

ABOUT THE MEANINGS OF WORDS

Mariana MATEI (BUCIU)

PhD student, University of Craiova (Romania)

Abstract

The article aims to present aspects related to the close relationship between semantics and lexicography, as well as the applied semantics model for semantic, contextual and stylistic analysis and interpretation of some words or groups of related words in terms of meaning. The author notes that, over time, researchers have identified two types of linguistic semantics: paradigmatic or lexical, dealing with the study of lexical units independently of context and syntagmatic semantics, which studies words in context. It is highlighted that at the linguistic level, synonymy is a stylistic-functional problem of use and effect also achieved through use; two lexical invariable units come to act as variants under certain conditions. Artistic language is the one that favors the creation of atypical synonyms through the most unusual movements of meaning, thus accomplishing the updating and semantic dynamics. The semantic, contextual and stylistic analysis model is applied to the language of a realistic objective type, written by Liviu Rebreanu. Although the novelist's style is a gray one, with colorless phrases, with a wide range of contextual synonyms and antonyms, and also with seemingly insignificant terms, new meanings and surprising nuances of the characters' soul experiences are suggested.

Keywords: *analysis, context, stylistic-functional variants, sense movements, semantic dynamics*

Résumé

L'objectif de l'article est de présenter les aspects liés à la relation étroite entre la sémantique et la lexicographie ainsi que le modèle de sémantique appliquée regardant l'analyse et l'interprétation sémantique, contextuelle et stylistique de certains mots ou groupes de mots ayant un sens similaire. L'auteur note que, au fil du temps, les chercheurs ont identifié deux types de sémantique linguistique: paradigmatic ou lexicale, qui traite l'étude des unités lexicales, indépendamment du contexte et la sémantique syntagmatic, celle qui étudie les mots dans le contexte. Il est souligné que sur le plan linguistique, la synonymie représente un problème stylistique-fonctionnel d'utilisation et d'effet; deux unités lexicales invariantes réussissent fonctionner comme des variants dans certaines conditions. Le langage artistique est celui qui favorise la création de synonymes atypiques à travers les mouvements de sens les plus inhabituels, réalisant ainsi la mise à jour et la dynamique sémantique. Le modèle d'analyse sémantique, contextuelle et stylistique est appliquée au langage de type objectif dans un roman réaliste, écrit par Liviu Rebreanu. Même si le style du romancier est gris, avec des

phrases incolores à travers un large éventail de mots, expressions synonymes et antonymes contextuels ainsi que par le poly sémantisme de termes, apparemment insignifiants, de nouvelles significations et de nuances surprenantes des expériences spirituelles des personnages sont suggérées.

Mots-clés: *l'analyse, le contexte, les variants stylistiques-fonctionnelles, le changement de sens, la dynamique sémantique*

Contemporary society is undergoing an acute crisis of communication both vertically and horizontally, caused by a series of social, political, economic, and cultural factors. Those who really have something to say are not heard, and those who hear do not convey anything. Because some of us deeply deprecate this situation, I am trying to rediscover those paths, reinvent the means by which we can achieve a correct and effective communication. On the other hand, the same contemporary society is experiencing a rapid scientific and technological breakthrough with a dynamic rhythm of existence. That is why any Romanian speaker sees himself compelled to keep up with everything that is happening in society and language, to enrich his vocabulary, to acquire the newly emerging terms or to improve his knowledge of the meanings of less used words, which precisely define the phenomena, objects or products of this techno age in which we live. Learning words and learning about words have a place and a well-defined role in perfecting the correct expression of the individual and the communication relations in all fields.

Many lexicological and semantic studies have been written about the lexicons and the semantic relations between the words, these being signed by great Romanian and foreign researchers such as: Ion Coteanu, Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu (1975)¹; Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu (1986)²; Narcisa Forăscu, *Sinonimia ca modalitate de definire în dicționare* (1986)³; Alise Lehmann and François Martin-Berthet (1998)⁴; Vincent Nyckees (1998)⁵ etc.

In my approach, I propose the presentation of the close relationship between semantics and lexicography, the description of the applied semantic model of the semantic analysis and interpretation of semantic, contextual and stylistic interpretation of some groups of words related in point of meaning, the description of the semantic class of synonyms, the presentation of some aspects of synonymy in speech and synonymy in artistic language.

¹ Ion Coteanu, Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu, *Limba română contemporană. Vocabularul*, București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1975.

² Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu, *Structura vocabularului limbii române contemporane. Probleme teoretice și aplicații practice*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1986.

³ Narcisa Forăscu, *Sinonimia ca modalitate de definire în dicționare*, in SCL, an 33, no. 2, 1986, p. 122-128.

⁴ Alise Lehmann, François Martin-Berthet, *Introduction à la lexicologie. Sémantique et morphologie*, Paris, Dunod, Coll. Lettres sup. 1998, 206 p.

⁵ Vincent Nyckees, *La sémantique*, Paris, Belin, 1998, 365 p.

I shall present in a certain manner consecrated ideas from a series of lexicology and semantics studies of famous researchers, as well as some personal contributions regarding the highlighting of some semantic relations between words belonging to both common language and the artistic language of literary texts.

The working method is based on the use of explanatory dictionaries of the Romanian language, the selection and processing of scientific information of lexicological and semantic nature, the indication of the ways of selection and differentiation of some meanings of the words, as well as the ways of delimitation and interpretation of the semantic relations.

Over time, researchers have identified two types of linguistic semantics: paradigmatic or lexical (lexicology of content) dealing with the study of lexical units independently of the context, and establishing relations between them by means of syntactic semi-semantic analysis, the one that studies words in context. The two types of paradigmatic and syntagmatic analysis are ways of separating the lexical-semantic units. By paradigmatic analysis, the delineation of lexical units is done in relation to other units of the system, and by syntagmatic analysis, the lexical units are defined by the combinations with which they are compatible, because the exact interpretation and understanding of a term differs depending on the contexts in which it appears. However, it is necessary to tackle both research methods. In the case of some concrete nouns, their contextual relationships do not change their classification into more paradigms. In any type of communication words are not used in isolation, but they are used together with others, with which they combine, giving rise to messages, utterances, and texts of all kinds. In the usual process of knowing the Romanian lexis, the dictionary is the main accessible educational, normative learning tool. Lexical learning should not be seen as an end in itself, what matters is the way in which the words in dictionaries are used, interpreted, analyzed and updated in various types of texts and contexts. The relationship between dictionary, semantics and texts highlights the interdependence between the learning, use and interpretation of Romanian words. In fact, it is the relationship between what is stable and general in language (existing in dictionaries) and what is dynamic and particular (existing in texts and in speech). If we accept the idea that by using the element that inspires stability, meaning the dictionary, we learn how to use words correctly, we also admit the fact that the semantic relations between words are mobile, open, innovative realities.

The relationship between semantics and lexicography can be seen from two perspectives: the first from the dictionary to the semantic description and the second as the application of results, by indicating some principles of dictionary use. The dictionary should be regarded as a “reading grid”⁶ of the lexicographic definition. The grid is a decoding model for the correct and conscious choice of the words in the definition for the correct updating of the meaning by the speaker in discourses. The relationship

⁶ Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu, *Semantică și lexicografie*, in SCL, 36, no. 5, 1985, p. 364.

between semantics and lexicography is based on the principles of modern semantic analysis. Semantics encompasses all the meanings of the Romanian words. In semantics, the relationship between language and its use (speech) is both a theoretical and practical issue. Both the linguist and the speaker are interested in the vocabulary dynamics. The dynamics of updating the semantics means that any meaning-making can become a new meaning. Observing the dynamics should go beyond the state of the static descriptions of the system and focus on structural semantic research that also focuses on speech, not only on language. It is an orientation towards the practical, applicative side of research. Those who study the dynamics of the meanings of words must operate everything that is valuable from the point of view of theory, making it easy to translate into practice. Illustration can only be done in practice by words that manage to correlate the semantician's interpretation with that of the lexicographer and that of the ordinary speaker. There will be a post structuralism adapted to practice. The speaker makes a lexical purchase with the help of the dictionary, learns a new word by using others. Learning a new word goes beyond the simple reading of the lexicographic definition, based on the relational principle proposed by modern semantics (dealing with the study of words in classes), while the dictionary is limited to sense relations established at the level of the common elements) without insisting on the distinctive features. Lexical learning lies at the limit of scientific (theoretical) and applicative (because it provides guidance in the use of the dictionary). A word like *R endoreic* is defined in the explanatory dictionary as "non-leakage". In the absence of any stylistic or contextual specification, the form of the word could suggest that the term belonged to "medicine" (*endo* meaning *inside*). If the relationship with other geographic terms is not established (because it belongs to this domain), its meaning remains unclear to an uninformed speaker. Therefore semantics for all, of an applicative character, is recommended to be used by both informed and uninformed speakers.

The applicative model proposed by Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu (1986) consists of combining the semantic, contextual and stylistic interpretation of a certain group of words which are related in meaning. The model of analysis is applied to the names of the sound phenomena: *cry, voice, echo, thunder, lightning* from the excerpt "Alone" by C. Hogaș and aims at several objectives. The detailed analysis of the text, using the dictionary, is very useful in school, as a working method. A distinction is made between the denotative and connotative meanings of the terms, the contextual relations, the concrete semantic relations of the classes determined by the words. Modern semantic analysis implies a more comprehensive application than the relation between the given semantic system, as the words appear in dictionaries, and the updating of their meanings in a text or a context. There is a correlation of the data obtained by semantic analysis, useful for the overall stylistic interpretation. Through this applied model of analysis, the interdependence in a text of contextual, semantic and stylistic analysis is highlighted. The author emphasizes that in C. Hogaș's text the mere distinction between denotative

and connotative meaning is not sufficient. Bringing together the data of the contextual, semantic and stylistic analysis, it is concluded that, from the point of view of the stylistic interpretation of the text, the infernal and grandiose image of the storm is created as being that of a natural cataclysm not only by joining the names of the respective sound phenomena, but also by linking the semantic features (as they appear in the dictionary) and the contextual ones. Thus, a kind of sound tower of Babel is suggested at the level of the whole text. Therefore, according to the applied model of the modern semantic analysis, "it is not sufficient to simply relate a given semantic system (of the meanings of the dictionaries) with its updating in a certain context, a limited one though, but it is also necessary to correlate the data obtained by the expected analysis so as to obtain a better understanding not only of the meanings of the words but of the effects they have in a globally interpreted text."⁷

The general orientation towards establishing a correlation between the principles of semantic analysis and the use of dictionaries leads to the analysis of the words within semantic classes. The reading of the dictionary definitions of the polysemantic words raises the issue of sense relations, in which both the elements that realize the cohesion of the meanings and the semantic differences, given by the linguistic or stylistic context, arouse a great interest. Thus, if the meanings are semantically, contextually, stylistically differentiated and are considered independent, it is necessary to analyze the links they have with other words in the determined semantic classes. We deduce that, with regard to the lexicographic definitions of polysemantic terms, viewed from different angles, all the meaningful components matter. The polysemy network is extremely complicated. Every meaning of a word can have closer or remoter synonyms. Thus, polysemantic words differ in their meanings, from which series of synonyms can result, synonyms that are not equivalent to each other. So the series of synonyms is not established between words understood globally, but between their meanings. Each sense is an independent functional unit. Such a word as *good* can be part of classes of different synonyms:

1. good, tasty
2. good, skilled, talented
3. good, generous, merciful, altruistic
4. good, valid
5. good, suitable.

The establishment of these classes of synonyms is done only after the discerning and decoding of the meanings, which must precede the description. In the semantic decoding process, one should not neglect that the meaning of a word may vary depending on the age, region and social environment in which it is used. The emergence of such terms may be due to the influence of the conditions of life and the nature of the social

⁷Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu, *O modalitate de aplicare a semanticii modern în analiza de text*, in SCL, 37, no 1, 1986, p. 4.

relations between the individuals of a community, expressing certain mentalities and social relations. It is the case of the appearance and use of terms for the characterization of people according to their dressing, terms that highlight conflicts between different social groups. Wrong or pejorative words were born outside the social class for which they were used. But when these terms come to be used by people belonging to that social class, they lose their initial sense of irony and get a new, positive sense, as Boris Cazacu (1953). For example, *sans-culotte* (“pantalonar”=townsfolk) came to mean “patriot”. Other terms that correspond to current social reality and have affective value are still used with ironic or contemptuous intent: *burtă-verde* (literally “green belly”) = “bourgeois”, *golan*=ragamuffin (term suggesting total lack of clothing, derived from *gol* meaning “naked, empty”) = “a man without fortune, without any means”⁸.

In terms of synonymy, it is seen either as an equivalence, as a neighborhood, as a kinship or as an identity of meaning, or as a substitution of one word through another in one or more contexts. Usually, when an ordinary person speaks of synonymy, he says that two words have almost the same meaning, which does not bother. But when a scientific description of the phenomenon has to be made, the question arises whether “almost” is the most appropriate term for defining this semantic class. Because the approximation is thought differently and subjectively for the ordinary speaker, the term should be correlated with rigorous, precise principles when it comes to the scientific field. When discussing synonymy, some essential conditions must be met: the words in question are identical in the referent, the reality they call (even if some particular aspects of the referent have to be neglected); the words considered synonymous can be replaced in the context without the overall meaning of the message being changed, these words belonging to the same territorial and stylistic-functional variants of the language. If one or other of these conditions is neglected, we come into the sphere of that “almost” which does not respect the scientific rigor of the definition of synonymy. Depending on whether or not the three conditions are met, synonymy can be defined in two ways. On the one hand, synonymy presupposes the identity of sense, contextual behavior and functional variation of some words, and on the other hand, the synonymous relationship between two words implies the global designation of the same realities, neglecting dialectical, contextual or stylistic-functional differences. We deduce that only the last definition accepts the term “almost”. In fact, the two definitions correspond to the distinction synonymy in the language (system) - synonymy in speech (updating) or theoretical definition - practical definition. Synonymy in the language respects the stated conditions, while synonymy in speech can respect or violate them, the deviation being actually quite large.

Therefore, synonymy is not a static or abstract phenomenon in practice. It is manifested in and through the speech, in concrete communication situations. It is a dynamic element that activates system data by their concrete use during speech.

⁸ Boris Cazacu, *Termeni referitori la port și semnificația lor în cadrul relațiilor sociale* in SCL, IV, 1953, p. 120.

Referring to the synonymy in speech, the authors Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu and Narcisa Forăscu (1988) give as examples the words *periplu* (“periplus”) and *călătorie* (“trip”)⁹. According to the dictionary, *periplus* means “long sea voyage”, and *trip* is “a journey someone makes to a more distant place.” We note that in the case of *trip*, the distance is not specified, as in the case of *periplus*. Due to this difference their synonymy is not possible in contexts like “I made a trip to Bucharest”. But if the other words in the context provide data to fill the missing trait, semantic equalization, synonymy is possible: “He made a long journey through many countries of the world”. Other two terms like *prost* (“stupid”) and *istet* (“smart”) function in Romanian as antonyms, the difference between them being the absence / presence of intelligence. The difference between them can be cancelled by irony. The ironic intent of the speaker favors semantic equalization. So in the context of “Stupid/ smart guy, can’t you see that he is lying to you?”, the two terms can be substituted because the difference between them does not exist anymore because of the irony of the latter. Some words work in different language variants, violating one of the synonymous conditions previously formulated. Even if they refer to the same object, they differ in the stylistic mark that their use implies. And in this case it is interesting to see under what conditions this difference can be reduced. For example, *a scrânti* (“to sprain”) and *a luxa* (“to wrench”), have the same meaning: moving a joint from its place, but they differ by the fact that the former is used in current language and the latter in scientific medical language. It is impossible to use *wrench* in a medical text, because it is dissonant with the stylistic norm of the text. But *wrench* tends to come out of the boundaries of specialized scientific language and to enter into the current language as a synonym for *sprain*.

The condition of a synonymous relationship between two lexical units is the identity of the referent. But this is not enough, because it is just the extra-linguistic field. At the linguistic level, the synonymous relationship exists when two words are interesting in terms of their functionality, i.e. two invariant lexical units, meaning different ones, to act as variants under certain conditions, determined by two factors: the distribution of terms at the dialectal level and their functional stylistic repartition, “because synonymy is a stylistic-functional problem of use and effect also achieved through use”¹⁰. The differences between synonyms do not relate to the semantic sphere, but to the stylistic characteristic, highlighted in the general functional variants, according to various criteria - whether it is an obsolete word, out of use, regional, dialectal, rare, argotic, euphemistic, or ironic. For example, Narcisa Forăscu (1980) showed that within the functional variant composed of the words *buimac*, *năuc*, *beat*, *capiu* (“dizzy”, “dumbfound”, “drunk”, “dotty”) - in which the first two have a denotative meaning and

⁹ Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu, Narcisa Forăscu, *Cuvinte și sensuri*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1988, p. 131.

¹⁰ Narcisa Forăscu, *Probleme ale interpretării stilistice a sinonimelor*, in SCL, 31, no.5, 1980, p. 554.

the last two a connotative meaning, the relationship of synonymy is imperfect¹¹. Another stylistic difference can be the gradual traits, in the case of the words *dumb*, *stupid*, *idiot*. Although they appear in the same synonymous series, *dumb* means less than *stupid*, and *stupid* less than *idiot*. At the level of different functional variants, differences between synonyms are caused by passing a word from one language to another or because a word exceeds the fixed boundaries of a specialized language and enters common language. Thus, in the series *vorbăreț*, *guraliv*, *limbut*, *locvace* (“talkative”, “garrulous”, “gabby”, “voluble”), the word *talkative* has a stylistically neutral character whereas *voluble* has a bookish character. Therefore, after the verification of the synonyms at the semantic level is carried out, their stylistic examination must be carried out, as important resemblances and functional differences can be revealed. Differences are observable both at the level of the same functional variant and in terms of different functional variants. Stylistic features are also important if the semantic opposition between two terms can be canceled, and the two terms may even function as synonyms.

The type of language that favors the most unusual movements of meaning and thus the creation of atypical synonyms is artistic language. Poetic language functions like a context in a broad sense whose first feature is the suggestion of the object rather than its name. Therefore, in the poetic language there are displacements of surprising sense and the obtaining of new semantic values that lead to insoluble synonyms. Poetic language introduces a new perspective of appreciation of objects. If this does not exist, there is no synonymy. Thus, the relationship between words changes into expression and the statement, the text, the context, and the language create conditions leading to the emergence of new synonyms. For example, in the lyrics of Nichita Stănescu (1988): “The young lioness, love /, jumped in front of me / She had been lurking for me in for a long time¹²” (from the poem “Young Lioness, Love”, vol. “A Vision of Feelings”, (1964), although the two words have nothing in common in the current language, the word *lioness* suffers a brave and impressive metaphorical transfer, also supported by the adjective *young*, becoming synonymous with *love*. The mechanism of this shift of meaning is easy to understand, but the synonymy thus obtained no longer exists outside the conjunctive context, it is no longer viable. We can also make the same observation for the noun *shell* in the poem with the same title written by Lucian Blaga (1981): “with a bold smile I see in myself/ and my heart/ I hold in my hand. Trembling/ I hold my treasure at my ear / and I listen/ it seems to me/ that I am holding a shell/in which/ prolonged and incomprehensible/the rumor of an unknown sea is heard”¹³. The word *shell* is decoded in these verses as “the heart” of the poet, thirsty of absolute knowledge, synonymy which becomes possible due to the other elements of the poetic context. Although in this context synonymy is obvious, it cannot be possible in another language,

¹¹ Idem, *ibidem*: 556

¹² Nichita Stănescu, *Poezii*, București, Editura Minerva, 1988, p. 31.

¹³ Lucian Blaga, *Poezii*, București, Editura Minerva, 1981, p. 18.

either usual or scientific, a fact which confirms its accidental character, but also the overwhelming expressive force.

The realistic objective prose is interesting in terms of semantic, contextual and stylistic analysis. It is the case of Liviu Rebreanu's debut novel, "Codrea"(1908)¹⁴, which later became the "The Voice of the Heart", in which the gray, sober, neutral style of the great Transylvanian writer, a style lacking adornment, with colorless sentences, "like sea water held in hand, but which have the black-green tones and the roar of the sea"¹⁵, as George Călinescu (1988) said. The short story "The Voice of the Heart" presents the relationship parents-children from a peasant family whose peace is conditioned by the historical and social circumstances, generating suffering in the soul of the father, on the one hand, but also in the souls of the sons who do not understand the meaning of war, on the other hand. Through a broad series of contextual synonyms and antonyms and by the polysemantism of some terms, nuances of the characters' feelings under the tyranny of the historical, of the ethical and of the social are suggested, which is related to the specificity of Rebreanu's prose.

L. Rebreanu uses the lexical registers according to the social condition of his heroes in the name of truthfulness and authenticity. Taking into account the regional stylistic register specific to the peasants from Transylvania, our attention is drawn to terms such as: *ghiujule* = "old man", (*femei*) *lăptoase* ("milky" women)=with "big breasts", *gogoliri*= "endearments", *aburoasă*= "steamy", etc.

From the first pages of the novel, we notice the sobriety of the notation, the selection of words belonging to an ancient background of hard peasantry, with onomatopoeic resonances and vague rejection feelings, like old Codrea's very heavy thoughts, such as the terms *horcăit* ("snoring") and *hropăit* ("strong snoring") in a synonymous gradual relationship, or the antonymic regionalism *scătrăni* ("to upset") and *opăci* ("to calm down"). The popular term *luleaua* ("pipe"), which denotes the object which is never absent in the life of the peasant, for good and for bad times, appears suggestively in several contexts, its smoke accompanying the character's deep thoughts: "to put the red clay pipe between his teeth", "after dinner he inhaled from the pipe again", "the pipe dropped from his teeth", "releasing thick smoky bubbles".

In spite of the acknowledged poor stylistic adornment of Rebreanu's writing, however, the figurative meaning of some terms is updated in the text (see also the word *fuioare* "bubbles" in the quotation above) in meaningfully constructed contexts, in which, for example, the day and the night, as temporal landmarks of the action of the short story, do not unite, but *join* together in the mysterious fact of the sunset, like human beings with opposing characters belonging to the same family, like Codrea and his wife, he, anxious and dark, and she, calm and sad. There are elements of verbal

¹⁴ Liviu Rebreanu, *Opere I, Nuvele*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1968, p. 3- 10.

¹⁵ George Călinescu, *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent*, București, Editura Minerva, 1988, p.734.

communication in the text-words with figurative meaning, words that show unusual changes of meaning, and gradual quasi synonymous contextual structures - accompanied by suggestive nonverbal elements that suggest Codrea's restlessness and nervousness, worried about his sons running away from the army:

a. participles – *se ridică înțepat* / “he gets upright” (‘offended’), *se uită îngâmfat la babă* / “staring upright at the old woman” (‘nervous’)

b. gerunds (Romanian “gerunziu”) - *buzelei se mișcă ținând, bodogănd* / “his lips are moving, screaming” (‘muttering’)

c. verbs in personal moods: indicative, conditional-optative and conjunctive (synonymous with *a vorbi* / “to speak”, in different ways and degrees): *gemea* / “he was moaning”, *ar bolborosi ceva* / “he would mumble something”, *gâlgâi răgușit* / “he puffed hoarsely”, *să se sfărâme el din gură* / “to break out of his mouth”, *să hăpâiască până s-o sătura* / “to keep taking until he tires” (‘to speak a lot’), *mustățile moșneagului se zvârcoliră fioros* / “the old man’s mustaches scowled wildly”, *urla* / “(he) was screaming”.

With all these qualities and actions that characterize the old man (annoyance, nervousness, loquacity) and others that are targeted at his wife, Firoana, he establishes an opposition relationship, even antonymy (suffering, calmness, silence): *he does not utter a word, she did not fight him back, tears were flooding her, she was wasting her days, cold spears passed through her heart.*

In the end, however, the old woman's suffering and calm flooded over the old man's heart after Ionica's departure: *her pain and her mute love softened him; in the darkness of his troubled night there was a great, unmistakable change, he became silent.*

One can notice how the terms of the rural universe and nature are used in some contexts with a new, figurative meaning, for example in the portrayal of the old man: *furrow/furrows* and *groups* = “wrinkles” (many and deep), *peak* (in the dictionary of regionalisms, the Romanian word *opcina* means “the top of the hill”) = “cheek”, *rosy* = “blushed”(cheeks), *thicket* = “clump” (of hairs), *hoar-frost* = “white hair”, *drops* = “tears”, *to become wet* (in the dictionary, the meaning of *a se răveni* is “to moisten” in relation to the earth) = “to enliven”, “to be energetic”.

The polysemy of the word *vremea* (“weather”, “time”) is used in the text as well: *the harshness of the weather* (“the trials of life”), *the weather confuses the lapses of memories and wraps them to its liking* (“the past time”), *a favorable warmth envelops him when he thinks of those times* (“the distant times of youth”), *the obstacles of time* (“irreversible/ limited time of the human being”).

In the examples analyzed, we have illustrated the various types of differences that condition the relation of polysemy, synonymy or antonymy, but which can be violated in use. Any deviation from the rules of the system is a mistake, except when the deviation is consciously made, and when it has the intent to achieve a certain effect. The awareness of the similarities and differences of any kind is the condition of a correct use of the vocabulary, of its dynamization process and its updating. By updating, we actually

understand two things: first of all, constructing sentences in which compliance with the rules of the language system is mandatory in order to have a correct communication, and secondly, uses (poetic contexts) involving the violation of these restrictions, so as to have expressive communication, in which case we move away from the rigors of the system. But even in the latter case, it is mandatory to observe certain minimal rules so that understanding and communication are possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, *Semantică și lexicografie*, in SCL, 36, nr.5, 1985, p.364- 368.
- Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, *Structura vocabularului limbii române contemporane. Probleme teoretice și aplicații practice*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1986.
- Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, *O modalitate de aplicare a semanticii modern în analiza de text*, in SCL, 37, nr.1, 1986, p.3- 8.
- Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela; Forăscu, Narcisa, *Cuvinte și sensuri*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1988.
- Cazacu, Boris, *Termeni referitori la port și semnificația lor în cadrul relațiilor sociale*, in SCL, IV, 1953, p. 99-137.
- Călinescu, G., *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent*, București, Editura Minerva, 1988.
- Coteanu, Ion; Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, *Limba română contemporană. Vocabularul*, București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1975.
- Forăscu, Narcisa, *Probleme ale interpretării stilistice a sinonimelor*, in SCL, 31, nr.5, 1980, p. 553- 557.
- Forăscu, Narcisa, *Sinonimia ca modalitate de definire în dicționare*, in SCL, 33, nr. 2, 1986, p. 122-128.
- Lehmann, Alise; Martin-Berthet, François, *Introduction à la lexicologie. Sémantique et morphologie*, Paris, Dunod, Coll. Lettres sup., 1998.
- Nyckees, Vincent, *La sémantique*, Paris, Belin, 1998.

SOURCES

- Bлага, Lucian, *Poezii*, București, Editura Minerva, 1981.
- Stănescu, Nichita, *Poezii*, București, Editura Minerva, 1988.
- Rebreanu, Liviu, *Opere I, Nuvele*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1968, p. 3-10.