The Picture of Consistency in the Vocabulary of Modern Russian Language

Zhadyra Zh. Zhumagulova[1*], Gulzhan K. Altynbekova[2], Sevil Piriyeva Karaman[3], Olga A. Stycheva[4], Gulnur Abubakirovna Belgibaeva[5]

[1] *Candidate of Sciences (philology). ORCID ID 0000-0001-7547-7792 Tashenev University. E-mail:* zhadi.72@mail.ru, *Shymkent, Kazakhstan.*

[2] *Candidate of Sciences (philology). Auezov South Kazakhstan University. E-mail:* Altynbekova-69@mail.ru, *Shymkent, Kazakhstan*

[3] *Candidate of Historical Sciences. ORCID ID 0000-0001-9781-8236 Ankara University. E-mail:* spiriyeva68@gmail.com, *City Ankara. Turkish Republic*

[4] *U.Zhanibekov South Kazakhstan Pedagogical university. E-mail:* sto0906@mail.ru, *Shymkent, Kazakhstan*

[5] *Shymkent University. ORCID İD 0000-0003-0914-0811, E-mail:* Vika-vika-20@inbox.ru, *Kazakhstan, Shymkent*

*Corresponding Author: spiriyeva68@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article "The picture of consistency in the vocabulary of modern Russian language" – is update the classification of lexical-semantic system of relations by D. N. Shmelev, which is crucial for the functional-semantic characteristics of the vocabulary. "Figuring out the nature of the external semantic relations of words is one of the most important objectives of studying the vocabulary of the language. ... these relationships in general can be divided into three main lines: paradigmatic, syntagmatic and derivational (marked D. N. Shmelev. – S. T.) communications." At the same time D. N. Shmelev considers priority only the first two types of semantic relations in the system of semantic analysis of lexical units – paradigmatic and syntagmatic, calling derivational relations "the third dimension", and correlative with paradigmatical and syntagmic: "The ability of the word to engage simultaneously in different lexical-semantic paradigm (and thus in syntagmatic combinations with other words) finds a match in the pressure variation of the word too, i.e. in the ability of different values to join different derivational series". He also notes that " the study of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations in the lexicon allows to justify the selection of elements of word meaning, the individual semantic characteristics, and thus in a new way to illuminate traditional questions of polysemy and homonymy, synonymy and synonymy and semantic groups of words." To achieve this objective, in our view, will contribute to the following tasks: 1. To formulate the concept of consistency of lexical-semantic units; 2. to identify the typology of combining lexical items in certain groups and to uncover the nature of the interaction with each other; 3. to determine what connects lexical units in semantic terms, and what distinguishes them from each other. Thus, the most important selection criterion of synonymy and antonymy as a linguistic phenomenon serve the system relations of words in the lexicon. The system approach allows to penetrate into the depth of this phenomenon, to reveal its regularities, to explain the peculiarities of the use of synonyms and antonyms in speech. In order to identify systemic relations in the vocabulary of the modern Russian language were used descriptive linguistic method, methods of compare and contrast.

Keywords: Consistency, Lexical-Semantic, Synonyms And Antonyms, Etymologically, Stylistically, Grammatically

INTRODUCTION

The question about the system semantic relations in the lexicon originated in the Russian linguistics in the XIX century. At its origins were such famous scholars as M. M. Pokrovsky, and A. A. Potebnya. One of the first

in Russian and world linguistics who theoretically substantiated the idea of vocabulary as a system which elements are linked by different relationships was I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay. Considering the system of vocabulary as the "synthesis design", he saw the implementation of the objectives of the whole study in an interrelated description of phonetic and morphological structures of words and the morphological structure of sentences.

The system of relations between lexical units of the language was also studied in the works of the student of I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, N. V. Kruszewski, who identified "Association by similarity" (paradigmatic relations) and "Association by contiguity" (syntagmatic relations). Noting that language is one harmonious whole, N.V.Kruszewski connects existence of a system in the language with the processes of typing – the ability of the human mind to categorize and generalize objects and phenomena of the objective world in a certain system or types of concepts. The basic law of language development N. V.Kruszewski considered the law of correspondence of world of words to the world of concepts; the wording of important semantic regularities, the meaning of which is that the wider the use of one word, the less content it will contain, is also belong to him.

Consistency of language, in particular lexical units and their meanings, was one of the main themes in the creative works of another student of I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, L. V. Scherba, who in "Experience of the general theory of lexicography" right said: "Words of each language form a system and their values change is understandable only within such a system". System properties of lexical-semantic units in the Russian language were reflected in the works of L. A. Bulahovski. Researchs of L. A. Bulahovski in Russian literary language dedicated to system-semantic characteristics of lexical units taking into account the synchronic and diachronic aspects of their study. The problem of consistency of lexical-semantic units in the Russian language also received widespread coverage in the works of V. V. Vinogradov, who believed that "words and their meanings in a particular nationwide, the national language form internally connected, unified and common to all members of society system." V. V. Vinogradov also identified parameters that form the basis of a systematic lexical-semantic units of the language: "The meaning of a word is determined not only by its conformity to the concept that is expressed by this word; it depends on the properties of that part of speech, that grammatical categories to which the word belongs, depends on the public conscious and settled contexts of its use, on specific lexical relations with other words, due to the inherent to the language laws of the combination of word meanings, on semantic correlation of word with synonyms and generally with similar values and shades of words, on expressive and stylistic coloring of the word".

In the second half of the XX century, the study of lexical-semantic units of the language as a system becomes the most important problem of modern Russian lexicology and lexicography. Works, in which an attempt is made with the help of statistical methods and mathematical modeling to characterize the vocabulary of a single language or a particular text as a coherent system, with a defined hierarchy and interdependent semantic relationships horizontally and vertically, appear. Close attention to learning the vocabulary of language as a system, identify the internal unity and interdependence of the individual elements of the semantic side of language is focusing in the works of A. A. Ufimtseva. She not only states the fact that "the word and its meaning are the elements of the lexical-semantic system of the language", but, depending on the method, the object and purpose of vocabulary study, identifies three main directions: a) learning vocabulary in subject areas; b) study of the semantic side of language at the conceptual and semantic fields; c) historical-semasiologically study of lexical-semantic groups of the same or different languages.

Defining aspects of studying the vocabulary as a system, A. A. Ufimtseva writes: "The semantic connections of words can be considered in three main aspects: a) intra-word semantic connections, or subordination of the semantic elements on the level of a word; b) semantic relationships of words within different semantic groups and series of words; c) semantic relationships of words at the level of the entire system of language." And further: "The peculiarity of lexico-semantic system of the language in its difference from others lies in how these defining types of relations of the meanings of words at this stage of language development is carried out, in what forms and under what conditions lexical meaning implemented and again reproduced. Therefore, the identification of the lexical-semantic system of the language involves the study of words as separate units of the vocabulary in the complex of their various relationships".

Considering the structure of the lexical-semantic system of language, A. A. Ufimtseva, after V. V. Vinogradov, emphasized that "the lexical inventory of words and expressions itself, and external forms of words, grammatical and derivational categories that determine grouping and semantic correlation of words; models of their compatibility, and the main semantic groups of words which have a great influence on relations of the meanings of words, basic rules of combinations and ratios of words" applies to this system.

The problem of consistency of lexical-semantic units of the language depends largely on the system of human knowledge, of man as the bearer of certain linguistic traditions and linguistic innovations. At various times many researchers came to think about the impossibility of studying of lexico-semantic units of the language as a system without considering the impact of human factors on its formation. Thus, V. V. Vinogradov, setting as its goal the study of literature language in all its complexity and diversity, however the most important starting point in the

study of this whole thought structure of the individual voice of the writer as a specific linguistic identity.

However, we would like to stress the special importance of the provisions on the issues of interaction of the lexical-semantic system of language with its carrier – human in the works of D. N. Shmelev and Yu.N.Karaulov. In this works the whole range of problems associated with the concept of consistency in vocabulary and semantics was reflected.

D. N. Shmelev believes that "one of the major tasks that lexicology aims to solve, is the establishment of various types of system relationships...", and in one of the papers – "Problems of semantic analysis of vocabulary" - right shows the dependence of semantic relations in the vocabulary of the human factor: "Being the projection in our mind of an object or phenomenon of reality, the lexical meaning of the word inherently comprise a concept about the subject or phenomenon in a specific relationship to other concepts".

The works of Yu.N.Karaulov were devoted to issues of consistency of lexical-semantic units in the Russian language, in particular, his book "Russian language and linguistic personality". The object of study defined in it as : "Linguistic personality – this is the through idea that, as the experience of its analysis and description shows, permeates all aspects of language learning and simultaneously destroys the borders between the disciplines studying a human since it is impossible to study a human out of his language." Criticizing the current situation of linguistic science, Yu.Karaulov writes: "Modern linguistic paradigm, being historical, social, systemic-structural, psychological, remains however cruel, devoid of the presence of a living human spirituality, features incommensurability practised in the framework of scientific values, formulate goals, used technical skills and techniques, and often products of research activity themselves – with the scale of the individual, subjective human element".

In this connection we should also mention the works of G. I. Bogin and B. A. Serebrennikov, in which the problem of linguistic identity and the lexical-semantic system, their interaction and interdependence is discussed in detail at various levels of language and speech. Existing in modern linguistics a systematic approach to the problem of lexical meaning involves the existence of certain semantic relations in the lexicon. However, we proceed from the fact that the lexical-semantic system relations, as experiments show, are not less than 70% of the functional load of linguistic communication. That's why modern semasiology isn't satisfied by the semantic description, which applies to an arbitrary set of semantic features, not organized into a single system.

The classification by D. N. Shmelev of lexical-semantic system of relations, which is crucial for the functional-semantic characteristics of the vocabulary, is used in the modern Russian language. "Figuring out the nature of the external semantic relations of the word is one of the most important objectives of studying the vocabulary of the language. ... these relationships in general can be divided into three main lines: *paradigmatic, syntagmatic and derivational* (marked D. N. Shmelev. – S. T.) relations".

At the same time D. N. Shmelev considers priority only the first two types of semantic relations in the system of semantic analysis of lexical units – paradigmatic and syntagmatic, calling derivational relations "the third dimension", and correlative with paradigmatical and syntagmatic: "The ability of the word to engage simultaneously in different lexical-semantic paradigm (and thus in syntagmatic combinations with other words) finds a match in the pressure variation of the word too, i.e. in the ability of different values to join different derivational series". He also notes that " the study of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations in the lexicon allows to justify the selection of elements of word meaning, the individual semantic characteristics, and thus in a new way to illuminate traditional questions of polysemy and homonymy, synonymy and synonymy and semantic groups of words." The same idea is also sound in the works of Yu.N.Karaulov: "the whole area of semantic relations of lexical units, the uniqueness of the types of groups and the nature of the interaction with each other (lexical paradigmatic) and with elements of other subsystems of language, terms and forms of linguistic expression of the results of semantic variation of the word marks (lexical syntagmatic) refers to lexico-semantic system" Based on the foregoing, we can conclude that the significance of a lexical unit is defined by paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations and the semantic specificity of it in particular speech area, as well as communicative need, functional load, etc.

Prior to analyzing the functioning of the lexical-semantic units, it is necessary to consider the nature of their paradigmatic relations. How can this be implemented practically? "In order to explore the vocabulary of the language, you need of course, to dismember it, to highlight a certain semantic groups of words. It is necessary to establish what unites the meanings of these words, and what distinguishes them from each other, i.e. identifying both common and distinguishing their characteristics ...". It is clear that here we talk about synonymy and antonymy as the basis of paradigmatic relations in the lexicon and semantics.

Between words in modern Russian language there are different sorts of connections. These connections do not operate in isolation from each other, and in varying degrees of conditionality. The subject of consideration in this case is synonymous relations and words-synonyms. The ancient Greeks came to the conclusion that there is the richness of language in the words-synonyms: an abundance of thoughts in words and variety of expressions. Roman scholars were aware of not only the similarity of words-synonyms, but the difference between them. Specialists in modern Russian language after a detailed researchs came to the conclusion that the synonyms (gr.-

of the same name) are words that are close or identical in meaning, expressing the same concept but differing in shades of meaning or stylistic colouring, or both of them. As a rule, the synonyms belong to the same part of speech and act as "interchangeable elements of an utterance" (L.S Perchik), "the same in meaning, but different sounding" (N.G. Goltsova), "denoting one concept, but differ from each other semantically (in meaning) or stylistically" (A. M. Chepasova), "words not only with the same substantive focus, but similar in meaning, they have things in common in the meaning of the word, lexical meaning" (V.I. Coduhov). Words with "equal value" (M. Maruzo), "with a similar meaning" (L. R. Zinder, T. V. Stroeva), words meaning "the same concept or concepts very close to each other" (A.P. Evgenyeva), the words "with a common or very similar subject-logical content" (K. V. Arkhangelskaya), the words "identical in the nominative ascribed, but as a rule, stylistically distinguished" (A. A. Reformatsky), the words "able in the same context or in contexts that are similar in meaning, to replace each other" (L. A. Bulakhovsky) are called synonyms. To summarize all of the above, we come to the conclusion that synonyms are words differently sounding, but similar or very close in meaning. For example: vezde- vsuydu (*везде – всюду), dvenadtsat – dyuzhina (двенадцать – дюжина),smeliy-hrabriy (смелый – храбрый),beskrainiy - bezgranichniy (бескрайний – безграничный),branit - rugat (бранить – ругать),vozle – okolo-podle (возле – около – подле), po-inomu-po-drugomu (по-иному - по-другому),vvidu - vsledstviye (ввиду – вследствие),dryanoy –skverniy (дрянной – скверный),potomu chto – tak kak (потому что - так как), zdes-tut (здесь – тут),toropitsya – speshit (торопиться – спешить)* (throughout - everywhere, twelve - dozen, bold - brave, boundless – limitless, to revile - to abuse, near – beside – next to, differently- otherwise, because - as a result, shoddy - bad, because - since, hurry – haste).*

A group of synonyms consisting of two or more words is called synonymic range: friend - buddy - mate, beautiful - gorgeous - amazing - delicious. Synonymic series can be formed from a single-rooted words: *zabit – pozabit (забыть – позабыть),obognat-peregnat (обогнать - перегнать),otchizna-otechestvo (отчизна - отечество), turesticheskiy – turistkiy (туристический – туристский),tish – tishina (тишь – тишина)* (to forget - to leave behind, to overtake – to outstrip, fatherland - motherland, tourist - tourist, quiet - silence,* etc.)

Synonyms – are words that denote the same phenomenon of reality. However, calling the same, synonyms usually call this one and the same in different ways or highlighting different sides of called things, or describing the thing from different points of view. That is why synonyms, designating one and the same, as a rule, are not the words absolutely identical to each other both in terms of semantics and in terms of their emotional and stylistic properties.

In the "Dictionary-reference book of linguistic terms" synonymy is defined as "coincidence in their basic meanings (while retaining differences in shades of meaning and stylistic colouring) of morphemes, words, syntactic structures, phraseological units". Here we would like to mention too general definition and some contradictions between the meaning of the words outside brackets and in brackets, especially when you consider the limitless possibilities of theoretical and practical formation of synonyms in the literary language. Thus, there are "absolute synonymy" like "behemoth – hippopotamus" in the "Dictionary-reference book...". We are of the opinion that "as a rule, there are no absolute synonyms in language". Therefore, "there is no absolute boundary between synonyms" in language and especially in a literary text. Suffice it to say that interchangeable on the same semantic level, the same words can be contrasted on another semantic level.

Noting that all synonyms in general terms can be divided into the common-language and contextually-author, we believe that lexical items in a literary text always acquire additional shades of meaning, and entering into paradigmatic relations, are of interest primarily as a product of the author's usage. In other words, we can only speak about rapprochement synonymous lexical-semantic units in a work of art in terms of context, as outside it the lexical values of the analyzed words are characterized by different degree of variability in the paradigmatic series.

Based on the above features, the synonyms should be called words of one part of speech and the equivalent phraseological units with different sound and calling the same phenomenon of objective reality, differing shades of the main, common to each of these values, or attribution to various speech styles, or simultaneously both. Synonyms also differ in ability to enter into combination with other words, the ability to derivation and establishment forms of subjective assessment.

Synonymy is always a phenomenon deeply national, it is created in different languages in different ways. In the modern Russian literary language synonyms appeared either as the result of formation of new words on the base of existing building material or as a result of replenishment of the vocabulary of Russian literary language through the vocabulary of territorial and professional dialects and partly jargons, or as a result of assimilation of foreign words from the vocabulary of other languages.

Synonyms are often defined as words of different sound that have similar values. This definition accurately describes the entity of synonyms as a phenomenon of the language system. You may think that among the synonyms there are only such words which necessarily differ from each other by more shades of meaning, although in reality there are synonyms, the difference between them lies only in the expressive and stylistic coloring or coined by and etc. You can also think that there are synonyms that can replace each other (because the values of the

synonyms are only similar, not identical), although in fact it is the most important, the most characteristic feature of the synonyms, in contrast to relatively close in value, but still nonsynonymous words.

As already mentioned, the synonyms among the words of important parts of speech always act as lexical units denoting the same phenomenon of objective reality. This same nominative function is the core, whereby the words in the lexical system of language merged in the unconfined synonymous rows.

The structure is allocated binomial and polynomial interchangeably. On the one hand, there are small and simple binomial enterprises (eg.: kon – loshad (*конь – лошадь*), *speliy- zreliy (спелый – зрелый),vizdoravlivat-popravlyatsya (выздоравливать – поправляться)* (*horse - mare, ripe - mature, to recover - to recuperate*), etc.), on the other hand, there are polynomial synonymous rows (eg.: litso-lik-morda-rozha-phizionomiya-phiziya-harya-murlo (*лицо - лик - морда - рожа - физиономия - физия - харя – мурло) (face - countenance - muzzle - erysipelas - physiognomy - phiz – mug)*, etc. *umeret – prestavitsya –zagnutsya-pomeret-skonchatsya (умереть - преставиться - загнуться - помереть – скончаться) (to die - to pass away - to kick the bucket - to decease)*, etc., nedostatki-probely-defekty-nedochety (*недостатки - пробелы - дефекты – недочеты) (shortcomings - gaps - defects – shortages)*, etc.). The basic word stands out as for the binomial and polynomial unions: it is called a dominant of the synonymic series and defines the character of a number of synonymous, gives the most general concept and it is neutral on the use. Every word of the synonymic series must be synonymous not only primary, but also all the other words of this group. This means that, at least, any one value should be typical for all members of the synonymic series. Because of the polysemy of many words of the Russian language the same word can have several synonyms that are not in synonymic relations with each other. For example, synonyms to the word tyazheliy (*"тяжелый") (heavy)* in different values will be trudniy (*трудный) (tyazhelaya , trudnaya rabota (тяжелая, трудная работа))*, mrachniy, bezradostniy (*мрачный, безрадостный) tyazhelie, mrachniye, bezradostniye misli (тяжелые, мрачные, безрадостные мысли), suroviy (суровый) (tyazheloe, surovoe, nakazaniye (тяжелое, суровое наказание))*, opasniy (*опасный) (tyazhelaya, opasnaya bolezn тяжелая, опасная болезнь))*, neponyatniy (*непонятный) (tyazheliy, neponyatniy yazik (тяжелый, непонятный язык))*, svarliviy (*сварливый) (tyazheliy, svarliviy harakter (тяжелый, сварливый характер)) (hard (heavy, hard work), dark, bleak (heavy, dark, bleak thoughts), severe (severe, harsh punishment), dangerous (severe, dangerous disease), confusing (hard, confusing language), cantankerous (heavy, cantankerous character))*. These words are not in synonymous ways among themselves.

Recently in modern Russian lexicology a look at synonyms as words denoting the same phenomenon of objective reality is approved. This definition is not in conflict with the systemic character of the vocabulary. The specific nature of the lexicon as a system is manifested primarily in the presence of a number of very peculiar relations between words as elements of this system, namely: *grammatical, etymological, thematic, stylistic, homonymic, antonymy, synonymous, associative*. Relationships can be distant and close, immediate and intermediary, can have varying degrees of conditionality.

The issue of proximity of the meanings of words is closely connected with the problem of synonymy. For a very long time synonyms were interpreted as words that are close in value, and the criterion of synonymical was the possibility of replacing one word with another. The degree of proximity of the meanings of words-synonyms was not determined. The proximity of the meanings of words – is very, very broad term. So, the words chestniy*, smeliy, hrabriy, smetliviy, besstrashniy, vezhliviy, rastoropniy, korretkniy, pravdiviy (честный, смелый, храбрый, сметливый, бесстрашный, вежливый, расторопный, корректный, правдивый) (honest, brave, valiant, intelligent, fearless, polite, efficient, correct, truthful)*, etc. have contiguous values, as they express the positive qualities of the person. Within this totality of words, there are groups: "the words naming qualities in the face of danger" (dauntless, fearless, courageous, bold, brave); "calling the character, features of the human mind in its relation to reality" (clever, ingenious); words with meaning: "expressing true feelings and thoughts" (truthful, honest, sincere).

Relations are heterogeneous between words in synonymic ranks. So, in a synonymic row petuh-kur-kochet-piven-petel (*"петух – кур - кочет – пивень – петел"*) (different names of a cock) the word petuh ("*петух") (cock)* is opposed to all the other words of a number as a stylistically neutral word, word kur ("*кур") (cock)* is opposed as an archaism, words kochet-piven-petel (*"кочет – пивень – петел"*) (different names of a cock) opposed to other words as territorially bound. But all these words are variations of the main, total value.

In the synonymic row tsenniy-dorogoy-dragotsenniy (*ценный – дорогой – драгоценный) (valuable, expensive, precious)* all words are stylistically neutral, but differ in the shades of the basic meaning. So, the word *valuable*, in addition to the main, common to this set of values – having a high price – there is an allusion to the significance, the importance of the designated object, for example: "*Valuable* gifts were awarded". There is no such tone in words *expensive* and *precious*: "They did not consider the fur of sables *expensive* and valued more wolverine"; "Sandals are attached with *precious* buckles, glowing gold, and stones".

In the synonymic row mokriy-vlazhniy-syroy-volgliy (*"мокрый – влажный – сырой - волглый") (wet – damp – raw – damp)*, the word volgliy (*"волглый"*) is opposed to words *wet – damp – raw* as a regional; the words *wet – damp – raw* differ in the shades of the basic meaning: soaked with liquid, moisture. The word *мокрый (wet)* has the greatest degree of this sign, the word vlazhniy (*влажный) (moist)* is the smallest. Thus, there are the differences

between words and stylistic colouring and the shades of meaning in this range. These synonyms have also different lexical compatibility. For example: *to absorb* (moisture, heat, smell), *to soak* (moisture, liquid).

In the synonymic row kon-loshad-klyacha ("*конь - лошадь – кляча*") (*steed - horse – nag*) the word loshad (*лошадь*) *(horse)* is stylistically neutral, the word *kon (конь) (steed)* is frequently used in the high solemn style, and the word *klyacha (кляча) (nag)* is opposed to words *horse* and *steed* with his additional hints: *nag* – emotive word with meaning "thin, tired horse." So, there are differences in stylistic colouring, and the shades of meaning between the words in this series.

Thus, there is no a complete identity between synonyms, they differ in stylistic colouring and shades of meaning. But it is sometimes difficult to identify the shades of meaning that differ two synonyms. For example, the words bespriyutniy (*бесприютный*) *(homeless)* and bezdomniy (*бездомный*) *(houseless)* seem absolutely identical, but there are differences between them, due to the fact that one of them is formed from the combinations without a *home*, another from a combination without a *house*, as a result the word *homeless* is more abstract and broader in scope.

Words-synonyms differ not only by stylistic colouring and shades of common, basic values. Every word has its own history of origin, functioning within the active or passive vocabulary, acquires a number of values, and enters into associative relationships with other words.

Words-synonyms also differ by the ability to derivation, the ability to generate forms of subjective assessment, the ability to enter into phrases with other words. For example, a large number of words were formed by the word glaz (*глаз*) *(eye)*: glaznik, glazomer, glaznitsa, glazunya, glaznoy, nadglazniy, zaglazniy, podglazniy, glazet, zaglazno (*глазник, глазомер, глазница, глазунья, глазной, надглазный, заглазный, подглазный, глазеть, заглазно*) *(oculist, eye estimation, eye socket, eyeball, eye adj., above the eye, behind the eye, under the eye, to stare, behind the eye adv.)*, etc.; this word generates forms of the subjective assessment: *glazok , glazki, glazishi (глазок, глазки, глазищи) (eye, eyes, eyeballs)*, etc. – and has the ability to enter into combination with the enormous number of words. It is synonymous with the word ochi (*очи*) *(eyes)*, which has a little bit derived words: ochki, ochnik, zaochnik, ochniy, zaochniy, ochno, zaochno (*очки, очник, заочник, очный, заочный, очно, заочно*) *(glasses, full-time student, part-time student, intramural, extramural, internally, in absentia)*; forms of subjective assessment does not generate, this word is very rare in the singular form. The ability of the word ochi (*очи*) *(eyes)* to enter into combination with other words is limited. So, the word *очи (eyes)* does not combine with such adjectives as: lamb, colorless, arrogant, etc.

The words separated in a synonymic row by the same signs, associated with various types of relations (etymologically, stylistically, grammatically) to the other words of the language. For example, the word *syroy (сырой) (damp)* is linked etymologically with the words of almost all significant parts of speech: syrost-otsyret-syro (*сырость, отсыреть, сыро*) (damp n., to dampen, damp adv.), etc.

Words in synonymic line, which represents the most narrow thematic separateness of words, as has been said, are always limited by belonging to the same lexical-grammatical category of the words, to one part of speech, so you cannot install synonymic relations between words like hrabriy-hrabrets (*храбрый – храбрец*) *(brave adj. – brave n.)*, since these words are included in different themes and call: 1) characteristic, 2) object that is endowed with this characteristic.

Synonyms are always different from each other in something. First of all, the division of synonyms into ideographic and stylistic is accepted. However, the differentiation according to the syntactical features, complexity, etc. is possible.

The words, which are very close, but not identical in meaning, have differing shades of meanings, are called conceptual (or ideographic) synonyms. Conceptual synonyms are: smotret – glyaset, krasivaya-horoshenkaya, dumat-razmishlyat, vnezapno-neozhidanno (*смотреть – глядеть, красивая – хорошенькая, думать – размышлять, внезапно – неожиданно*) *(to see - to look, beautiful – pretty, to think – to ponder, suddenly – unexpectedly)*. As an example of conceptual synonyms we can serve such adverbs as bezzvuchno (*беззвучно*) *(silently)* and neslyshno (*неслышно*) *(quietly)*. Comparison: "Cars raced *silently* past the windows" and "Cars raced *quietly* past the windows"; or "He *silently* crept up on me" and "He *quietly* crept up on me." The semantic difference between the words *silently* and *quietly* quite small: *silently* points to the lack of sound, *quietly* emphasizes the perception of sound within the hearing ear.

When considering many synonyms stylistic difference is noteworthy. The identical in meaning but differing in stylistic coloring synonyms are called stylistic synonyms. Series of stylistic synonyms are usually formed in the case, if one of the synonyms belongs to the so-called neutral words, the other to the colloquial or vernacular, high or official, etc. There are quite long series consisting of words with different stylistic coloring. For example, in the synonymic row ukrast – pohitit- stashit-speret (*украсть - похитить - стащить – спереть*) *(steal - snatch - sneak – crook)* the verb *to steal* is neutral in style, *to snatch* is official, *to sneak* belongs to the colloquial vocabulary, and *to crook* - to vernacular (this number can be continued mainly through the further accession reduced the style of the words). Other examples of synonymic series of this type are: ustat – umayatsya, darom-zadarom, stranniy-chudnoy,

vzglyad-vzor (*устать - умаяться, даром - задаром, странный - чудной, взгляд – взор*) (*to be tired – get tired, gratuitously - gratis, strange - weird, a look - a gaze*).

Synonyms may differ from each other by the degree of modernity: one word contemporary, other (with the same value) - is obsolete: samolet-aeroplan, gorod-grad, holodniy-hladniy, prestupnik – tat, poskolku-poeliku, evenk-tungus (*самолет - аэроплан, город - град, холодный - хладный, преступник - тать, поскольку - поелику, эвенк – тунгус*) (plane - aircraft, town – town, cold - cold, criminal - thief, because - inasmuch as, evenk - tungus).

Synonyms may differ by field of use. For example, one word is nationwide, the other is dialectal, regional, one word is nationwide, other is professional, etc.: *gorshok-mahotka (горшок – махотка)* (reg.), ochen-porato *(очень – порато)* (reg.), baklazhany-demyanki (*баклажаны – демьянки*) (reg.), vplav-vplin (*вплавь – вплынь*) (reg.), revolyer – pushka (*револьвер – пушка*) (jarg.), zheltuha-gepatit (*желтуха – гепатит*) (med.), povar-kok (*повар – кок*) (морск.), stranitsa-polosa (*страница – полоса*) (prof.) (pot - pot (region), very - very (region), eggplant - eggplant (region), by swimming – by swimming (region) revolver - gun (jarg.), jaundice - hepatitis (med.), chef - cook (nautical), page - band (prof)).

Synonyms may differ by the degree of compatibility with different words: for example, adverbs kategoricheski (*категорически*) (*categorically*) and naotrez (*наотрез*) (*absolutely*) identical in meaning, but *categorically* goes well with many words (to state *categorically*, *categorically* demand, *categorically* refuse, etc.), *absolutely* in modern speech goes only with the verb refuse. We'll give more examples of synonyms with limited compatibility (there are the words in brackets with which the synonyms are combined): otkryt-razinut (rot) (*открыть - разинуть (рот)*), korichneviye-kariye (glaza) (*коричневые - карие (глаза)*), cherniy-voronoy (kon) (*чёрный - вороной (конь)*) (to open - to gape (mouth), brown - hazel (eyes), black - raven (horse)).

Synonyms may differ from each other by syntactical peculiarities. For example: two verbs with the same value require different cases for nouns (i.e., have different management). These are the verbs nachat (*начать*) (*to start*) and pristupit (*приступить*) (*to begin*): to start work (accusative), but to get to work (dative); utratit (*утратить*) (*to lose*) and *lishitsya (лишиться) (to forfeit): to lose the trust* (accusative), but *to forfeit confidence* (genitive); imet (*иметь*) (*to have*) and obladat (*обладать*) (*to possess*): *to have restraint* (accusative), but *to possess endurance* (ablative) etc.

Synonyms may differ in degree of difficulty. In this case, most often one word has idiomatic phrase as a synonym: roditsya –poyavitsya na svet, malo-kot naplakal, pomalkivat-derzhat yazik za zubami, chaste – to I delo razoblachit-vyvesti na chistuyu vodu (*родиться – появиться на свет; мало – кот наплакал; помалкивать – держать язык за зубами; часто – то и дело; разоблачить – вывести на чистую воду*) (*to be born - to come into existence; a little – not enough to swear by; to keep quiet – to keep my mouth shut; often – every now and then; to denounce - to expose*), etc.

Synonyms, indicating the same concept and having the same lexical meaning, differ in their expressive coloration, tightness in a certain style, a degree of usage. Many synonyms differ from each other on the same lexical meaning, and expressive coloring. So, synonyms can be differentiated at:

1) the referred to objects (for example, synonyms skomoroh-litsedey-komendiant-aktyor-artist ("*скоморох – лицедей – комедиант – актёр – артист*) (buffoon – actor – comedian – performer – artist)" reflect different moments in the development of theater and a different attitude to the profession of an actor);

2) social assessment of the referent subject (e.g. synonyms zhalovaniye-zarplata ("*жалованье — зарплата*) (salary – pay)" reflect different attitudes to the reception of remuneration for work);

3) on the applicability in a particular style of speech (eg, synonyms kon-loshad ("*конь – лошадь*) (horse – equine)" are not always interchangeable stylistically; in verse "where do you leap, proud horse?" substitution for the word "horse" a synonym for "equine" will produce a comic effect - "where do you leap, proud equine?");

4) according to its etymological meaning, which can give to one of the synonyms a particular color (for example, synonyms such as smeliy-besstrashniy("*смелый — бесстрашный*) (bold – fearless)" are connected with a general concept of courage; in the first case associated with "daring", "determination", second — "lack of fear"; therefore, these synonyms in a certain context can be used as words opposite in meaning, i.e. as antonyms);

5) the presence or absence of portable values: for example, in the famous epigram of K. N. Batiushkov Sovet epicheskomu stihotvortsu (*Совет эпическому стихотворцу*) (*Advice to epic poet*):

«Give the name that you want to your semi-wild poem - „Peter the Long", „Peter the Big", but only don't name it "Peter the Great"», here the absence of the portable value of the first of the synonymous "big – great" was used.

Some linguists (eg. Bally) extend the concept synonymous with the unambiguous grammatical momentum. In the grammatical system of the Russian language *grammatical synonyms* are, for example, so-called parallel momentum, various forms of complex sentences and sentences that include participial or participial construction (*"when I passed by this house, I met him"* – *"passing this house, I met him"*), etc.

Lexical synonymy is closely connected with the phenomenon of polysemy (i.e. the ambiguity). Synonyms help to show the difference in shades of meaning of the polysemantic word.

Synonymous words interchangeably in one of the values, lose this property when mapping to another value. The problem of collocations-synonyms with other lexical units is closely related with it, i.e. the establishment of

so-called constantly using contexts. For example, synonyms vyrazit, sformulirovat , formulirovat *(выразить, сформулировать (формулировать)) (to express, to formulate (formulate))* varies in their compatibility. With one circle of words *(thought, opinion, judgment, position; output, task)* they are combined both and they are interchangeable, which suggests the proximity of their values in the data typed combinations. In another case, the nature of the relationship changes and new contexts appear. For example, the word vyrazit *(выразить) (to express)* can be combined with the words of *feeling, attitude, sympathy* and *love* with which the word *sformulirovat (сформулировать) (formulate)* is not combined. This reflects the existing pattern of systematic lexical connections of different words (and groups of words) with each other, complex and diverse transformations in their relationship.

The development of the synonymic relations in polysemous word occurs, as a rule, not on all its values. This leads to the fact that polysemantic words are usually included in different synonymic ranks. For example, the word blizkiy *(близкий) (close)* has basically the meaning of "*located or occurring at a short distance from someone or something*" and it has synonyms *middle (middle forest), near (near walking), short (short road)*. These words can obtain the meaning *'not remote in time'* (dates, events), keeping between them synonymous relations. However, in the value of 'based on common interests, mutual sympathy, trust' (on human relations), the word *close* has synonyms *tight, intimate*, and with the same meaning, but in combination with the noun *friend* is synonymous with the words *soulful, crony*. Another meaning is 'having a direct relationship to anyone closely associated with any personal relations', it brings together synonyms *close, its, own way*, and its means 'belonging to the same environment' *(insider)*. In this synonymic series can be credited the word *home* in the meaning 'associated simple, off-duty relationships'. The word *close* is also included in the synonymic line with dominant *similar*, in which the convergence of synonyms based on their shared values 'have similarities with anything similar in any of the properties, qualities, characteristics': pohozhiy – skhodniy, skozhiy, podobniy, analogichniy, rodstvenniy *(похожий – сходный, схожий, подобный, аналогичный, родственный) (similar - like, comparable, alike, analogous, related)*.

The close relationship of synonymy with the polysemy evidence about a systemic character of relations between words. Synonyms are really helping to show the colour difference of values of a polysemantic word. Depending on the values, polysemantic word may enter in different synonymic ranks. Here is an example from the "Dictionary of Russian synonyms" by Z. E. Alexandrova: cold 1) icy, frozen, severe, frosty; 2) cooled down, chill; 3) dry, restrained; 4) indifferent, uncaring, wooden, lethargic, insensitive.

The role of lexical synonyms are very diverse and significant. They help to clarify, to supplement our understanding of objects and phenomena of reality, to characterize them brighter and diverse. Therefore, the richer synonymous rows, the wider their boundaries, the richer the language, the greater opportunities it gives for its creative use.

A special place in the modern Russian language is the phenomenon of antonymy, the lexical items opposite in meaning. Antonymy reflects the significant side of the system of relations in Russian lexicon. The modern science of language considers the synonymy and antonymy as extreme cases of substitutability and contraposition of words in content. If for synonymic relations is characterized by semantic similarity, for antonymy - semantic distinction.

The existence of antonyms in language due to the nature of our perception of reality in all its contradictory complexity, unity and struggle of opposites. Therefore, the contrasting words, as their denoted concepts, are not only opposed to each other, but closely linked.

Antonyms (gr. anti - against + onyma - name) are words, different in sound, have the opposite values: *true - false, good - evil, speak - silence*. Antonyms usually refer to one part of speech and form pairs. Antonymy in language presented narrower than synonymy: only that words are entering in antonymy relations, that are relative to that on any grounds - qualitative, quantitative, temporal, spatial, and belonging to the same category of objective reality as mutually exclusive: *beautiful - ugly, many - little, morning - evening, to distance - to close*. The words of other values usually do not have antonyms: *house, thinking, to write, twenty, Kiev* and *Caucasus*. Most antonyms are characterized by the quality *(good - bad, smart - stupid, native - alien, dense - rare*, etc.); there are those that indicate spatial and temporal relationships *(big - small, spacious - close, high - low, wide – narrow, early - late, day - night)*; less antonymy pairs with a quantitative value *(many – few; single - numerous)*. There are opposite names of actions, states, *(to cry - to laugh, to rejoice - to grieve)*, but such examples are little.

The development of antonymy relations in the lexicon reflects our perception of reality in all its contradictory complexity and interdependence. Therefore, the contrasting words, as their denoted concepts, are not only opposed to each other, but closely linked. The word *good*, for example, evokes in our minds the word *evil, far* recalls *close, speed up - slow down*.

Antonyms are at the extreme points of lexical paradigms, but between them can be words in the language that reflect a given symptom to a different extent, i.e. its descending or ascending order. For example: *rich - wealthy - poor - indigent - needy; harmful - harmless - useless - useful*. Such a contrast suggests the potential degree of amplification of the trait, quality, action, or gradation (lat. gradatio - gradual increase). Thus semantic gradation (gradualist) is peculiar only to the antonyms, which semantic structure contains a reference to the degree of quality: *young - old, big - small, little – large*, etc. Other antonymy pairs are devoid of sign of gradualness: *top - bottom, day - night, life - death,*

male - female. Antonyms with a sign of gradualness can interchange in order to make the statement in polite form; so, it is better to say *thin* than *skinny*; *older* than *the old one*. The words, used in order to eliminate the sharpness or roughness of the phrase, are called euphemisms (gr. eu - good + phemi - speak). On this basis, they sometimes talk about antonyms-euphemisms that express the importance of opposition in a gentle way.

There are also antonyms-converse in the lexical system of language (lat. conversio - change). These are the words that express the opposite relation in the original (direct) and modified (reverse) statement: Alexander *gave* the book to Dimitri.- Dimitri *took* the book from Alexander; Professor *accepts* credit from intern.- The intern *delivers* credit to the professor.

Within-word antonymy also exists in the modern Russian language - the antonymy of values of polysemantic words, or enantiosemy (gr. Enantios - opposite + sema - sign). This phenomenon occurs in polysemantic words, developing mutually exclusive values. For example, the verb othodit (*отходить*) (*to escape*) can mean "to come to normal, feel better", but it also can mean "to die, to say goodbye to life". Enantiosemy becomes a cause of ambiguity of such statements as, for example: Redaktor prosmotrel eti stroke, Ya proslushal divertisment, Orator ogovorilsya (Редактор *просмотрел* эти строки; Я *прослушал* дивертисмент; Оратор *оговорился*) (Editor *reviewed* these records; I *listened* to the divertissement; Orator *misspoke*) and others.

Antonyms structure is divided into antonyms with different roots (*day - night*) and single-rooted prihodit – uhodit, revolyutsiya – kontrrevolutsiya (*приходить - уходить, революция – контрреволюция*) (*to come - to go, revolution - counter-revolution*)). The first group is actually lexical antonyms, the second - lexical and grammatical. Single-rooted antonyms have opposite values caused by a variety of consoles, which are also able to enter into antonymy relations; eg: vlozhit – vylozhit, pristavit-otstavit, zakryt-otkryt (*вложить - выложить, приставить - отставить, закрыть – открыть*) (*to put in – lay out, put – set aside, close – open*). Therefore, the juxtaposition of these words is obligated to word-formation. However, it should be borne in mind that the addition of prefixes non - , without - to qualitative adjectives, adverbs often gives them the value of only weakened opposites (*young – not young*), so the contrast of them compared to non-prefixed antonyms is "muted" (*not young* - it does not mean "old"). Therefore, the antonyms in the strict sense of the term can be attributed not all prefixed formations, but only those that are extreme members of the paradigm antonymy: udachniy – neudachniy, silniy-bessilniy (*удачный - неудачный, сильный – бессильный*) (*successful - unsuccessful, powerful – powerless*).

As it has been said, antonyms are usually pair correlation in the language. However, this does not mean that a particular word can have only one antonym. Antonymy relations allow to express the contrasting concepts in the "unclosed", polynomial series, eg: *concrete - abstract, discrete; cheerful - sad, sorrowful, rueful, boring*. In addition, each member of the pair antonymy or antonymy series may have its own synonyms, non-intersecting in the antonymy. Then a kind of system formed in which vertical are synonymous units, and horizontally - antonymy.

Например:

Smart	– stupid	To sad	– to rejoice
Intelligent	– goofy	To mourn	– to have fun
Wise	– mindless	To miss	– to exult
Brainy	– headless		
Sensible	– silly		

A similar correlation synonym and antonymy relations reflects the systematic relationship of words in the lexicon. The relationship of polysemy and antonymy lexical units also indicates on the consistency.

In the study of lexical antonymy should be borne in mind that individual meaning of polysemantic words can also be antonymous. For example: the word verhniy (*верхний*) (*top adj.*) in meaning "at the top, above the other" is the antonym nizhniy (*нижний*) (*lower*) in value "situated downstairs" (top rung - bottom rung). In its second meaning, "a close to the reaches of the river" – word *top* is also opposed to the corresponding value of its antonym – "located closer to the mouth" (upstream – downstream). Special meanings of these words are also anonymized: "relating to the top" (upper case) and "forming the lower limit of the range of any voice or instrument" (lower case). However, the full antonymy of all values of polysemantic words is a phenomenon comparatively rare, more often some values of polysemant are entering in antonymy relations. For example, the word *day* in meaning "part of the day" is the opposite of *night*, and in the meaning of "twenty-for-hours, date" do not have antonyms. The different meanings of the same word can have different antonyms. For example, the word blizkiy (*близкий*) (*close*) in values "located at a small distance" and "distant small period of time" is the opposite dalekiy (*далекий*) (*far*) (close distance - far distance, close years - far years). And the value of the "hard bound" the word is antonymous to the word chuzhoy (*чужой*) (*alien*) (close friends – strangers). Speaking in the sense of "similar, akin", it forms a pair antonymy with the word razlichniy (*различный*) (*different*) (eg: works, *close* in content but *different* in form).

Antonymy relations of words are reflected in its lexical compatibility. If antonymy opposition is formed by words, with a broad border of lexical compatibility, they can be used in a variety of antonymy combinations: *left -*

right (hand, shoulder, ear, eye, side, wing, paw, side, part, half, coast, flank, party, bias, etc.). The words with limited possibilities of lexical compatibility have small zone of antonymy: *fresh – stale* (loaf, bread).

In modern linguistics it is sometimes said about contextual antonyms, i.e., words, that are opposed in a particular context: "*Wolves* and *sheep*". The polarity of values of such words are not fixed in the language, their opposition has the individual author's character. The writer can identify the opposite qualities of the different concepts and on this basis to oppose them in the speech; eg: not *mother*, but *daughter*; *sunlight - moonlight*; *one* year - *whole* life. However, the words calling such concepts are not antonyms, since their opposition is not reproduced in language, it is occasional.

Proper use of antonyms in speech helps to reveal the contradictory nature of objects, phenomena and qualities. Antonyms are an essential means of creating the antithesis (gr. antithesis - contraposition) - is a stylistic figure of contrast, a sharp opposition to the concepts, terms, images, states: e.g.: Ty i ubogaya, ty i obilnaya, ty i moguchaya, ty i bessilnaya, matushka Rus (Ты и *убогая*, ты и *обильная*, ты и *могучая*, ты и *бессильная*, матушка Русь) (you are *poor*, you are *abundant*, you are *powerful*, you are *powerless*, mother Russia). The structure of the antithesis can be simple (one-term):(eg.: U silnogo vsegda bessilniy vinovat (У *сильного* всегда *бессильный* виноват) (might is right)) and complex (polynomial):(e.g.: And we *hate* and we *love* by accident, don't sacrifice neither *anger*, nor *love*, and some secret *cold* reigns in the soul, when the *fire* is boiling in the blood). Here multiple antonymy pairs are involved in the challenging antithesis. The antithesis is the opposite of the reception, consisting in denying the contrast characteristics of the object:(For example: A gentleman sat in the cart, he was *not handsome* but *not bad-looking*, not too *thick*, not too *thin*; we cannot say that he was *old*, however, and not so *young* too). This stringing antonyms with the negative emphasizes the mediocrity of a described person, the lack of outstanding qualities, distinct characteristics. This use of antonyms gives the ability to specify such concepts in the language that have not accurate designations in the language: e.g.: If a friend was suddenly not a *friend* and not an *enemy*, and *like this*.

The juxtaposition of antonyms in a statement imparts special significance to each of their named items, which enhances the expressiveness of speech: e.g.: Mountains *divide* countries but *unite* people; The character of the athletes is brought up not by triumph of *victories* but by bitterness of *defeats*. In addition, the antonyms to such cases, assume logical stress, highlighting the semantic centers of the phrase; e.g.: Life is *long* enough to correct *old* errors, but *short* enough not to fall into *new*. The antonyms give special acute and aphoristic nature to the sayings:(For example: Houses are *new*, but the prejudices are *old*; The *darker* the night, the *brighter* the stars; So *little* roads are covered, so *many* mistakes are made). The phenomenon of antonymy is used in the oxymoron (gr. oxymoron - funny-stupid). This technique is based on the combination of contrasting lexical units with the aim of imaging the new, unusual concept: "*Bad good man*" (the name of the movie). Some oxymorons are based on the true antonyms (the beginning of the end), others are based on words, with opposite values combined as defined and decisive: "The living corpse"; "The optimistic tragedy"; "Lavish withering of nature". The words used in such oxymorons, cannot be named as the antonyms in the strict sense of the term, as they belong to different parts of speech.

Thus, the system relations of words in the lexicon serve as the most important criterion for the selection of antonymy as a linguistic phenomenon. The system approach allows to penetrate into the depth of this phenomenon, to reveal its regularities, to explain the features of using the antonyms in the speech.

The richness and variety of Russian antonymy, its typology are fully disclosed in the consideration of classification of antonyms. Structural, semantic and functional-derivative classifications are the most significant classifications of words with opposite meanings.

There are antonyms with different roots and with one root in the structural classification. Most antonyms are words with different roots. Antonymy with different roots permeates most important lexico-grammatical classes of words (parts of speech), especially adjectives, adverbs, nouns and verbs: *high – low, smart – stupid, funny – sad, left – right, summer - winter; fast – slow, loud – quiet, early – late, forward – backward; truth – lies, rise – decay, start – end, day – night; to lift – to lower, to overtake - to keep up, to look younger – aging, to love - to hate; everything - nothing, everybody – nobody; yes – no, here – there; in – out, to – from, before - after; march! – stop!* etc.

The value of antonymous of the same root words occurs either as a result of accession to the same word of antonymous prefixes pri+hodit-u+hodit, so+birat – raz+birat (*при + ходить – у + ходить, со + бирать – раз + бирать*) (come – leave, collect – disassemble)), or as a consequence of the use of the prefix that gives the word the opposite meaning (gramotniy –ne+gramotniy, revolyutsionniy – kont+revolyutsionniy (*грамотный – не + грамотный, революционный – контр + революционный (competent – not competent, revolutionary – counter + revolutionary)*)). Most extensive root system of antonymy form prefixal verbs: vvodit-vyvodit, vlezat-vylezat, vvertyvat-vyvertyvat, vsypat-vysypat, vbegat-(vzbegat)-sbegat (v goru-s gory), vlezat-slezat, vskakivat-soskakivat, zavyazyvat-razvyazyvat, zapletat-raspletat, zakryvat-otkryvat, zakleivat-otkleivat, nedovypolnyat-perevypolnyat, nedosalivat-peresalivat (gribi), nedoletat-pereletat, podbegat-otbegat, podkatyvat-otkatyvat, podsazhivatsya-otsazhivatsya, priezhat-uyezzhat, prileta-uletat, prinosit-unosit, privyazivat-otvyazyvat, pristegivat-otstegivat, prikalivat-otkalivat, svyazyvat-razvyazyvat, sobirat-razbirat, szhimat-razzhimat (*вводить – выводить, влезать – вылезать, ввертывать – вывертывать, всыпать – высыпать; вбегать (взбегать) – сбегать* (в гору – с горы), *влезать – слезать, вскакивать –*

соскакивать; *завязывать – развязывать, заплетать – расплетать*; *закрывать – открывать, заклеивать – отклеивать*; *недовыполнять – перевыполнять, недосаливать – пересаливать* (грибы), *недолетать – перелетать*; *подбегать – отбегать, подкатывать – откатывать, подсаживаться – отсаживаться*; *приезжать – уезжать, прилетать – улетать, приносить – уносить*; *привязывать – отвязывать, пристегивать – отстегивать, прикалывать – откалывать*; *связывать – развязывать, собирать – разбирать, сжимать – разжимать*) (*input – output, climb – get out, screw – unscrew, to pour – to empty; run (run) - to run away* (to the mountain – from the mountain), *climb – climb down, to jump up – to jump; to tie – to untie, to braid – to untwist; close – open, seal – peel; underfulfilled – overfulfil, insufficient salting - oversalt* (mushrooms), *do not reach – overfly; to run up – to run off, to roll – to roll back, take a sit – change a sit; to come - to leave, to arrive – to fly away, to bring – to carry; to tie – to untie, to fasten – to unfasten, pin – unpin; to tie – to untie, to collect - to analyze, compress – decompress*), etc.; there are not antonymous prefixes in other cases of the correlation and antonyms are formed by adding prefix to the word, giving it a polar value ubezhdat –razubezhadat, mobilizovat-demobilizovat (*убеждать – разубеждать, мобилизовывать – демобилизовывать*) (*to convince – to argue, to mobilize – to demobilize*), etc.). Unlike verbs, a characteristic manifestation of cognate antonymy of adjectives is, on the contrary, the latter attitude: non-prefixal word - prefixal word (*war – anti-war, democratic - anti – democratic, scientific – unscientific; natural – unnatural, legal – illegal, social – antisocial; tasty - tasteless, fair – unfair, reasonable – unreasonable; moral – immoral, ideological – unprincipled, human – inhuman*). Cognate antonyms of nouns is largely a reflection of antonymy of verbs and adjectives: vvoz-vyvoz, vseleniye-vyseleniye (*ввоз – вывоз, вселение – выселение* (ср. vvozit-vyvozit, vselyat-vyselyat (*ввозить – вывозить, вселять – выселять*)); zavyazyvaniye-razvyazyvaniye, zakleivaniye-otkleivaniye (*завязывание – развязывание, заклеивание – отклеивание*) (ср. zavyazyvat-razvyazyvat, zakleivat-otkleivat (*завязывать – развязывать, заклеивать – отклеивать*)); nedovypolneniye-perevypolneniye (*недовыполнение – перевыполнение*) (ср. nedovypolnyat-perevypolnyat (*недовыполнять – перевыполнять*); prihod-uhod (*приход – уход*) (ср. prihodit-uhodit (*приходить – уходить*)); pristegivaniye-otstegivaniye (*пристегивание – отстегивание*) (ср,pristegivat-otstegivat (*пристегивать – отстегивать*); sborka-razborka (*сборка – разборка*) (ср.sobirat-razbirat (*собирать – разбирать*); ubezhdeniye-razubezhdeniye (*убеждение – разубеждение*) (ср. ubezhdat-razubezhdat (*убеждать – разубеждать*)); mobilizatsiya – demobilizatsiya (*мобилизация – демобилизация*) (ср. mobilizovyvat- demobilizovivat (*мобилизовывать – демобилизовывать*) и др.; vezhlivost-nevezhlivost, dovolstvo-nedovolstvo, izvestnost-neizvestnost) (*вежливость – невежливость, довольство – недовольство, известность – неизвестность* (ср. vezhliviy-nevezhliviy, dovolniy-nedovolniy, izvestniy-neizvestniy (*вежливый – невежливый, довольный – недовольный, известный – неизвестный*) (*import n. – export n., moving in n. – eviction n. (import v. – export v., instill – evict); tying – the outbreak, sealing – peeling (i.e., to tie – to untie, to stick – unstick); shortfall – fulfillment (underfulfilled - to exceed); the arrival – departure (come – go); the fastening – releasing (to fasten – to unfasten); assembly – disassembly (i.e., to collect - analyze); persuasion – dissuasion (convince – dissuade); mobilization – demobilization (to mobilize - to demobilize*), and others; *politeness – impoliteness, satisfaction – dissatisfaction, fame – obscurity (polite – impolite, happy – unhappy, known – unknown*)). A private, unrecorded antonymy of nouns is much poorer (revolutsiya – kontrevolyutsiya, udar-kontudar, tezis-antitezis, fashist-antifashist, drug-nedrug, udacha-neudacha, sila-bessiliye, slava-besslaviye (*революция – контрреволюция, удар – контрудар; тезис – антитезис, фашист – антифашист; друг – недруг, удача – неудача; сила – бессилие, слава – бесславие*)) (*revolution – counter-revolution, strike - counterstrike; thesis – antithesis, fascist - anti–fascist; friend - foe, success – failure, power – powerlessness, glory – shame*), etc.).

We can talk about another type of antonymy – within-word antonymy, i.e. the inverse of the values of one polysemantic word. This phenomenon is called enantiosemy (ger. Enantiosemie – polarization values of the word). An outward and formal expression are not the root or affixal morphemes and the contexts of use of the word in its polar values: odolzhit v dolg komu-nibud deneg "dat v dolg" –odolzhit u kogo-nibud deneg "vzyat v dolg" (*одолжить кому-нибудь денег* 'дать в долг' *– одолжить у кого-нибудь денег* 'взять в долг') (*to lend someone money* 'to lend' *- to give someone money* 'to borrow') (syntactic difference between contexts), spetsialno ogovoritsya (v predislovii k knige) "sdelat ogovorku – nechayanno ogovoritsya "oshibitsya" (*специально оговориться* (в предисловии к книге) 'сделать оговорку' *– нечаянно оговориться* 'ошибиться') (*specifically mention* (in the book's preface) 'make a reservation' *– accidentally mention* 'wrong') (lexical difference contexts).

Another semantic classification of antonyms is possible - their distribution across main topics (fields). From this point of view we can distinguish large classes of opposite words that denote natural phenomena (*freeze – thaw*), physical qualities and properties of objects (*light – heavy*), number, order and sequence of their location (*many – few, first - last*), movement, moving, change of position in space (*go – get*), various types of specific actions (*to put on – remove*), appearance and physical qualities (*broad shoulders – narrow-shouldered*), change of physical state (*freeze – to keep warm*), emotions, feelings, will, intellect (*to rejoice – to be afflicted, intelligent – stupid*), behavior and human nature (*withdrawn – communicative*), the phenomenon of the social order (*collective – individual*), ethical and aesthetic evaluation (*good – bad, lovely – disgusting*) and many others.

Functionally derivational antonyms classification represents a great interest. Unlike derivational this systematization is based on the "deep" functional relationships of opposite words and not based on their formal similarity. This classification, which is just beginning, will provide an opportunity to better introduce the system of antonymy, drawing attention to such links of opposite words that would normally go unnoticed.

CONCLUSION

Considering the nature of functioning of the lexical-semantic units in the system of paradigmatic relations, we rely on a well-known position that "units of a certain level get their value based on their collation with other units of the same level, which makes their review in a certain paradigmatic row possible and necessary (often in a system of paradigmatic rows)". In this respect, there is a quite convincing point of view which defines that "the systemic nature of the vocabulary is primarily found in distribution of words according to some semantic combined lexical groups– lexical-semantic paradigms. Every word of language is part of the lexical-semantic paradigm, most often due to its ambiguity, not only in one".

Thus, the individual semantics of the word is revealed through his presentation and opposition of other members of the paradigm in which it is included, according to certain essential features.

That's how the lexical-semantic system of language is created.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avina NY Active processes in vocabulary of the Russian language. -M., 2000 (Авина Н.Ю. Активные процессы в лексике русского языка. –М., 2000г.)

Alimjanov A. Steppe echo. Novels. - Alma-Ata: Zhalyn 1983. (Алимжанов А. Степное эхо. Романы. – Алма-Ата: Жалын, 1983.)

Alefirenko NF The theory of language. Introductory Course: Textbook for stud.filolog.spets.vyssh.ucheb.zavedeniy. M .: Publishing Center "Academy", 2004. (Алефиренко Н.Ф. Теория языка. Вводный курс: Учебное пособие для студ.филолог.спец.высш.учеб.заведений.-М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2004.)

Barlas LG Russian language. Introduction to the science of language. Lexicology. Etymology. Phraseology. Lexicography: Textbook. Flint -M .: Nauka, 2003. (Барлас Л.Г. Русский язык. Введение в науку о языке. Лексикология. Этимология. Фразеология. Лексикография: Учебник. -М.: Флинта: Наука, 2003.)

Valgin NS, Rozental DE, MI Fomina "The modern Russian language" .- Moscow, 2008. (Валгина Н.С., Розенталь Д.Э., Фомина М.И. «Современный русский язык».-М.,2008.)

Gainullina NI Lexicology of the Russian language. Izd.2 e-Ispra. and Sub-Almaty Kazak universiteti 2003. (Гайнуллина Н.И. Лексикология русского языка. Изд.2-е, испр. и доп.-Алматы: Казак университеті, 2003.)

Krysin LP Modern Russian language: Lexical Semantics. Lexicology. Phraseology. Lexicography. -M., Ed. Centre. "Academy", 2009. (Крысин Л.П. Современный русский язык: Лексическая семантика. Лексикология. Фразеология. Лексикография. –М., изд. центр. «Академия», 2009.)

VP Moskvin The style of the Russian language. Theoretical course. - Ed. 4th, Revised. and ext. - Rostov n / D: Phoenix 2006. (Москвин В.П. Стилистика русского языка. Теоретический курс. - Изд. 4-е, перераб. и доп. - Ростов н/Д: Феникс, 2006.)

Sobolewski AI Works on the history of the Russian language. - M .: Slavic Cultures Languages 2006. (Соболевский А. И. Труды по истории русского языка. - М.: Языки славянских культур, 2006.)

Ozhegov SI Russian dictionary / Ed. N.Yu.Shvedovoy.-23 ed, Ispr.i M:.. Russian language 1991. (Ожегов С.И. Словарь русского языка/ Под ред. Н.Ю.Шведовой.-23-е изд.,испр.-М:Русский язык, 1991.)

Dictionary of antonyms of the Russian language / Ed. L.A.Novikova. M .: Russian language 1985. (Словарь антонимов русского языка/ Под ред. Л.А.Новикова.-М.: Русский язык, 1985.)

Podbereznyj LI Approaches to the definition of "antonym" in linguistics. // Philosophy of Law. 2009. - № 31. С. 98- 102. (Подберезная Л.И. Подходы к определению понятия «антоним» в лингвистике. // Философия права. 2009. - № 31. С. 98- 102.)

Taukeev SU Russian lexicon at the present stage. Educational handbook. - Shymkent, SKSU. M.Auezov 2011. (Таукеев С.У. Русская лексика на современном этапе. Учебно-методическое пособие. – Шымкент, ЮКГУ им. М.Ауезова, 2011.)

Taukeev SU In the beginning was the word. Lecture course. - Shymkent, 2013. (Таукеев С.У. Вначале было слово. Курс лекций. – Шымкент, 2013г.)

Taukeev SU The lexical-semantic system A.Alimzhanova / A teaching posobie.- Shymkent literary texts, SKSU. M.Auezov 2014. (Таукеев С.У. Лексико-семантическая система художественных текстов А.Алимжанова/ Учебно-методическое пособие.- Шымкент, ЮКГУ им. М.Ауезова, 2014.)

Tolstaya AL Antonymy as a mechanism to create a contrast to the modern journalistic speech: dis.cand. Philology. Sciences. - Moscow, 2010. - 230 p. (Толстая А.Л. Антонимия как механизм создания контраста в современной публицистической речи: дис.канд. филол. наук. - Москва, 2010. - 230 с.)

Chernega E.H. Opposites in linguistic and Lingvo-cognitive aspects: Dis. Candidate phil.science. - Taganrog. 2005. - 352 p. (Чернега Е.Н. Антонимы в лингвистическом и лингвокогнитивном аспектах: дис. канд филол.наук. - Таганрог. 2005. - 352 с.)

Shanskiy NM Lexicology of the modern Russian language. - Ed. 3rd, Revised. - M .: Publishing House of the LCI, 2007. - 304 p. (Lingua, the legacy of the XX century.). (Шанский Н.М. Лексикология современного русского языка. - Изд. 3-е, перераб. - М.: Изд-во ЛКИ, 2007. - 304 с. (Лингв, наследие XX в.).)

Shmelev DN Essays on semasiology Russian language. - Univ e 3rd. M .: Publishing House of the LCI, 2008. - 248 p. (Шмелев Д.Н. Очерки по семасиологии русского языка. - Изд-е 3-е. М.: Изд-во ЛКИ, 2008. - 248 с.).