

ARTICLE

Actual Problems of Determining the Phenomenon of Cognitive Synonymy in Linguistics

Sayan Zhirenov^{1*} , Zeinep Osmanova¹ , Zhazira Nursultankyzy² , Nazira Amirzhanova³ , Yerlan Kassen¹ , Zhanibek Ashirov¹ 

¹ Department of Theory of Kazakh Linguistics and Methodology, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty 050010, Kazakhstan

² Department of Philology, Journalism and History, Kyzylorda Bolashak University, Kyzylorda 120000, Kazakhstan

³ Graduate School of Education, Nazarbayev University, Astana 010000, Kazakhstan

ABSTRACT

The article identifies changes in the development of the synonym system, the criteria that make up the synonym series. Since synonyms are the main factor in the development of vocabulary and the richness of language, they should be studied in close connection with human thinking, association and stereotyping. Therefore, methods of cognitive research of synonyms have been proposed. Absolute synonyms are conditional, because meaning is constantly replenished and changes with the development of society. Hence, this article aims to prove conclusion that words whose meaning are fundamentally similar cannot be eternal. While antonyms are clearly binary oppositions, synonyms do not have such strict binary relations. The article was written to clarify the statement that creating synonymic series requires at least two-digit words. Currently, synonyms are also formed in the language system through authentic use of equivalent borrowings from other languages. Synonyms-epithets and synonyms-metaphors are also formed in cognitive-pragmatic interest. By studying synonyms in modern language within the «nucleus-periphery» framework, it becomes possible to determine relations between genotype-phenotype, hyponym - hypernym. Moreover, according to the «associative chain», the order of words in a synonymic series is defined by their semantic proximity to the preceding reference word. The methods of

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Sayan Zhirenov, Department of Theory of Kazakh Linguistics and Methodology, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty 050010, Kazakhstan; Email: Saken82@mail.ru

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 15 July 2025 | Revised: 12 August 2025 | Accepted: 28 August 2025 | Published Online: 3 November 2025
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i12.11070>

CITATION

Zhirenov, S., Osmanova, Z., Nursultankyzy, Z., et al., 2025. Actual Problems of Determining the Phenomenon of Cognitive Synonymy in Linguistics. Forum for Linguistic Studies. 7(12): 1–11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i12.11070>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

distinguishing synonymic series by semantic, stylistic and usage shades were proposed. The difference between associated and non-associated synonyms-epithets was demonstrated. Problems in translating synonyms into another language, along with their possible solutions, were discussed.

Keywords: Cognitive Synonym; Synonym-Epithets; Associated Synonyms; Synonymic Series; Core; Periphery; Synonym-Metaphor

1. Introduction

Although synonymy is one of the main categories of structural linguistics, it contains many controversial issues. The phenomenon of synonymy highlights its function of differentiating meaning, and meaning itself is a reflection of thought and cognition in language. Therefore, semantic problems in linguistics cannot be reduced to fixed formulas within the framework of structural linguistics. As human cognition expands, the dynamic changes in meaning also transform language. For this reason, we believe that the most effective way to study unresolved issues of synonymy is within the anthropocentric paradigm. The problem of lexical synonymy in the Kazakh language was initially studied in «rhetoric» and later considered as lexicological issues. Eventually, it became a central problem of speech stylistics. Thus, synonyms perform many functions and have wide applications. In this regard, there is a tradition of classifying them into lexical synonyms, rhetorical synonyms, and stylistic synonyms. At first, difficulties in distinguishing meanings, the instability of criteria for identifying them, and the inability to fix the rules for determining synonymous words did not attract the attention of linguists. Later, when the analysis of literary language in rhetoric and stylistics arose, and when visual-expressive means appeared, it became clear that the functions and linguistic models of synonyms require special research.

In structural linguistics, synonyms considered only within lexicology remained limited to the lexical aspect. For a complete study of synonymy as a natural phenomenon, it should be examined within semasiology and addressed in linguo-cognitive and psycholinguistic paradigms. Although synonymy is recognized as a separate branch of lexicology, its universality allows it to be considered in all areas of language structure. Whatever language we examine, we find a category of synonymy.

Because structural-system linguistics regarded syn-

onymy only as a linguistic phenomenon and studied it as a frozen system rather than as a mental-linguistic category, no precise definition was developed to reveal its nature and its natural function in speech. The theory of truth in cognition seeks to connect reality with the world to determine the essence of an object or phenomenon. But defining the essence of reality requires conceptualization and categorization. As the connections between categorized features become closer, the possibility of determining a constant meaning increases. If, by this logic, we define the exact meaning of each word, then each meaning becomes isolated, unable to replace or serve in place of another. This would mean denying synonymy altogether.

Thus, this view of the relationship between language and reality explains the attempts of linguists to create an ideal category. However, transforming meaning into an ideal category excludes functions of similarity and equivalence of values. Synonymy also cannot be reduced to a set of algorithmic rules and schemes. It cannot ignore general cognitive mechanisms, since reasoning derived from thought and reflected in language is always free. There are no restrictions in the language system: however, we express an idea, the main point is to choose and use the correct meaning. Therefore, it is wrong to limit similarity of meanings, to exclude semantic shades or to assume that each word has only one meaning. On the contrary, the expansion of meaning stimulates the formation of new words. For example, over time, the meaning of one word may acquire a new designation. In this way, new names emerging from the development of meaning form both synonymy and polysemy. The expansion of meaning enlarges the synonymic series. One of the most important mechanisms of enriching the vocabulary is thus the growth of meanings and the increase of synonyms. Therefore, we conclude that it is most effective to consider the functions and possibilities of synonyms in the development of language in the aspect of cognitive linguistics, and we propose ways and approaches for such research.

The process of synonymizing of words leads to the further development and enrichment of their semantic content in context, refining their meaning through synonymic fields. Therefore, whether at the authorial or the general language level, semantic proximity enhances the expressiveness, value, and richness of words. The greater the number of meanings a word has—that is, the wider its polysemy—the more it expands the range of synonymous words. Distinguishing the semantic shades of a word depending on its use in different contexts also increases the series of synonyms. The tendency to create new semantic connections is essentially an act of comparison. According to scholars, synonyms are classified into two types: first, the traditional synonymic series—absolute synonyms; and second, the synonymic series formed through speakers' perception and use of semantic proximity between words.

2. Literature Review

Willard Van Forest Quine, in his famous article *Two Dogmas of Empiricism* which was published in 1951, widely applied the concept of cognitive synonymy, emphasizing that two words are considered cognitive synonyms if they can be used interchangeably as much as possible^[1]. For example, *bachelor* means an unmarried man. According to T.A. Simonyan, «synonyms are single-structured names with identical or similar characteristics that can serve as mutual equivalents»^[2]. A.P. Ovchinnikova argues that the distinctive feature of synonyms is their dualistic character; in other words, the semantic structure of synonyms combines unique features with similarities^[3]. Therefore, synonyms must necessarily be equivalent and should not be multi or differently structured.

Synonyms are an important category for the development and expansion of the vocabulary, exerting significant influence on the dynamic change of word meanings. Therefore, improving the lexicographic corpus and the formation of semantic words that strengthen the functional style served as the basis for the emergence of synonyms». The scientist I.V. Arnold noted that activity allowed us to achieve high indicators in increasing the power of the language^[4].

However, in the 19th century, the phenomenon of synonymy was perceived as a decorative and visual means. In the 20th century, after Ferdinand de Saussure's concept of

structural linguistics, lexical synonyms received the status of a separate category of special semasiology^[5]. Nevertheless, when synonyms were officially acknowledged as words with close or similar meanings, debates arose among scholars. According to G.O. Vinokur, «the semantic similarity of words can be confirmed outside linguistic abstraction. And we must also take into account that words with a pronounced lexical meaning always have distinctive features. For example, in Russian *doroga* (road) and *put'* (path, direction), though recognized as synonyms, are clearly distinguishable from each other»^[6].

A.S. Krasinsky believes: «Synonymy is a philosophical aspect of language, without which it is impossible to understand either the spirit of language or the truth»^[7].

In the study of L.A. Novikov «the use of synonyms make it is possible to determine an individual level of speech-thinking and cognition»^[8].

Since the properties of synonyms and their functions in the language are diverse, there is no consistency or stability in defining them. After analyzing the research of scholars, we grouped the definitions of synonyms as follows:

1. Synonyms are words that differ in sound, but are identical, or similar in meaning^[9–12]. This is the most common type of definition.
2. Synonyms are words that can meaningfully replace each other in different contexts^[13].
3. Synonyms are words that express the same concept^[14].
4. Synonyms are words that denote the same object^[15].
5. Synonyms are equivalent words^[16].
6. Synonyms are words that are similar in meaning, «in this way, language contradicts the law of truth»^[17].
7. Synonyms are not words that are completely identical in their semantic and emotional-stylistic properties^[18].
8. For absolute synonyms, semantic and stylistic differences are reduced to zero, the closeness of meanings is equated, and synonyms become lexical doublets^[19].
9. Types of absolute synonyms: semantic (the ultimate semantic equivalent); stylistic (the absence of stylistic differences); temporary (existing only in synchronous linguistic layers)^[20].
10. Absolute synonyms in a language are a temporary phenomenon^[21].

These definitions have been summarized from works studied within the framework of structural linguistics. Sum-

marizing the definitions of scientists who studied synonyms in the field of cognitive linguistics, we found that each scholar interprets the phenomenon differently. For example:

1. A synonym is understood as the result of categorization and conceptualization. Conceptualization is a cognitive process aimed to dividing concept into minimal semantic units, while categorization is the unification of similar or identical units into one concept^[22].
2. Recognition of a synonym as a set of meanings concentrated in the conceptual sphere of one notion. Synonyms are the small bricks of a concept in the process of thinking. They build a conceptual image in complex reasoning^[23].
3. Synonyms are recognized as expressions of associations. In the semantics of a word, our knowledge of the world includes a set of associative components that arise from our perception of its structure^[24].

Synonyms are recognized as components of the conceptual structure. In synonymy, concepts interact with each other, so the structure of one concept reflects the features of another^[3].

3. Materials and Methods

In our view, synonymy should be studied from the lingual cognitive aspect. The cognitive approach to this phenomenon regards not only language as a means of communication, but also as a tool that represent concepts, and express knowledge about reality. Therefore, synonymy is perceived in human mind as both an indicator of thinking, a way of expressing thought. In other words, conceptual analysis of the semantic structure of names at the level of synonymy makes it possible to identify the category of similarity in the language system. This category unites concepts and serves as the basis for analyzing their core meanings contained in them. Therefore, we apply the method of conceptual analysis in our work. Psycholinguistic methods are effective for distinguishing synonyms that do not correspond to semantic differentiation. For example, if the words jeep and crossover (transport), doctor and physician, driver and moderator, giant (oligarch) and philanthropist (rich man), leader and president form a synonymous series, a psycholinguistic method helps determine their frequency of use depending on the age of

groups or identify user strategies. The pragmatic method is important for determining functional value of synonyms. It is implemented by analyzing them in context. The semantic tone of synonyms in the text is revealed by the degree which they are used for manipulation or specific purpose. For example, although the sightless (unseeing) and the blind are synonymous, but pragmatically they differ in meaning.

4. Results

Thus, we believe that the process of synonymy should be considered from the cognitive aspect using the research tools and methods of cognitive linguistics.

For this purpose, the first step is semiotic (interpretive) analysis, in which the alternative names forming a synonymous series are collected. For example, in Kazakh, the word zaman (time from Arabic) has following alternatives: dauir (epoch) - gasyr (century), era and kezen (period). The peculiarity of semiotic analysis within linguocognitive research is that the synonym is understood through its core –the base word– and semantic units that follow in the series. This requires recognizing the original, marked semiotic meaning of the word, rather than its secondary or figurative shades. As we observed, the concepts of zaman, dauir, gasyr, era and kezen are not divided into primary and complementary levels. When these concepts are used interchangeably in context, the meaning of the text does not change. Each of them functions as a labeled name with the same general meaning. Therefore, the object of semiotic analysis is homogeneous (general) meaningful names.

Next, we consider the possibility of creating a conceptual periphery of the second synonymous series applying «core-periphery» approach. Unlike the previous approach, this one introduces a hyponymic relation. For example: inKazakh, if we take the word ustaz (pedagogue) as the nucleus of synonymous series, the closest the closest periphery includes: mugalim (schoolteacher), oqytushy (lecturer/professor), talimger (tutor/mentor), tarbieshi(kinder-garten teacher/educator). As we can see, each word on the periphery has its own distinctive feature and specific meaning. Strictly speaking, they should not be regarded as a full synonymous. Yet from the perspective of their phenotype, they appear similar both externally and internally. This can be illustrated in **Table 1**.

Table 1. The potential for establishing a core-periphery structure within a synonymic series.

Synonymous Row	Genotype			Phenotype	
	Man	Specialty	Intellectual/Humanitarian	Student Presence	School
Ustaz (pedagogue)	+	+	+	+	+
Mugalim (Schoolteacher)	+	+	+	+	+
Oqytushy (lecturer/professor)	+	+	+	+	+
Talimger (tutor/mentor)	+	+	+	+	+
Tarbieshi (kindergarten teacher/educator)	+	+	+	+	+

As can be seen from **Table 1**, when the core word is used instead of periphery ones, the meaning in context does not change. In other words, replacing heterogeneous names such as schoolteacher, lecturer, mentor, and educator with the homogeneous general term pedagogue (ustaz) does not diminish the content of the sentence. Therefore, words can be regarded as synonyms if they do not alter the meaning of the content.

The third approach is the «associative chain». This approach is implemented by collecting words with figurative uses or variable meanings which differ in emotional-expressive value and stylistic shade, but do not change the overall content when used context. The associative chain has no clear boundaries and can be classified into thematic groups.

For example, the associative chain of the concept of “life” can be considered in three thematic groups:

1. Life in negative cognition (life) - dull life (everyday hustle and bustle) - monotonous movement (a squirrel in a wheel) - rushing time.
2. Life in pleasant cognition (life) - ray of light (light) - paradise-love.
3. Life in background cognition (life) - heartbeat - breath - blood fever - body movement.

Fourth, linguistic analysis. Synonyms in the language system develop in different ways. In particular, they arise through the semantic development of words and the creation of an additional indirect shades of meaning; through enrichment of the vocabulary of the literary language with region-specific words; through the reactivation of archaic vocabulary and professional terminology and through the borrowing of words from other languages. These are the main ways in which synonyms emerge.

The meaning of synonyms as a linguistic phenomenon, stands in opposition to homonyms. Unlike homonyms, syn-

onyms are closely related words with shared meaning. Words that form synonymic series do not belong to different parts of speech, but only to one. Cases where words from different parts of speech form a synonymic series are rare and occur mainly with numerals. For example, eki (two), qos (double), par (pair), egiz (twin). But words like ekiden biri (“one of two”), jartysy (“half”), törtten bir (“a quarter”) belong to other parts of speech such as nouns or adjectives.

The use of substitutes for one another is considered a type of syntactic synonymy. Some scholars argue that in any language there are no two or more words that are completely identical in meaning. Therefore, their similarity cannot be regarded as absolute. At the same time, researchers acknowledge that because the meanings of language units may be close in varying degrees, synonyms also differ among themselves, though they cannot always be strictly classified. It is a linguistic fact that within some synonymic groups there are slight semantic or stylistic differences. Since such differences are not always immediately obvious, they can be identified in context. This explains why we often use synonyms interchangeably, even though each can only be applied in specific combinations. For example, in Kazakh the words adam and kisi are often treated as absolute synonyms. But their subtle nuances must be observed. In contexts such as “We need a person/man” or “Two persons/men came today,” they can be used interchangeably. But in phrases like “Not a man, but a dog” (adam emes, it eken), “Human is an honorable name” (adam degen ardaqty at), «Ask this person» (myrna kisiden suranyz), or «Kisi balasy kinamshil» (man is fault-finding), the words cannot replace each other. The same applies to the synonymic pair dauys/un («voice/sound»). «Dauys» conveys clarity and concreteness — what can be heard by the ear. For example, the voice of a person, the voice of child, the sound of a motor. By contrast, «un» has a broader meaning, encompassing both concrete and figurative uses. Thus, the word «un» can combine with abstract notions as well:

a human voice, a human sound, but it is correct to say “the Asian voice,” not «the Asian sound», Kazakh voice, but not Kazakh sound. There is also a contextual difference between the synonyms «eski» (old) and «kone» (ancient). «Eski» is used with tangible objects that can be touched, seen, or physically experienced: old clothes, old belongings. «Kone», however, combines with abstract words: ancient language, ancient heritage. Therefore, when analyzing synonymic series, it is necessary to clarify the principles for selecting words included in the synonym series, based on their distinctive semantic or stylistic features.

It should be noted that the use of synonyms in place of one another cannot be regarded as a strict law. Words included in a synonymic series should be grouped according to the consistency of their meanings rather than the frequency of their use. A series of related words expressing a single concept usually has a keyword or dominant synonym. The dominant synonym is chosen on the basis of the semantic and stylistic features of the words in the series, and its meaning forms the core of the group.

Polysemous words often participate in several synonymic series, each linked to one of their meanings. Sometimes this leads to overlap and even potentially unlimited extension of series. In such cases, the grouping is not based on occasional contextual shades, but on the stable and widely recognized meanings of the words. Some words have two or more basic meanings, and one word continues to be used in several synonymous series. For example, the word *dunie* (universe) belongs to four different series: world, creation, substance, life.

Since the synonyms of one series represent only single concept, the concept has a limit that can be defined by its logical unity. To establish this, it is first necessary to examine the meanings of each word separately. For example, there are 5 well-known words to dispute – conflict – argue and fight – quarrel.

In this context, the meanings are arranged in a single row according to their consistency. But if you carefully analyze the meanings of each of them, you can notice the following feature:

A dispute is a simple disagreement between people on one issue.

The conflict escalated without subsiding.

Argue is an escalating form of disagreement.

A quarrel is a place where everyone reaches, the culmination.

It is the limit of a specific concept.

The event here begins with a simple argument and ends with harsh words. If the incident continues to escalate, the quarrel will turn into a fight. A quarrel and a fight represent two different meanings. In the first, there is a dispute of thoughts and words; in the second, a dispute of power. The other synonymic series is also arranged in this order.

Words that are synonyms can be recognized by the following three signs:

1. Semantic shades. These differ slightly between words expressing the same concept. For example, one word may be slightly higher or slightly lower in meaning than another. For example: huge – giant, shooter – gun-slinger. In some cases, one word may have a broader or narrower scope than the other. For example: war – battle. One of the related words can be polysemantic, the other unambiguous. For example: name – first name. One synonym is used in a documentary sense, while the other is used in a general sense. For example: child – baby; stomach – uterus – abdominal cavity.
2. Contextual distribution. Synonyms are also distinguished by their usage. For example: larynx – pharynx. While larynx can be used metaphorically (the larynx of a furnace, the larynx of a pond), the second (pharynx) is limited to its main anatomical meaning.
3. Word origin and productivity. Synonyms may differ in their ability to generate related words. For example, the concept road is highly productive: fellow, lane, passenger, roadway, guidebook. Trip, however, has little capacity for word-formation.
4. Stylistic shades. The stylistic value of synonyms is closely linked to their use in functional styles. The richness of a language can be measured by both the quantity and quality of its stylistic usage. In developed literary languages, stylistic features of synonyms are clearly distinguished, while in less developed written traditions these boundaries are blurred. In Kazakh, the stylistic differentiation of words began to be studied in the 1950s. Therefore, it is difficult to state their exact number and types. However, based on available data, the stylistic meanings of synonyms can be divided into the following groups:

- 1) Synonyms denoting dignity: elder – old man; citizen – guy
- 2) Synonyms with solemn or elevated meaning: celebrate – celebration; prize – competition
- 3) Poetic synonyms: height – high; arm – army; sunrise – dawn
- 4) Synonyms with roughness: visage – mug; naughty – capricious; lame – cripple
- 5) Synonyms with sarcasm or stuttering tone: rooster – litter; vigorous – thrill
- 6) Synonyms expressing disdain or contempt: transport – branches; person – living soul

Shades of meaning in the use of this word. Synonyms in a language differ in meaning depending on their use in context. For example: although the words country/people are ambiguous in linguistic usage, there are cases when one cannot substitute for the other. We can't say «the population has landed inside», although we can say «the people were eating something».

Ladle – bucket. It is correct to say «he poured from the ladle» but not «he poured from the bucket».

Face/Appearance. We cannot say «the appearance is torn», and although we can say that the face is torn. Likewise, we say «the appearance is familiar», but not «the face is familiar». High/tall are synonyms: but with restrictions: it is a high mountain, not a tall mountain. Synonyms also differ in frequency of use. The word «thick», often used in everyday speech, is not always interchangeable with «chubby». For example, a heavy blanket, but not a puffy blanket. Although the words life/lifetime are synonymous, life is more pronounced than lifetime. Although the words life/ lifetime is synonymous, life is more pronounced than a lifetime.

When studying synonyms, it is necessary to understand their subtle distinctions. This shows that synonyms differ in meaning, in stylistic value, and in patterns of use. Mastery of synonyms enriches fluency and allows more precise expression of thought. Every thought is realized through words drawn from the language of the people. Language not only expresses thought but also conveys feelings and will. It should be both impressive and attractive. The synonyms serve for this purpose. In Kazakh, stylistic richness is reflected in the abundance and activity of synonyms. Currently, synonyms are differentiated depending on their meaning and

use and are divided into several types. The Kazakh language is extremely rich in synonyms, both in quantity and in variety. Sometimes 20–30 synonyms may exist for a single concept.

Synonyms have a wide range of applications. In speech and writing, they make the language flexible, allowing the same idea to be expressed in multiple ways. Synonyms play a crucial role in conveying thoughts depending on a speaker's purpose, mood, and attitude. If a person understands the subtle shades of related words and uses them appropriately, their speech or writing becomes as attractive and expressive as possible.

The fifth type is a metaphorical epithet.

Based on the research of Willard Van Orman Quine, we recognize that one of the characteristic features of cognitive synonymy is the use of a metaphorical epithet. This is because synonymy itself arises from assigning an absolute equivalent to a particular concept in human thought. For example, home - dwelling, boxer - master of leather gloves, journalists - news bulletin. According to syntagmatic criteria, there are epithets that are widely used in texts—clarifying, synonymous, oxymoronic — whose purpose is to complement one another through semantic relations between components. Less common epithets are those based on tautology, inequality, quality, quantity, and irony. The latter group forms two-word synonymous epithets. For example: love is a sweet feeling; distrust is a dark thought.

Taking into account the grammatical, semantic, and stylistic features of epithets, we recommend defining a two-step synonymous epithet as a language tool with a morphological and syntactic structure. Its semantic features distinguish the epithet as a whole: it can have emotional-evaluative and expressive connotations and can provide a figurative description of a particular object or phenomenon. A synonymous epithet must also contain an image component. A.N. Veselovsky refers to transportable epithets as syncretic, which indicates that they are caused by associations of our sensory perceptions^[25].

According to the study, the semantic classification of epithets is divided into associative and non-associative epithets^[26]. Associative epithets reflect the characteristic features of an object by its nature. From such associative concepts, synonymous epithets arise. For example, a honeymoon is a solemn pleasure. The lowest degree of association is represented by a tautological epithet, which repeats the defin-

ing feature of the main component. For example, murder is heartless cruelty. Non-associative epithets are those that reflect features not directly related to the subject. Because of the diversity of their semantic connections, non-associative epithets are figurative; they are based on images evoked by imitation of sound, tactile sensations, and other perceptions. For example, death is an irrevocable ship, a bloody battlefield is the honey and sweetness of war, a city is the sound of an engine.

Cognitive synonyms are regarded as words that denote the same phenomenon of reality, that is, synonyms share the common feature of a “designated subject.” Through the denotative method of synonym formation, similar semes are identified in the shades of shared, basic, and general meanings, as well as in their relation to different speech styles. The denotative explanation of cognitive synonymy is often found in the introductory definition of a term: “there are different words denoting the same object, the same action, the same subject, or the same feature. For example: qaskyr; böri (wolf) — both are names for the same animal.” In the traditional approach, synonyms are defined as words with identical or close meanings and are regarded as a purely linguistic category.

The increase in semantic equivalents within a synonymic series is primarily influenced by the use arising from human associative cognition. As a result of lexical freedom, the practice of openly expressing associative perception through positive or negative evaluation has developed in human cognition. On the basis of exaggerating thought, figurative–associative expressions have emerged.

For example: “Are the jaütenköz in the orphanage lacking anything? Have medical services and education been properly arranged?” In this sentence, the word jaütenköz as an individual lexeme may convey different meanings:

- 1) a person with disabilities;
- 2) a neglected elderly person;
- 3) an orphan.

However, when combined with the phrase “in the orphanage,” it is specified in the meaning of orphan. Thus, we concluded that the contextual synonym of orphan is jaütenköz.

According to the Qazkorpus.kz database (the National Corpus of the Kazakh Language), jaütenköz (in the meaning

of orphan) occurs 5 times. Meanwhile, Google.kz shows a frequency of 223 uses. In contrast, in the Dictionary of Synonyms of the Kazakh Language, jaütenköz is not recorded: the synonymic row of jetim (“orphan”) is limited to jetimek, panasyz, ata-anasız. We believe that jaütenköz, which precisely associates with the meaning of orphan, should be included in this synonymic row. This is because it is a lexical unit that has emerged from the associative cognition of the Kazakh people and is entering into widespread usage.

In the 15-volume Dictionary of the Kazakh Literary Language, jaütenköz is referred to jautanköz, which is defined as “to look softly, tenderly, with shining eyes.” Therefore, it is necessary to expand the dictionary entry of jaütenköz by including its second meaning – orphan - and to support it with contextual examples.

Thus, conducting a cognitive analysis of synonyms allows us to accurately identify synonymic series, to establish sequence of words within the series according to their semantic proximity to the dominant synonym, and to assess the potential of words included in synonymic series.

As we have already noticed, the cognitive analysis includes five stages:

1. Semantic analysis
2. The «core-periphery» method
3. The «associative chain» method
4. Linguistic analysis
5. The Metaphorical epithet

5. Discussion

The study of synonyms from the cognitive perspective is of great importance for addressing complex problems determined by their linguistic characteristics. These include the polysemy of synonyms, their explicit or implicit references, the system of synonymic relations realized in institutional discourse, as well as non-linguistic factors. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a cognitive analysis of semantic changes in synonyms in order to determine their semantic balance in specific contexts and conditions, to account for the interaction of communicators, to evaluate the correspondence of synonyms to the speaker’s background knowledge, and to consider communicative goals and intentions (strategies and tactics). For example, let’s look at some features of a full or partial translation of synonymous terms from

English into Russian and from Russian into English in professional discourse. The paradigm of complete synonymous terms that are interchangeable in the text can be represented by synonymous terms of the British, American versions, and terms that have common meanings for both versions:

- I. People who own stocks and bonds are referred to as investors or more specifically stockholders (shareholders) and bondholders^[2]. The full synonyms — investors - stockholders – shareholders from a synonymous paradigm and are used in the following meanings: investor - Brit., Amer. 1 investor, depositor (of capital); 2. owner of securities. Shareholder - Amer.: owner of shares, shareholder; (compare the English owner of government securities, bondholder); Shareholders – English: shareholder (share – English share). Although in this meaning, as well as in the meaning of «shareholder» the term is used in both variants (as reflected in parentheses in the above sentence).
- II. When translated into Russian, the synonym series can be given in a wider and narrower version, without informative content of the sentence: 1. people, who own shares and bonds, are called depositors (owners of Price Books) or, accordingly, shareholders and bondholders. 2. people who own shares and bonds are called depositors or, accordingly, shareholders and bonds.
- III. The peculiarity of synonymous terms is that they can form hypernymic and hyponymic relationship: investors – hypernym, stockholders (shareholders) – full hyponym. investors-hypernym, bondholders-hyponym.
- IV. The dominant denotative meaning of a synonymic series in the source language may correspond to a single term in the target language. For example, moderator in English-organizer in Russian; electorate-elect; resolution-decision. partner-participant. These foreign words have entered the vocabulary of modern Russian and Kazakh languages, they are actively in building a synonymic series.
- V. In many contexts of business correspondence, translations can sometimes be less accurate than their equivalents. For example, the word «execute» has several meanings. In English: execution – execution of the plan, intention; fulfillment – full implementation; performance-accuracy of execution, compliance with the plan. Therefore, although «execution - fulfillment

– performance» can be considered synonymous, they cannot be directly related to the word «исполнение» (execution) in Russian and «орындау» (execution) in Kazakh^[27].

Synonymy is one of the main ways to reduce polysemy. Once several synonyms are introduced, the rules for their contextual usage begin to take shape. Semantic words in a synonym series prevent inappropriate use of the word. The development of synonyms replaces introductory words. This possibility can be achieved by identifying the phenomenon of cognitive synonymy.

6. Conclusions

Cognitive synonymy is a type of synonymy, referring to synonyms that are so close in meaning that they cannot be distinguished either denotatively or connotatively, that is, by psychological associations, connotations, emotional reactions, poetic value. The peculiarity of a cognitive synonym is that the meaning remains unchanged regardless of context. Each word in a series of cognitive synonyms should have the same meaning, and if their referents are necessarily identical, one word becomes a cognitive synonym of another; in other words, substitution should not depend on the context. The theoretical and practical (lexicographic and lingua methodological) study of lexical synonymy at different stages of lexicology and lexicography has been determined by the dominant directions in the development of linguistic thought. Synonyms that reflect the heterogeneity of the Kazakh literary language (and, more broadly, the national language) play an important role in ensuring the continuity of vocabulary, creating a stable network of lexical connections. Synonymous relations are integrated into the lexical system and interact with other types of lexical units, so the problem of differentiating meanings within the lexical system is solved by the phenomenon of synonymy. At the periphery of the lexical and semantic field, there are problems of defining the semantic threshold, clarifying the semantic shade of meaning. The main basis for this lies in the regularities of synonymic series formation. The multilevel extensibility of the synonymic series (from two words to many) created an adjacent synonymic series, as well as synonymic antonymic series and ensures continuity in the dynamics of vocabulary development.

The variety of meanings of words in the Kazakh language testifies to the wide development of the synonymic series and indicates that the cognitive basis of different semantic features of words has been established within the system.

There is a clear tendency in the components that make up the synonymy system: the more pronounced the predicates, reliability, subject features, and properties of the word, the higher the probability of the occurrence of synonymous series. At the same time, there is no doubt that each word in a synonymous series has its semantic shades. Because every word has an absolute individual meaning. Therefore, semantic differences between synonyms allow us to convey subtle shades of meaning, which makes them an indispensable tool for expressing the speaker's intentions. Synonyms are widely used in literary and journalistic styles to avoid unnecessary repetition. Their active use in texts ensures an expressive, precise, and understandable transmission of thought in both dialogue and the internal network of communicative exchange.

Therefore, in studying the category of synonymy from a communicative and pragmatic perspective, it is necessary to identify the principles for determining when words can or cannot be considered synonyms, as well as the patterns of their semantic usage.

Currently, due to the expansion of the semantic use of words recognized in the synonymic series, the criteria of absolute semantic similarity are increasingly blurred. In this regard, it is important to distinguish between strong/weak, clear/indistinct, pure/premature shades within the system of meanings that constitute the integrity of synonymy. The main task here is to determine the denotative, connotative, communicative, and pragmatic functions of meanings across several synonyms.

Traditionally, the phenomenon of synonymy has been studied only within the framework of structural linguistics and has not gone beyond the lexical domain. However, in the linguistic representation of the world, synonymic networks emerge through the process of conceptualization within the semantic space. Therefore, in linguistics, the study of synonymy has increasingly shifted in the cognitive direction, leading to the identification of cognitive synonyms.

Cognitive synonymy is a type of synonymy in which

words are so close in meaning that they cannot be distinguished either denotatively or connotatively—that is, by mental associations, connotations, emotional reactions, or poetic meanings. In the process of forming synonymy lies a person's ability to perceive and categorize the world. Human thought is naturally inclined to compare phenomena with the one other, similarities and differences between objects of the world – objective, qualitative, critical, etc. From this perspective, synonymy in the cognitive aspect is recognized as a mental-language category. Synonymy is realized only through creation a synonymic series. And the construction of a series is built on a peripheral field model. That is, the world of recognition (language) is the core and its close in meaning, very close, exactly similar shades are concentrated. If the place of a word in the core can be replaced by semantic shades on its periphery, then a synonymic series has been realized, that is, the phenomenon of synonymy. Similarly, a network of synonyms consisting of a series of exact meanings always follows and clarifies the boundaries of the meaning. Because the meaning of the word changes and expands according to the level of use of words due to the dynamic development of the language.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, S.Z. and Z.O.; methodology, N.A.; validation, Y.K and Z.A.; formal analysis, Z.N.; investigation, Z.A.; resources, N.A.; data curation, Y.K.; writing—original draft preparation, Z.O.; writing—review and editing, S.Z.; visualization, Z.N.; supervision, S.Z.; project administration, Y.K.; funding acquisition, Z.A. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This study was supported by the Kazakh National Pedagogical University named after Abai as part of the intra-university project “Mechanisms for modeling the lexical system of the educational workshop” (IRN 0125RK10108).

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

All data analyzed during this study are included in this published article. No additional datasets were created or used beyond those presented herein.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Quine, W.V.O., 2000. Two dogmas of empiricism. *Logos. Praxis*: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [2] Golubkova, E., Suvorina, E., 2021. Semantic similarity of words in RuWordNet thesaurus and in psychosemantic experiment. In: *Advances in Cognitive Research, Artificial Intelligence and Neuroinformatics (Intercogsci 2020)*. Available from: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-71637-0_45 (cited 10 May 2025).
- [3] Ovchinnikova, A.P., 2005. Synonymy in the cognitive aspect (by the example of the English adjectives fresh and new). *Bulletin of TSPU*. 4(48), 22–31. (in Russian)
- [4] Semantics, A.I.V., 1999. *Stylistics*. Saint Petersburg University Publ.: Saint Petersburg, Russia. pp. 153–158. (in Russian)
- [5] de Saussure, F., 2004. *Course of general linguistics*. Editorial URSS: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [6] Vinokur, G.O., 2010. *Selected works on linguistics and speech culture*. LKI: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [7] Krasinski, A.S., 1985. *Dictionary of synonyms of the Polish language*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Artystyczne i Filmowe (Artistic and Film Publishing House): Krakow, Poland. (in Russian)
- [8] Novikov, L.A., 2000. *Synonymy*. Publisher of Moscow University: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [9] Smith-Peter, S., 2016. Enlightenment from the East: Russian views of the early nineteenth century on the East from Kazan University. *Knowledge. Understanding. Ability*. 1, 318–338.
- [10] Zaripova, A.I., 2018. Characteristics of synonyms in English, Russian and Tatar languages. *Kazan Bulletin of Young Scientists*. 2(5), 135–146. (in Russian)
- [11] Bazhov, S.I., 2010. *Galich. Mysl'*: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [12] Volkov, V.A., Kulikova, M.V., Loginov, V.S., 2006. *Moscow professors of the XVIII – early XX centuries*. Yanus-K: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [13] Bulakhovsky, L.A., 1987. *Modern Linguistics: To the 100th Anniversary of His Birth*. Naukova Dumka: Kyiv, Ukraine. (in Russian)
- [14] Gvozdev, N.A., 2007. *Modern Russian Literary Language: A Theoretical Course. Part II. Syntax*. URSS (KomKniga): Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [15] Shansky, N.M., Bobrova, T.A., 2001. *Back to the world of words: A manual for a word teacher*. Moscow Branch of the Pedagogical Society of Russia: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [16] Shapiro, A.B., 2005. Some questions of the theory of synonyms (based on the material of the Russian language). *Reports and Communications of the Institute of Linguistics of the USSR Academy of Sciences*. 8, 69–87. (in Russian)
- [17] Tsyganova, V.N., 2006. *Synonymic series (on the material of verbs of the modern Russian language)*. Nauka: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [18] Tlusten, L.S., 1997. *Acquaintance of younger schoolchildren with synonyms*. Academy of Sciences Publishing House: Krasnodar, Russia. (in Russian)
- [19] Barlas, L.G., 1995. *Russian Language*. Nauka: Taganrog, Russia. (in Russian)
- [20] Lagutina, A.V., 1997. Absolute synonyms in the synonymic system of the language. *Nauka: Moscow, Russia*. pp. 121–129. (in Russian)
- [21] Shansky, N.M., 2004. *Lexicology of the Modern Russian Language*. University book: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [22] Kubryakova, E.S., 2010. *Nominative aspect of speech activity*. LIBRO COM: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [23] Popova, Z.D., Sternin, I.A., 2007. *Cognitive linguistics*. AST, Vostok-Zapad: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [24] Schramm, A.N., 2009. *Essays on the semantics of qualitative adjectives*. Nauka: Leningrad, Russia. (in Russian)
- [25] Veselovsky, A.N., 2009. *Historical poetics*. Vysshaya shkola: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [26] Chaley, O.V., 2015. Linguistic and cognitive approaches to the study of synonymy (by the example of English adjectives tasty, delicious). *Philological Sciences. Questions of Theory and Practice*. 1(43), 193–197. (in Russian)
- [27] Mitrofanova, Z.I., 2012. *Cognitive-pragmatic aspect of synonyms and their translation*. Vash Poligraficheskii Partner: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)