDDNIZACEN DLJA SEBJA *z X, X, and X is meant for oneself*, cf. zapastis' *prodruktami v dorogu [drovami na zimu] to stock up on supplies for the journey [firewood for the winter]*. In the meaning of *zapast* there is no indication as to the potential consumer of the zapaisesnym object: one may zapast for oneself as well as for others, whereas zapasat'sja one may only for oneself. Consequently, the condition for neutralization in the verb zapast is the use of an element (such as the reflexive pronoun) which explicitly identifies the consumer with the subject of the action, e.g. On zapas dia sebja wagen drov na zimu 'He saved for himself a carload of firewood for the winter' = On zapasja wagonom drov na zimu 'He hoarded a carload of firewood for the winter'. Snačala *first* (adv.) designates first place of any sequence: Snačala X pošli za pokupkami, potom pobrilja...* 'First X went shopping, then he shaved...'; Snačala nazo razobrat'sja, a potom nakazvat' 'First one should look into things, and (only) then punish'; Snačala svil dolž, potom-grad 'first it rained, then hailed'. The quasi-synonymic locations *pervym delom, pervym dolgorn* and *v pervyu oferč* include the meaning *SNAČALA*, but presuppose a planned or some other imperative [sic—A. L.] order of events whose subject is a rational actor [*racional'nyj dejatel'!*]. *Pervym delom* or *pervym dolgorn* my pojedan za pokupkami, a potom už odelcem vsčo ostana* 'First we'll go shopping and everything else we'll do later'; no good: *Pervym delom [pervym dolgorn]* priču pozdes daļneh sledovanija, a potom—daļnij (First came the long distance train, and then the local) or *Pervym delom [pervym dolgorn]* NN podumal, čto našel razgradku tajny, no potom uvidel, čto ošibja (First NN thought he found the solution of the mystery, but later saw that he had been
Lexical Semantics

At least a partial neutralization takes place in the presence of modalities of the N UŽNO 'one must' class and on the condition that the subject of the event is a purposeful actor: Snáčeša [pervym delom, pervym dolcem] můžu pobrlitša, a potom můžu i pesť 'First one must shave, and afterwards one could have something to eat.'

In the case of the conjunctive organization, one more (less trivial) form of neutralization is theoretically thinkable. Let B = X Y Z, A = X Y and Z; if the meaning Z' is expressed in the text and apart from A and junctively [junktivno] joined to A, then the respective chunk of the text will look as follows (acc. to the rules of tautology deletion): 'X Y and Z' (meaning A) + 'and Z' = 'X Y and Z and Z' = 'X Y and Z'. If the text has B = X Y instead of A, then the respective portion of the text will receive the same exact interpretation: 'X Y' + 'and Z' = 'X Y and Z'.

Vsjakič means N E O P R E D E L E N N Y J KAŽDYJ 'indefinite each/every' (more precisely, ODIN, NO KAKOJ UGODNO 'every which one'); každyj, by contrast, can be joined to the name both of the definite and of the indefinite participant, e.g. Prisko 10 čelovek; každyj (but not vsjakij) imel pri sebe crude 10 people came; each one had a weapon on him'. In the situation of "introducing a new subject of discourse", when the object of the discourse cannot be definite by the very nature of things, there arise conditions for neutralization, e.g. Každyj or vsjakij čelovek imet pravo na trud i na otdih 'Every human being has the right to work and to rest'.

A more complex case of neutralization is represented by the pair of verbs SOVERŠENSTVOT' X = DELAT' X SOVERŠENNEE 'to make X more perfect/better' (cf. SOVERŠENSTVOT' mašinu [talant, svoj znanja] 'to perfect a machine [(one's) talent, one's knowledge'] and SOVERŠENSTVOT'aja v X-e = STANOVIT'SJA SOVERŠENNEE V X-E LI DELAT' X SOVERŠENNEE; X—UMENIE OBJEKTA 'to become better/more perfect' at X or make X better; X is a skill of the subject (e.g. SOVERŠENSTVOT'aja v znanja [v svojim iskusstve, vo francuskom, v igre na planinu] 'to perfect one's knowledge (one's art, (one's) French, (one's) piano technique'). The part DELAT'JA SOVERŠENNEE V X-E 'to become better at X' is necessary because SOVERŠENSTVOT'aja does not always presuppose conscious effort of the subject but may designate a natural,

uncontrollable growth of knowledge, skills, etc. To neutralize the distinctions between these two quasi-synonyms, it is necessary to (a) remove the indicated component of the meaning of SOVERŠENSTVOT'aja, (b) restrict the class of the possible Xs by qualities of the subject himself. Condition (a) is satisfied if the verb is modified by adverbs such as U P O R N O 'persistent', SISTEMATIČESKI and the like which presuppose conscious effort on the part of the subject and is therefore inconsistent with the idea of the subject's lack of control over the process. Condition (b) is satisfied if X designates a human quality and if preceded by the pronoun svoj 'one's (own)'. On U P O R N O SOVERŠENSTVOTAJA svoj masterstvo = On U P O R N O SOVERŠENSTVOTAJA v svojim masterstve 'He persistently perfected his craft'.

On the Notion of Shade of Meaning

Pairs and series of words, similar to those considered above, are often treated as synonyms differing from each other in shades of meaning. In connection with this there arises a necessity to analyze the notion of shade of meaning. Since it does not have a strict definition, we can try to find out what is usually meant by this term in one way or another, namely by inspecting language situations whose descriptions resort to this term.

In most cases, shades of meaning are understood as non-coincident parts of similar meanings, independently of whether the items compared are different meanings of the same polysemous word or one meaning of several quasi-synonymous words. "When we say not only of the human being that it goes but also of the rain (dožd' idšit 'it rains' = 'rain goes'), of the train (poezd' idšit 'the train runs'), of time (gody idšit 'years go by'), here the semantics of the verb idšit 'to go' appears as both stable and dynamic at the same time. Its stability is manifested in the fact that in all of the above cases the verb idšit 'to go/be on (one's) way' preserves its main meaning (to move) merely acquiring additional shades prompted by context" (Budagov 1952: 20). Here the shades are objects interpreted in all modern dictionaries as independent meanings, in some cases rather far apart from each other. Such is for instance the meaning represented in the sentence Gody idšit 'Years go by': gody
cannot, of course, be envisaged as traveling in time, and the only idea that this īdī has in common with the other three is the idea of change. In another paper, the same author writes about the instrumental of subject and of instrument as the most subtle shades of meaning (Budagov 1972: 408 ff.); specialists, however, see here a difference in meanings, and not such a subtle one at that (Mrazek 1964).

Indeed, an instrument is a thing used to perform the action, whereas a subject is a person who causes the instrument to perform this action; thus, the instrument and the subject meaning differ at least in two important features: 'thing' vs. 'person' and 'action' vs. 'causation of action'. In both cases, there are denotational semantic differences-distinctions in sets of meanings participating in definitions of the meanings under comparison.

Consider the second class of situations where the term "shade of meaning" is used. According to P. A. Evgen'eva, "the most important indication for the verb gasnut' ['to go out, be extinguished' (fire, lights, etc.)] is the indication of the cessation of light, whereas for tuxnut' [synonymous with gasnut'-A. L. and its derivatives, the cessation of burning is also essential..." (Evgen'eva 1967: 79). We would like to interpret this observation as probabilistic: the distinction indicated by P. A. Evgen'eva is actualized in most cases, but not always. Sentences such as Kostir pogas 'The campfire went out' and Lampa potuxda 'The lamp went out' are quite correct. It is impossible to single out distinctive features of contexts in which the actualization of the distinction under consideration would be obligatory. Thus, it does indeed acquire a purely probabilistic character. Consequently, the second explicad [eksplicat] of the notion of "shade of meaning" is a semantic component whose probability of realization is not equal to one.13 Such components can be treated in two different ways. First, they may not be recorded at all. Then words like gasnut', tuxnut' will have exactly identical meanings, i.e. the same lexical meaning, and there is no room left for any "shades". Second, they could be included in the definition, but preceded by semantic components such as 'usually', 'sometimes', 'rarely' and the like: gasnut' = 'to cease to provide light or (rarer) burn', tuxnut' = 'to cease to burn or (rarer) provide light'. In this case, the semantic distinction between gasnut' and tuxnut', however small, will be a distinction of meaning, and the notion of "shade of meaning" is again superfluous.

Considering the same group of verbs a few pages back, A. P. Evgen'eva makes the following remark: compared to gasnut', tuxnut', the prefixed verbs ugasat', pogsat', satuskat' are used when graduality, slowness of the process itself is emphasized (Evgen'eva 1967: 73). This observation is, without a doubt, correct, and can be interpreted in the following two ways. First, it may be thought, roughly, that gasnut' and tuxnut' mean simply 'to cease to burn' while the other three verbs have a more complex meaning, 'gradually to cease to burn'; what we get is, again, a difference of meanings, not "shades". Second, the word podlēčerka iatša 'is emphasized' in Evgen'eva's statement can be taken to mean "is logically singled out", "carries logical stress" (under the condition that the component 'gradually' is included in the meanings of all five verbs). But even in this case the term "shade of meaning" is superfluous because it duplicates the term "logical emphasis" [logičeskoe udarenie], which is much more precise and necessary for descriptions of a large number of semantic categories (specifically, lexical and grammatical conversives). Let us illustrate this notion.

Two very similar situations can be described as pulanja pobeda X-a nad Y-om 'total victory of X over Y' and razgrom Y-a X-om 'crushing defeat of Y by X'. In the first case, the attention is focused on the result which the struggle brought for X, and in the second, for Y. Rezat' X Y-om 'to cut X with Y' = DVIGAT' OSTRYJ Y PO X-U ILI NADAVLIVAT' OSTRYJ Y-OM NA X, VOZMOZNO, DELJA X NA CASTI 'to move a sharp Y on (the surface of) X or to press a sharp Y against onto X possibly dividing X into parts/sections', narezat' X Y-om 'to cut up X with Y' = DELIT' X NA CASTI, DVIGAJA OSTRYJOM Y-OM PO X-U ILI NADAVLIVAJA OSTRYJOM Y-OM NA X 'to divide X into sections by moving a sharp Y on (the surface of) X or pressing against X with a sharp Y: in the case of rezat', the main information is that of the manner of manipulation with a sharp instrument while the information of the possible result of it is marginal; in the case of narezat', the main information is that of a result, while the information on the way the result is achieved is marginal (the interpretation of the latter example is by I. A. Melčuk and the present author).
The pairs of words considered above can be regarded as inexact synonyms. Similar differences are characteristic of lexical conversives of all types.

All such distinctions among inexact synonyms and conversives must be reflected in a complete description of the lexica. They belong to the part of the semantics of the sign called signification meaning (see p. 36). One of the ways to describe such distinctions is either to underline the respective component in the literal sense of the word, or to factor it out to the very beginning of the definition, or place it at the top nod of the semantic tree corresponding to the standard linear definition. Such (or some other) formal highlighting is necessary not only within the framework of theory of lexical synonyms and lexical conversives, but also within the theory of lexical semantics as a whole.

Sometimes the term "shade of meaning" is used when there are differences in semantic, lexical or morphosyntactic combinatorial properties of two semantically close words or two different realizations of one meaning. Consider the treatment in SAD of the noun \( \text{klassy} \) meaning 'measure of quality, level, depending on which the place of the object among similar objects is determined' (cf. \( \text{kamni pervogo klassa} \) 'first rate stones [jewels]', \( \text{igras voskogo klasses} \) 'first rate (musical) performance/sports game', \( \text{teknika pervogo klassen} \) 'first rate technology/technique'). Here SAD singles out the "shade of meaning" 'level of athletic training' with the example \( \text{futbolist voskogo klassa} \) 'first rate soccer player'—a solution that can hardly be semantically justified, especially since the dictionary finds a different shade of meaning in the syntagm \( \text{igras voskogo klasses} \). In fact, \( \text{vysokyi klass} \) can be ascribed not only to an athlete, but also to a representative of a certain profession, e.g. \( \text{fizik voskogo klassa} \) 'first-rate physicist', \( \text{zurnalists voskogo klassa} \) 'journalist'. If the "shade of meaning" indicated by the dictionary is indeed realized in the syntagm \( \text{futbolist voskogo klassa} \), then one will have to see other "shades of meaning" in other syntagms of this kind, e.g. 'level of scientific/scholarly training' (\( \text{fizik voskogo klasse} \), 'level of literary training' (\( \text{zurnalists voskogo klassa} \)) and the like. But then the description becomes very cumbersome and obviously redundant: the notions of sports, science and literature are included in the meanings of the words \( \text{futbolist} \), \( \text{zurnalists} \), \( \text{fizik} \) and \( \text{zurnalists} \) respectively. A correct semantic interpretation of these combinations can be obtained even without duplicating meanings, simply due to the meanings of the respective nouns, and it is sufficient to postulate to the word \( \text{klassy} \) one general meaning: 'level of professional training' (it is precisely this solution, albeit formulated somewhat differently, that is adopted in LAD). Thus, in the example considered above, an element of the meaning of the noun with which \( \text{klassy} \) is combined, is mistaken for a "shade of meaning".

Two "shades of meaning" are singled out in the word \( \text{glubokii} \) 'profound/deep' in the meaning 'very strong' (cf. \( \text{gluboke ot"ajanie} \) 'deep despair'): 'full, complete' (\( \text{glubokii son} \), \( \text{pokoj} \), \( \text{mrak} \), \( \text{traur} \) 'deep sleep, calm, darkness/gloom, mourning') and 'that which attained the limit in its development' (\( \text{glubokaia starost} \) 'extreme old age', \( \text{glubokaia zima} \) 'the peak of winter', \( \text{glubokaia no"i} \) 'the darkest (part of the night)'). It is impossible to see any differences, except those in lexical combinability, between \( \text{gluboke ot"ajanie} \) and \( \text{glubokii son} \) or \( \text{glubokaia starost} \) in all three cases, we are dealing with the extreme or full degree of that which is designated by the modified noun. The other differences can be reduced to the differences in the meanings of the nouns themselves. If we wanted to go far enough in distinguishing "shades of meaning" in the word \( \text{glubokii} \) which depend on the meaning of nouns with which it can be combined, we would be obliged to separate \( \text{glubokaia starost} \) from \( \text{glubokaia zima} \) and \( \text{no"i} \): old age is called \( \text{glubokaia (starost)} \) when it is near the end, while winter (\( \text{zima} \)) and night (\( \text{no"i} \)) are so called when they are in their middle.

We have already considered cases when a morphosyntactic combinatorial property is taken for a "shade of meaning" (see p. 39). Here's an additional example. The verb \( \text{prinjats'ia} \) in the meaning 'to take up/start' (e.g. \( \text{prinjats'ia za etenices knigi} \) 'to start reading books') is said (by MAS) to have the shade of meaning 'to start doing something' in an infinitival construction (e.g. \( \text{prinjats'ia rezat' zleb} \) 'to start cutting bread'). The nature of this distinction is also not semantic but rather morphosyntactic; cf. the synonymy of \( \text{prinjals'ia za etenices knigi} \) 'started reading the book'—\( \text{prinjals'ia etat'} \) 'kniigu' id. Note that LAD sees such syntagms as manifestations of the same meaning (without "shades").
Finally, let us consider the last explicate [eksplicit] of the term "shade of meaning", namely the notion of semantic associations, or, more broadly, pragmatic elements of the sign. To the material added on p. 45, we shall add the following fine example from Šcerba 1940: 36: "French eau is seemingly quite equal to Russian voda 'water'; however, the figurative use of the word voda in the sense 'something devoid of content' is completely alien to the French word, whereas the latter has a meaning, which can more or less be rendered with Russian otrva 'broth' (eau de ris, eau d'orge). It follows from this and other minor facts that the Russian notion of water underlines its nutritive usefulness, whereas in French this characteristic is perfectly alien. Although the feature 'nutritive usefulness', obviously, cannot be included in the definition of the word voda, it must be represented in this word's lexical entry, namely in the connotative zone, or the zone of pragmatics, because it reflects an interesting characteristic of perception and evaluation of the object "water" reflected in certain facts of the Russian language (e.g. V doklade čezešur mnogo vody 'There is too much empty talk [lit. 'water'] in the report). Thus, vis-a-vis the main meaning of the word voda, the said characteristic is an element of the pragmatics and therefore cannot be interpreted as a "shade of meaning" precisely because it is not a characteristic of the meaning. As to the figurative meaning of this word, the component 'useless', 'irrelevant' is an important element of the semantics and again cannot be interpreted as a "shade".

One example from the lexicographic practice. SAD finds in the word kusok in the meaning 'severed, broken off, and the like, part of something' the shade of meaning 'means of subsistence' (e.g. poprekat' kogo-libo kuskom 'to reproach someone for one's livelihood'). As one can see, the formulations of the literal and figurative meaning do not have any semantic components in common, and it seems illogical to see one as a "shade" of the other. Apparently, it would be better to describe this case so that a certain pragmatic feature of kusok 1 is represented as a semantic feature of kusok 2.

Thus, the term "shade of meaning" corresponds to anywhere from three to six different linguistic notions, each of which is necessary for many branches of the semantic theory: a property of the semantics of a word (the denotate or the signifie), a syntagmatic property (semantic, lexical or morphosyntactic combinability) or a pragmatic property. By duplicating several entirely different notions, the term "shade of meaning" turns out to be devoid of any content of its own. A term which is at best redundant and, in the worst case, meaningless, has no scientific value and should be abandoned. By insisting that it is impossible to find any satisfactory theoretical status for the notion of "shade of meaning" in linguistic description we do not at all mean to say words cannot differ from each other in most subtle nuances, semantic and other. We are claiming only that they must be described by means of other theoretical notions.

Series of Quasi-synonyms and Semantic Fields

The relation of synonymy (a variety of equivalence) results in dividing the entire lexicon into non-intersecting classes of lexical units, viz. the so-called synonymic series [sinonimčeskie rjadovy]. The relation of quasi-synonymy, without being equivalence in the strict sense of the word, does not by itself generate such division, and to obtain non-intersecting classes of quasi-synonyms special rules are required.

Since exact synonyms do not differ semantically, a synonymic series does not have any internal structure. Classes of quasi-synonyms, on the other hand, possess a certain semantic structure because quasi-synonyms differ among themselves semantically in complex ways.

This structure can be of two kinds. Firstly, a series may be continuously broken up into progressively smaller quasi-synonymic or even synonymic series, wholly included in series of a higher order, so that there is obtained a hierarchical tree of sorts. This is particularly characteristic of those classes of quasi-synonyms that contain a generic term in each group and subgroup of any level of the hierarchy. Secondly, a class of quasi-synonyms may split up into subgroups and even pairs of words which intersect with each other in a complex way. This is particularly characteristic of generically-generous quasi-synonyms which differ from each other by several semantic components at once.
For example, hierarchic structure is characteristic of the class of quasi-synonyms with the generic label bit' 'to hit/beat' which splits up into the following two main subclasses: intensity (cf. valtuzit', vzdušit', dubasit', kolotit', kolobžmatit', tomat' [mat'] boka, hpidit', lujcavat', molotit', mordovat', otvodit', ozhažvat', tusit' [roughly, from beat the daylight out of someone] to 'pummel', and the like) and the type of instrument (drat', polosovat', porot', set' = BIT') CEM-LIBO DLINNYM I GIBKIM 'to beat/strike with something long and supple'. In the latter, a subset of verbs can be isolated, namely drat', porot', set', which indicate that the beating is done in order to punish.17

Verbs with the common meaning 'to speak' are divided into subclasses voskicat', gaiđet', gorlanit', gorlopanit' ('to speak loud'), brjužat', burčat', vorcat' ('to speak with discontent'), bormotat', bubnit', lopotat', mjamlit' ('to speak unintelligibly or hesitantly'), gnusavit', gundosit', zaikat'sje, kartavit', prišepěývat', šepeljavat' ('to speak with a speech defect').

Verbs with the generic meaning 'to inform' are divided into three main subclasses: (a) 'to inform properly', cf. izvečmat', informirovat', osvedomljat', soobčat', uvedomljat'; (b) SOOBSCAT' V USTANOVLENNOJ DLJAJ DANNOJ SITUACII FORME 'to inform in the form established/institutionalized for the given situation', cf. dokladjvat', 'to report' donosit' (komandiru o približenii protivnika) 'to report (to the commander concerning the approach of the adversary)', zajavljat' 'to petition/apply', pobjavljat' 'to announce, reportovat' 'to report'; (c) ŽALOVAT'SJA 'to complain', cf. donosit' (na druge 'to report/inform on (a friend) [e.g. to the police], žalovat'sja, klijazmičat' 'to write complaints', setovat' 'to wall', jabečničat' 'to squeal'.

Verbs with the generic meaning 'to kill' are divided into subclasses with the meaning (a) 'to kill' proper (ubit', prikončit', ulokit', prixlopovat', uholovat', ukokoščit')... with further subdivision into types of killing distinguished mainly by the features of instruments for killing or an organ affecting the killing which takes place; zastrelit' (with a firearm), zarezat', zarnbit' (with a cutting weapon), zatapiat' (in a liquid), zadavit' (with the mass of one's entire body), zatopat' (with one's feet), zadušit', udavit' (by affecting someone's breathing passages) and the like; (b) 'to punish by death' (kaznit' 'to execute', vešat' 'to hang', rasstrelivat' 'to shoot (dead)', šeturvovat' 'to quarter', šigat' 'to burn at the stake', etc.); (c) UBIAT' 'to promote by hunting' (bit' tjelej 'to kill seals', streljavat' 'to kill 'shoot' ducks', etc.; (d) UBIAT' 'to combine WITH S VREDITELJAMI 'to kill while exterminating pests' ("...in the order of the struggle against pests/vermin/saboteurs"), cf. izvesti tanavov 'to exterminate cockroaches, strobljat gyryunov 'to exterminate rodents', morit' klopop 'to exterminate bedbugs'.

The generic meaning expressed by the noun napadenie 'attack/assault' is actualized by the series našestvie 'invasion', vtorčenie id., aggressija (a long-term large-scale attack) and the series ataka, nabeg 'incursion', našet' 'raid' (a short-term and impetuous attack); ataka, in its turn, is subdivided, according to its implementation, type of the object being attacked, the number of objects under attack, type of attacking troops and place from which it is conducted, into udar 'strike' (an accomplished attack), šturm 'storm', pristup (an attack on a fortification), sabordaž (an attack against aship), režj (raid.—L.) a consecutive attack by vessels, cavalry, tanks, and the like, on several fortified points during a single "move" of the attacking troops), vypalzka 'sortie' (an attack from a besieged fortification).

Now let us consider a few series of quasi-synonyms with generic-generic distinctions which have non-hierarchic structure with complex intersections of classes. The general meaning of the verbs bit' 'to beat/strike/hit', drobit' 'to crush/destroy', kolot' 'to split/hew/chop' and krošit' 'to crush; hack' (FIZICESKIM VOZDEJSTVIEM KAUZIROVAT' RASPADAT'SJA NA ČASTI 'to cause to fall apart into pieces by physical action') is complicated by the following additional features: the feature of hardness—softness of the object (can be deformed with difficulty—without difficulty); the feature of percussiveness—non-percussiveness (udarnost'—neudarnost') of the destructive action; the feature of participation—non-participation of an instrument in action; finally, the feature of the size of the resulting parts.

Drobnije presupposes hardness and endurance/strength of the object (drobit'kosti [granit, kamen]) 'to crush bones [ground, stone]'; it is performed by striking the object with an instrument, and the resulting parts can
be either large or small. Kolot 'one splits' hard, but not overly strong/durable objects (cf. kolot 'drowa [saxar, lid, oregi] to split firewood, [sugar, ice, nuts],') by striking or with some other mechanical effort, with or without participation of an instrument (cf. kolot 'drowa teporom (he) was splitting wood with an axe' [saxar šелпами 'sugar with tongs'] or pal'cami 'with (one's) fingers'); kolot lēd o poleno 'was splitting ice against/on a log'; the parts obtained as a result of kolk 'splitting' are relatively large. Pljut 'one breaks/beats/strikes/hits' hard objects (cf. bit 'steklo [kemen] 'to break glass [stone]') by striking with an instrument (bit 'kamen' 'to break stone(s)) or by striking the given object against another object (bit 'steklo 'to break glass'); the pieces are small. Finally, krošat 'one crumbles' non-hard and non-strong objects (zleb 'bread', mel 'chalk') by a non-persuasive effort, usually without any instrument; the resulting pieces are small. As we can see, this class is devoid of hierarchical structure. By the feature of hardness—non-hardness, bit', drobl' and kolot' are in opposition with krošat'; by the feature of the resulting pieces, bit' and krošat' oppose drobl' and kolot'; drobl' and bit' are in opposition with kolot' and krošat' by the feature of persuasiveness—non-persuasiveness; drobl' is in opposition to the rest of the verbs by the feature of participation—non-participation of an instrument, etc.

The quasi-synonyms bluždat', boltats', kružit', okaļašiv'sja, petijat', plutat', ryskat', slonjašts', šastat', šatašts', šilajats', šnyrjat', which share the meaning XODIT' 'to walk', differ in the following features: goal/aim (ryska't) 'to scour'—in search of prey/booty, šijats'ja 'to wander about' without aim, šatašts'ja 'to go out' in search of pleasure, šnyrjat' 'to dart about' (in search of information); space (boltats', okaļašiv'sja 'to go around') not wandering off far from a fixed spot, slonjašts'ja 'to wander around', šnyrjat'—anywhere); right track (bluždat', plutat' 'to stray' without knowing one's way around, slonjašts'ja with no particular route or business, but with a knowledge of one's whereabouts); shape of track (kružit' in circles, petijat' 'to dodge' in loops, ryska't, šnyrjat' in zigzags); speed (bluždat', boltats', okaļašiv'sja, slonjašts', šatašts', šijats'ja slowly, ryska't, šastat', šnyrjat' fast); outwardly manner of movement (slonjašts', šatašts', šijats'ja in a relaxed and easy manner; ryska't, šastat', šnyrjat' in a concerned and purposeful manner).
Lexical Semantics

details', kapli 'drops', komija 'lumps', kraki 'crumbs', kuski 'bits', lomti 'pieces', loskuty 'scraps', obrezki 'rags/scraps', obryvki 'rags', oskoldki 'fragments', otrzyuki 'fragments/pieces', framenti, časti 'parts', šepek 'splinters'. These examples alone are sufficient to show that elements of a semantic field are not required to exhibit greater semantic similarity with each other than with other elements of the lexicon.

Due to the said property, semantic fields are intersecting classes; there is no unique division of lexicon into semantic fields, unless one adopts artificial principles of classification or substitutes semantic components with binary or other differential features; from any semantic field, through a more or less long chain of intermediary links, one can get into any other field, so that the semantic space of language in this sense turns out to be continuous.

Thus, the field of verbs with the meaning of vacillating motion (boltau'sja 'dangle', dergat'sja 'jerk', drozhat' 'tremble', kachat'sja 'swing', kolebat'sja 'sway/oscillate', motat'sja 'dangle', rezonirovat' 'resonate', trepetat' 'tremble', trjastis't 'shake', kachat'sja 'shaking', shvelling 'shake', 'shudder/judge', and the like) intersects first of all with the field of causative verbs like boltau 'dangle', dergat' 'jerk', kachat' 'swing/rock', kolebat' 'sway', motat' 'dangle', terebit' 'pull/pick at', trepat' 'to pull, snatch', trjastis't 'shake', katat' id., шевелит' 'stir', many of which, in their turn, are similar to verbs like bit' 'hit/strike/beat' in the feature of goal and result (cf. dergat' kogo-lisha za volosu 'to pull someone's hair', trepat' kogo-lisha za uži 'to pull (*) someone by the ear'; Ljudi ženu kak dušu, trezješ ešh khrab 'Love your wife as your soul, shake her like a pear tree'). Secondly, as has been already noted (p. 51), this field intersects with the field of determinate verbs of motion (begat' 'run', ezat' 'travel' (= "fahren"), katat' 'roll', lazat' 'climb/clamber', letat' 'fly', plavit' 'swim/sail/float', požat' 'creep', zhidat' 'walk', and the like), because elements of both fields designate actions consisting of clearly distinguishable quanta: the quantum of oscillation is the movement of the body from one extreme point to the other, and the quantum of multiple movement is the movement from a previous point to the point where the direction of the movement changes. Through the intermediary link of indeterminate verbs of motion, the verbs of oscillation turn out to be (semantically) related to determinate verbs of motion as well (cf. bežat' 'be running', ezat' 'be traveling', katit'sja 'be rolling', etc.).

And thirdly, figurative meanings of many of the verbs under consideration are metonymically connected with the meaning BOJAT'SJA 'be afraid', cf. drozhat', trepetat', trjastis't—trustit' 'to be scared', BOJAT'SJA 'be afraid', strasait'sja 'to fear'. Admittedly, the uttermost points of the examined chunk of semantic space—the meanings DVIČAT'SJA 'move', BIT' 'hit/strike' and BOJAT'SJA 'be afraid' are far enough from each other.

Verbs of motion and causative-factitive verbs present a very variegated and rich picture of fields intersecting on different planes, so to speak, of multidimensional space. The group of verbs of directed autonomous motion (bežat' 'be running', idati 'be walking', letat' 'be flying', polzat' 'be creeping', plyat' 'be swimming/sailing' and the like) is directly connected, first and foremost, with indeterminate verbs of motion, and via those (a) with verbs of oscillation (see above) and (b) verbs like bluždat', brodit', kržit', petlat', pluat', ryskat', slojat'sja and the like (see p. 308). It should be added that verbs such as brodit', slojat'sja, katit'sja have common semantic components with verbs such as putešestvovat' 'travel/be on a journey', stranovat' 'wander' (in foreign lands), skitatsja 'wander (without home)', the latter of which provides a natural transition to mykat'sja 'wander (and suffer)' and further to mučit'sja 'suffer' and the like. The verb idati is a component in a number of verbs that designate different kinds of walking (flanrovat' 'to idle/moan', šestovat' 'to walk in a procession', and the like), particularly slow walking: brasti 'shuffle', plestis't 'drag along', takat'sja id., edva 'nugi voloktit' 'barely drag one's feet'; the latter group, in its turn, is connected by the component 'slowly' with numerous verbs like valandat'sja 'dawdle, slack', volnit' id., kanitel'sja id., kopat'sja id., kovyrrat'sja id., medlit' 'procrastinate', meškat' 'tarry', and the like. The verb bežat' 'be running' is a component in the series of verbs designating various kinds of running (ryst' 'trot', trustit' 'jog', galoprovat' 'gallop'), in particular fast running: letat' 'fly', měšt' 'rush', nestis't id., and the like; the latter group, in its turn, (a) is connected, by its component 'fast', with verbs such as spešit' 'be in a hurry', toropit'sja id., and the like; (b) includes verbs with the meaning of inception of swift motion (brosit'sja 'rush', knut'sja id., rinut'sja id., and the like). Precisely one
to bang against', udarit'sja 'hit oneself against' (the same with the additional meaning of hitting), and the like. Verbs with the meaning of causing movement (iditi, ideti, pleti, posliet...) are connected with the verbs of non-autonomous motion (extat 'travel/ride', katit'sja 'roll', ideti 'fly', pleti 'sail'); verbs in both subgroups have complex causatives, e.g. vesti 'transport' (KAUZIROVAT' EXAT) I EXAT SAMOMU 'to cause to transport and to transport oneself', vesti 'to bring' [= "führen"] (KAUZIROVAT' IDTI I IDTI SAMOMU 'to cause to walk and to walk too'), volot' 'drag', gnat' 'drive/chase (away)', katit' 'roll' (tr.), nesti 'carry', (vulkan) peret' 'shlep', tal'lit' 'drag (along)' (i.e. verbs with the meaning of causing movement and self-movement). It is clear that verbs of the latter group are connected with verbs such as brosat' 'throw', zapuskat' 'launch', idtit' 'throw', metat' 'hurl', napravlit' 'direct', posyat' 'send', lonjat', spuskat' 'unleash' (dog), tolkat' 'push' (put the shot), tunat' 'pull/haul' (causation of movement without self-movement) and that these latter are connected with the verbs pixat' 'push', tolkat' 'id. (a hit causing movement without self-movement).

The causative meaning, abundantly represented in many of the examined groups, connects verbs of motion with the various causative and factitive verbs whose detailed consideration does not appear possible at this time; we will have to content ourselves with a brief yet representative summary of the main data: burit' (skvaživat') 'bore (a bore-hole)', valjat' (valjat) 'to feel (felt boots)', varit' (sup) 'to cook (a soup)', vajat' (skul'ptur'nuju gruppu) 'sculpt a group of statues', vit' (veršku) 'to twist (a rope)', vozvodit' (vozdiv'iat', sooruz'at', stroitt' (plot'nuju) 'to build (a dam)', vyvibrat' (čekanit') 'metal' 'to mint (a medal)', vyvdat' (vytisnit') 'nedpis' (nakaz na šestii 'to impress/stamp an inscription [sign on tin]', vydoblit' (lun'ko vo l'du) 'to gouge out (a hole in the ice)', vykoyat' (otkovat') (podkovu [meč] 'to forge (a horseshoe [sword])', vyp'lit' (ramku) 'to make [= "saw out"] (a [fretwork] frame)', vyrubit' (pamjatnik) 'to hew (a monument)', vysvetlit' (otverstie) 'to drill (a hole)', vytočit' (figurki iz dereva) 'to turn (figurines out of wood)', vyženit' (plan doma) 'to draw (a plan of the house)', vjazat' (sivet) 'knit (a sweater)', gravirovat' (portret) 'to engrave (a portrait)', delat' (jaščik) 'to make (a crate)', dut' (butyli) 'to blow (glassware)', kata' (šarki iz ginly)
Converses have become an object of detailed analysis only during the last decade, despite the fact that they had been noted already by authors of classical antiquity. In modern times, Charles Bally (1921: 141) noted expressions such as avoir le droit 'have the right' and être légitime 'be legitimate' as one of the sources of lexical synonymy (cf. On imel pravo protestovat' 'He had the right to protest'—Ego protest byl zakonnym 'His protest was legitimate'). O. Jespersen analyzed such word pairs in connection with the notion of (the passive) voice whose syntactic essence he saw in the exchange of function between subject and object, in other words, in the conversion of complements. Examining sense relations between sentences such as A precedes B and B follows A, Jespersen noted: 'What in the first sentence is looked at from the point of view of A is in the second looked at from the point of view of B' (Jespersen 1905: 164). He considerably broadened the concept of this type of synonymy by discovering similar voice oppositions in different parts of speech, namely prepositions (above—under, before—after), adjectives (older—younger, desires—desirable), nouns (examiner—examinee) and verbs (sell—buy, give—receive, have—belong) op. cit., p. 101.

Linguists of the later era did not understand or support these profound ideas. When, in 1952, Z. Harris described "quasitransformations" such as He sold me a book—I bought a book from him (Harris 1952), he in fact resurrected only a very small portion of O. Jespersen's theory. In 1957, by examining the synonymy of causes, produces, leads to, the result is, the upshot is, M. Masterman reconstructed yet another forgotten detail of the picture drawn by Jespersen (Masterman 1957: 174). In Zolkovskij et al. (1961: 23-23, 26), Jespersen's discovery was fully reasserted and in certain respects amplified. It was noted that "certain pairs of words expressing bilateral relations present the same sense in different directions" and with different emphases; the paper gave a more representative selection of such pairs belonging to different parts of speech (A