



Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi

The Journal of International Social Research

Cilt: 10 Sayı: 50 Volume: 10 Issue: 50

Haziran 2017 June 2017

www.sosyalarastirmalar.com Issn: 1307-9581

## A CORPUS-BASED APPROACH TO DICTIONARY DEFINITIONS IN THE INTERFACE OF SEMANTIC PROSODY AND NEAR-SYNONYMY

Abdurrahman KARA\*

### Abstract

Corpus-based dictionary entries, which are based on authentic and representative language usage, provide us with comprehensive, indisputable and up-to-date definitions. Setting off from the assumption that collocational behavior and semantic prosody contribute greatly to objective definitions, meaning sequence, exemplification and nuances, the study investigated the overall semantic frame of the allegedly near-synonymous words '*örgüt, kurum, kuruluş, teşkilat, şebeke*' (all denoting a certain sense of *institution*) as suggested by the Turkish Language Association-Grand Turkish Dictionary and the Contemporary Turkish Dictionary. Findings gathered from the Turkish National Corpus suggested that the negative semantic prosody assumed by the word *örgüt* was ignored in the dictionaries and also there were deficiencies in the definition and exemplification processes. Other than that, *kurum, kuruluş* and *teşkilat* were observed to center around the semantic preference of 'bureaucratic/administrative formation' but there also deficiencies in terms of meaning sequence. The dictionaries also seemed to neglect the 'infrastructure' semantic preference of the word *şebeke* in the definition process. In short, in the light of corpus-based findings, the study suggests additional definitions and recommendations in the sequence of meaning entries.

**Keywords:** Semantic Prosody, Semantic Preference, Turkish National Corpus, TDK Grand Turkish Dictionary, TDK Contemporary Turkish Dictionary.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Corpora provide a systematic, reliable and consistent data infrastructure for linguistic analyses in that they exhibit real-time, authentic and representative language usage. Accordingly, corpus-based dictionary entries, which are based on comprehensive and clear definitions, are considered to provide advantage for phraseology and lexicography studies. Language users frequently come across with these near-synonymous word sets both in daily life and in these definition processes. As near-synonymous words assume certain associative meaning; nuances of meaning; attitudinal, stylistic and structural differences besides their dictionary meaning (Cruse, 1986:278), near-synonymous word sets may pose difficulties for language users and specifically for foreign language learners.

In daily life, language users have to pick up specific lexical items between choices which are provided by context or their own mental lexicon, either consciously or unconsciously. This process may be more complicated for near-synonymous words in terms of nuances and collocational restrictions. In other words, in order to choose the most contextually and the most communicatively appropriate word, language users are expected to choose from a variety of options and limitations. In such optional cases, relying merely on introspection may not yield correct choices. At this point, where introspection seems to be inadequate for the correct choice, concordance lines, frequency lists and distribution values are likely to give critical information about those nearly-synonymous word sets (Chief et al., 2000:47).

According to Sinclair, "many lexical items tend to occur in certain semantic frames" (1991:112). In this respect, corpus evidence constitute an invaluable infrastructure for language users in disambiguating meaning between synonymous pairs and to observe the structural difference between them. Xiao and McEnery (2006:103) maintain that introspection may count inadequate or even misleading in identifying the semantic prosody and collocational structures. For this reason, we need highly representative corpora and concordance lines in order to identify the semantic frame of specific lexical items and near-synonymous words to be included in dictionary definitions.

This study aims to identify the characteristic semantic prosody frame of '*örgüt, şebeke, kurum, kuruluş, teşkilat*' (all denoting *institution*) in the Turkish National corpus, which are depicted as synonymous in the definitions of Turkish Language Association-Grand Turkish Dictionary and the Contemporary Turkish

\* Res. Asst. Dr., Erciyes University, Faculty of Letters, Department of English Language and Literature.

Dictionary, and to investigate whether or not these national dictionaries employ properly the nuances arising from that semantic prosody frame.

The study intends to answer the following questions:

1. What are the characteristic collocational behaviors of the words '*örgüt, şebeke, kurum, kuruluş, teşkilat*'?
2. What kind of semantic prosody and/or semantic preference do these nearly-synonymous words exhibit?
3. To what extent do the definitions in the Turkish Language Association-Grand Turkish Dictionary and the Contemporary Turkish Dictionary employ the critical features in questions 1 and 2?

## 2. THE THEORETICAL FRAME

The three concepts, collocation, denoting words frequently used together; semantic prosody, arising from the collocational relationships and denoting negative, neutral and positive meanings; and semantic preference, standing out as the meaning category shared by the frequent collocates of a key word, establish the theoretical framework for the identification of the nuances stemming from the differences of use of the near-synonymous words.

The term collocation was first used by Firth in linguistic analyses to denote "the habitual and conventional places of words" (1968: 181). To put it in other words, collocation exhibits the state of lexical items which are characteristically used together. According to Hoey, "for collocation to occur, word should be strongly used together beyond random probability" (1991: 6-7). In addition, Xiao and McEnery (2006:126) state that nearly-synonymous words may be difficult for foreign language learners regarding the collocational restrictions, the different semantic prosodies and the similar dictionary meanings.

As we progress from the structural feature of collocation to meaning, the semantic relationship between the key word and its collocates and also the relationship among the collocates themselves become clearer (Stubbs, 2002:225). In this context, Louw (2005:57) defines semantic prosody as 'the meaning arising from the interaction between a key word and its typical collocate words'. Thus, both individual words and also phrases may have semantic prosody in order to reflect attitudes and evaluations of language users. Partington (2004:133) categorizes semantic prosody under three groups, namely, positive semantic prosody to denote favorable affective meaning; negative semantic prosody to denote unfavorable affective meaning; and neutral semantic prosody in which a context does not give any negative or positive clue in terms of affective meaning. The following are some examples taken from the relevant literature:

	<i>Negative Semantic Prosody</i>	<i>Positive Semantic Prosody</i>
Sinclair (1991)	'break out; happen'	
Louw (1993)	'end up Ving'	'build up (trans.)'
Stubbs (1996)	'cause; signs of'	'provide'

Stubbs (1996:174-176), for instance, has shown that the word *cause* has its most frequent collocates as 'accident, concern, damage, death, trouble etc.' to assume a negative semantic prosody.

Considering the collocational relationships and the semantic prosody, it is a fact that the introspection of language users may prove insufficient in describing these two structural and semantic phenomena. Hence, the concordance lines in any representative corpora provide us with invaluable data about collocational behaviors and for disambiguating semantic prosody.

Another concept related to semantic prosody is semantic preference. In its simple sense, semantic preference is the common meaning categories shared by a key word and its most frequent collocates (Partington, 2004:150). In other words, the collocates establish a common meaning category or they share a common semantic feature (Stubbs, 2002:4). For instance, the English word *large* typically collocates with 'number, scale, part, amounts, quantities etc.' and therefore all of these collocates are included in the same semantic category, namely the semantic preference of 'quantity, size, magnitude'.

Although they share seemingly similar cognitive and lexicographic definitions, near-synonymous word sets have inherent collocational restrictions and nuances in terms of semantic prosody, and also they may not be used interchangeably all the time (Partington, 1998:30-32; Di Marco et al., 1993:121; Doğan, 2011:84-85). Additionally, near-synonymous words may have differences in terms of associative meaning, implication, emphasis, style, attitude and collocational behavior. Cruse (1986:265-291) classifies these features into four groups and the corresponding Turkish instances are as follows:

- a. Differences in terms of dictionary meaning  
Emphasis: *pahalı* vs *fahiş*  
Abstract feature (liquidity): *akmak* vs *damlamak*
- b. Stylistic differences

Power: öldürmek vs etkisiz hale getirmek

Formality: davet etmek vs çağırarak

c. Expressive differences

Attitude: cılız vs zayıf vs fit

d. Structural differences

Selective: rahmetli olmak vs ölmek

Collocation: gönül vs kalp vs yürek (\*ritmik gönül atışı)

Based on the assumption that the dictionary definitions that are not corpus-based may be inadequate in terms of a. collocational outputs, b. exemplifications, c. meaning sequence, and d. nuances of meaning, the present study will investigate the possible semantic and collocational features of the near-synonymous words '*örgüt, şebeke, kurum, kuruluş, teşkilat*'.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

In the first phase of the study, collocation lists of the near-synonymous words '*örgüt, şebeke, kurum, kuruluş, teşkilat*' were generated using the Turkish National Corpus (Aksan et al., 2012). The joker character (örgüt\*) was employed for a comprehensive in-context search to include the variants of each word. The resulting concordance lists were restructured in the form of +/- 5 left and right context.

Taking into consideration the mutual information scores, the final lists were limited to MIs=3 and above, and then the resulting values were sequenced from the highest value to the lowest. The collocates with a mutual information score of 3 and above form a powerful link to the key word and this value is higher than chance factor.

In the second phase, collocates with a strong mutual information score were classified according to their semantic prosodies as positive, negative and neutral. In the third and last phase, a similar process was employed to identify the specific semantic preferences. In simpler terms, the second and third phases comprised of selecting the semantic prosodies and semantic preferences of each target item.

### 4. FINDINGS

#### 4.1. Örgüt

Turkish Language Association-Grand Turkish Dictionary defines the word *örgüt* as follows:

Örgüt. 1. Ortak bir amacı veya işi gerçekleştirmek için bir araya gelmiş kurumların veya kişilerin oluşturduğu birlik, teşekkül, teşkilat: Örgütteki dosyası çoktan dürülmüştü. -T. Buğra. 2. Bir kuruluşa bağlı alt bölümlerin bütünü.

The Contemporary Turkish Dictionary includes the following expressions as the collocates of *örgüt*: '*örgüt kültürü, adalet örgütü, sivil toplum örgütü*'.

The lemmatized search of the key word *örgüt* and the alignment of the collocation lists according to mutual information scores, from the highest value to the lowest value, resulted mostly in words with negative semantic prosody, such as '*mafyavari, bölücü, illegal, ETA, militan, yasadışı, Hizbullah, Dev-sol, Dhkp-c, (El) Kaide, ayrılıkçı, PKK, suç, saldırı, silahlı, çatışma*'. On the other hand, the same list, from the highest to the lowest MI scores, yielded words denoting bureaucratic and hierarchical structuring such as '*sivil, toplum, uluslararası, siyasal, devlet, parti, yönetim, ekonomik, sosyal, kitle, işbirliği*'. Words with strong collocational ties in the list exhibit the following semantic prosody and semantic preference as seen below.

**Table 1.** The semantic prosody and semantic preference of the word *örgüt*

Semantic prosody/ Semantic preference	Positive	Neutral	Negative
	24	610	78
	-beneficial for society	-bureaucratic and administrative	-illegal
	-legal	-has a common aim	-destructive, anti-system
	-constructive	-hierarchical and systematic	-not wanted by the society

In accordance with the corpus-based analysis of the semantic frame of *örgüt*, the word comprises both the neutral 'bureaucratic/administrative structuring' and the negative 'illegal/destructive/anti-system' in terms of collocational behavior. When compared with the dictionaries of Turkish Language Association, these negative semantic properties seem to be ignored both in the definition and exemplification processes. In addition, the exemplary idiomatic expression '*dosyası dürülmek*' in the dictionary is neither explanatory nor comprehensive enough. In addition, we consider that the definition in the Turkish Language Association dictionaries would be more illustrative and representative if the expression 'legal or illegal' is inserted into it, denoting both the positive and the negative semantic prosody. We also suggest that the following corpus-based collocations '*terör örgütü, suç örgütü, Dünya Sağlık Örgütü, parti örgütü*' would be stronger in association and more exemplary in addition to the ones in The Contemporary Turkish Dictionary.

Besides these corpus-based findings, the definition task performed by 30 participants in the English Language and Literature Department, Erciyes University, revealed that the great majority of participants

ignored the negative semantic prosody in their personal introspective definitions of the term. Of the 30 participants, while only 4 elaborated the 'legal/illegal' distinction, the 24 focused on 'common aim, being organized, group' semantic preference. As clearly seen, even native speakers may ignore some aspects of semantic prosody in definition tasks.

#### 4.2. Şebeke

Turkish Language Association-Grand Turkish Dictionary defines the word *şebeke* as follows:

Şebeke. 1. Ülke çapında yaygınlaştırılmış ulaşım ve iletişim örgüsü, ağ. 2. Üniversite öğrencilerinin kimlik kartı. 3. Birbiriyle bağlantılı ve gizli çalışan kimselerin tümü: Bütün dünyaya eroin gönderen geniş bir şebekenin peşindeydiler. -R. Enis.

The Contemporary Turkish Dictionary does not include any collocation for *şebeke*.

The lemmatized search of the key word *şebeke* and the alignment of the collocation lists according to mutual information scores, from the highest value to the lowest value, resulted mostly in collocates with neutral semantic prosody and denoting communication, transportation and infrastructure, such as 'santral, operatör, abone, bant, frekans, terminal, devre, kanalizasyon, tesisat, doğalgaz, sulama'. Additionally, the list also yielded collocates with negative semantic prosody such as 'neonazi, fuhuş, rüşvet, organize, suç, ispiyon, çökertildi, sabotaj, elebaşı, kaçakçı, dolandırıcı, sahtecilik, casusluk, çeteler', which constitute the semantic preference 'secret, illegal, harmful groups'. Words with strong collocational ties in the list exhibit the following semantic prosody and semantic preference as seen below.

**Table 2.** The semantic prosody and semantic preference of the word *şebeke*

Semantic prosody/ Semantic preference	Positive	Neutral	Negative
	2	711	25
	-to lead	-network of communication, transportation and infrastructure	-illegal, harmful, secret and organized groups

In the light of the corpus-based findings, the word *şebeke* comprises two basic semantic preferences, namely 'network of communication, transportation or infrastructure' and 'illegal, secret, harmful groups'. Most importantly, a thorough analysis shows that the definitions in the Turkish Language Association dictionaries seem to ignore some of the most frequent collocates of *şebeke* such as 'irrigation, natural gas, installation' which combine under the 'infrastructure' semantic preference. Additionally, the third definition does not explicitly reflect the semantic frame of 'illegal, harmful, secret groups' which is extracted from the corpus evidence. For this reason the expression 'birbiriyle bağlantılı ve gizli çalışan' in the original (third) definition is associatively inadequate in terms of the negative semantic prosody. However, the dictionary offers an appropriate example such as *eroin şebekesi*, corresponding to that negative semantic prosody.

Regarding the meaning sequence in the dictionaries, the word *şebeke* corresponding to the second meaning 'university identity card' occurs only once throughout the corpus. Accordingly, the findings of the study suggest that the second meaning of the word *şebeke*, which now seems old-fashioned, should proceed to the third place in sequence. The only instance of the second meaning is seen below.

...1968 tarihli sayfası bu kısa cümlelerle başlıyor. Hemen ardından da "Kapıda şebeke kontrolü...  
Üniversite bahçesi... Her yerde bildiriler...

Finally, the following corpus-based collocates are suggested for the term *şebeke*: 'telefon şebekesi, gsm şebekesi, elektrik şebekesi, sulama şebekesi, kanalizasyon şebekesi, uyuşturucu şebekesi, suç şebekesi, fuhuş şebekesi'.

#### 4.3. Teşkilat

Turkish Language Association-Grand Turkish Dictionary defines the word *teşkilat* as follows:

Teşkilat. a. Örgüt: Bu yüzden teşkilatı kendi çıkarları için kullanmaya tenezzül etmedi. İ. O. Anar.

The Contemporary Turkish Dictionary includes the following expressions as the collocates of *teşkilat*: 'adliye teşkilatı, belediye teşkilatı'.

The key-word search indicated that the word *teşkilat* most strongly collocated with such words as 'devlet, planlama, polis, merkez, parti, genel, emniyet, milli, istihbarat, güvenlik, yönetim, eğitim, bakanlık, görev, başkan' in the concordance lines. Remarkably, the word *teşkilat* has few negative semantic prosody in number compared to the words *örgüt* and *şebeke* and most of the usages center around a neutral semantic prosody. Words with strong collocational ties in the list exhibit the following semantic prosody and semantic preference as seen below.

**Table 3.** The semantic prosody and semantic preference of the word *teşkilat*

Semantic prosody/ Semantic preference	Positive	Neutral	Negative
	0	711	7
		-related to the state/government -has a common aim -hierarchical and systematic -bureaucratic and administrative	-illegal and secret

The analysis of the corpus-based collocational lists and the resulting semantic prosody/preference indicated that the word *teşkilat* is identified to denote mainly 'state affairs and/or political/bureaucratic formation' different from the word *örgüt*. In this respect, the negative affective-connotational meaning of *teşkilat* remains rather weak and thus in the background. The dictionary definition depicts the words *teşkilat* and *örgüt* as near-synonyms and it is seen that the exemplary sentence is not explanatory enough. Interestingly, in cases in which *teşkilat* and *örgüt* are used spontaneously in the same sentence, contrary to the synonymy claims in the dictionary, the two words cannot be used interchangeably due to semantic prosody and semantic preference restrictions, as seen below.

...FHT adlı örgütün teşkilatımız bünyesinde özellikle Polis Akademisi, Polis Koleji, Polis Okulları gibi Eğitim ve Öğretim Kurumlarında örgütlendiği...

... Hükümet (özellikle de söz konusu dönemde Hükümetin bileşeni olan DYP) ve emniyet teşkilatı ile yakın bağlantısı olan örgütün devletin izlediği resmî politikaların "önünü açmak" için faaliyette bulunduğu anlaşılmıştır...

... Örgütün, Fransız İç İstihbarat Teşkilatı(DST) ile ilişki içerisinde olduklarını ifşa etmesi ve ...

We suggest that the collocational sets derived from the corpus 'devlet planlama teşkilatı, polis teşkilatı, emniyet teşkilatı, sağlık teşkilatı, parti teşkilatı' would reflect a more appropriate picture of the semantic prosody and semantic preference of the word *teşkilat* and therefore they should be both included and added to the ones in The Contemporary Turkish Dictionary.

#### 4.4. Kurum

Turkish Language Association-Grand Turkish Dictionary defines the word *kurum* as follows:

Kurum 1. Ocak başlarında biriken veya çevrede savrulan kalın is: Vapur dumanı ve baca kurumuyla kapkara olan saçlarımla yastığı kirletmek istemiyorum. –Halikarnas Balıkcısı

2. Evlilik, aile, ortaklık, mülkiyet gibi köklü bir yapıyı içeren, genellikle devlet ile ilişkisi olan yapı veya birlik, müessese: Türk Dil Kurumu.

3. Kendini büyük ve önemli gösterme davranışı, büyülenme, azamet, tekebbür: Sokakta bir sadrazam kurumu ile yürür. H. E. Adıvar.

The Contemporary Turkish Dictionary includes the following expressions as the collocates of *kurum*: 'eğitim kurumu, kamu kurumu'.

The key-word search indicated that the word *kurum* most strongly collocated with such words as 'kamu, sigortalar, SGK, personel, yurtlar, mükellefler, radyo-televizyon, vergi, finans, öğretim, kredi, piyasa, adli, standart, yönetmelik'. The analysis of the lists also showed that, as in the case of *teşkilat*, the great majority of the collocates of the word *kurum* is related to 'state/government affairs'. From this point of view, most of the collocates are used with a neutral semantic prosody. The semantic frame of the word *kurum* is as follows.

**Table 4.** The semantic prosody and semantic preference of the word *kurum*

Semantic prosody/ Semantic preference	Positive	Neutral	Negative
	0	716	0
		-related to the state/government	
		-has a common aim	
		-hierarchical and systematic	
		-bureaucratic and administrative	

The data obtained from the collocational lists indicated that, contrary to the negative semantic prosody suggested by the words *örgüt*, *şebeke*, and *teşkilat*, the collocates of the word *kurum* completely take on a neutral semantic prosody in the semantic frame of being related to state affairs. Regarding this, the definition 'genellikle devletle ilişkisi olma (relating to state affairs in general)' in the second meaning of *kurum* corresponds to our corpus-based finding and the nuance is clearly given in the definition process by the dictionary.

In terms of meaning sequence, the corpus-based findings and usage frequencies dictate that the second definition should be moved to the first place simply because the first meaning seems old-fashioned according to concordance lines. The first meaning of *kurum* 'baca isı (soot)' was not retrieved in the corpus. In addition to the collocates of *kurum*, the corpus findings suggest the following as more appropriate collocates: 'Türk Dil Kurumu, Telekomünikasyon Kurumu, Sosyal Hizmetler ve Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu, Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu'.

As a final point, the second meaning of the word *örgüt* 'bir kuruluşa bağlı alt bölümlerin bütünü (the sub-sections of an institution)' is given in the structure of *kurum*:

... Örgüt Yapısı: Kurumun organları; Genel Kurul, Yönetim Kurulu ve Genel Müdürlüktür...

...Rekabet Kurumu'nun örgütü içinde yer alan 'Rekabet Kurulu' kurumun karar organı olup...

... Türkiye Birlik Partisi'nin yurtdışı örgütü olan bu kurum kendini feshetti...

#### 4.5. Kuruluş

Turkish Language Association-Grand Turkish Dictionary defines the word *kuruluş* as follows:

*Kuruluş* 1. Kurulma işi: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kuruluşu 1923'tedir. 2. Topluma hizmet, üretim, tüketim vb amaç ve görevlerle kurulan her şey, kurum, tesis: Hastaneler, okullar, bankalar, fabrikalar birer kuruluştur. 3. Yapı, yapılış, bünye 4. Kasılma 5. Bir sefer kuvvetini oluşturan birliklerin birliği.

The Contemporary Turkish Dictionary includes the following expressions as the collocates of *kuruluş*: 'kuruluşlar bütünü, sanayi kuruluşu, sivil toplum kuruluşu'.

The key-word search indicated that some of the words that most strongly collocated with *kuruluş* are 'derecelendirme, düşünce, egm, stk, akredite, kanunlarında, rating, iso, finans, gönüllü, kamu, denetim, danışmanlık'. As in the case of *kurum* and *teşkilat*, the majority of the collocates of the word *kuruluş* also centered around being 'related to state/bureaucratic affairs' and thus it greatly tends to take on a neutral semantic prosody. The semantic frame of *kuruluş* is seen below.

**Table 5.** The semantic prosody and semantic preference of the word *kuruluş*

Semantic prosody/ Semantic preference	Positive	Neutral	Negative
	4	711	0
-quality		-related to the state -has a common aim -hierarchical and systematic -bureaucratic and administrative	

The corpus evidence suggest that the phrase 'her şey (everything)' involved in the second definition is too broad and thus it should be restricted considering the semantic prosody and semantic preference of *kuruluş*, and also it should be redefined in line with the semantic preference 'related to state; bureaucratic/administrative'. Additionally, the sequence of meaning 1 'kurulma işi (the act of forming)' and meaning 2 '*kurum* (institution)' should be revised after an analysis of the usage frequencies.

In addition to the collocations given by the dictionary, the study suggest that the following collocations would be more representative, such as 'kamu kuruluşu, düşünce kuruluşu, insani yardım kuruluşu, kredi derecelendirme kuruluşu'.

#### 5. CONCLUSION

Corpus-based dictionaries, compared to traditional dictionaries, give more details and comprehensive information about collocation, colligation and semantic prosody (Pan and Feng, 2003:361). This study investigated the typical collocational behaviors of the allegedly near-synonymous words *örgüt*, *kurum*, *kuruluş*, *teşkilat* and *şebeke*; and resulting from this structural feature, the corresponding semantic prosodies and semantic preferences were evaluated.

The resulting semantic frame for the above-mentioned near-synonymous words are summarized in Figure 1 below.

**Figure 1.** The overall semantic framework of *örgüt*, *şebeke*, *teşkilat*, *kurum* and *kuruluş*

	Semantic prosody	<i>örgüt</i>	<i>şebeke</i>	<i>teşkilat</i>	<i>kurum</i>	<i>kuruluş</i>
negative	Illegal and secret	✓	✓	x	x	x
neutral	Has a common aim	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Hierarchical and systematic	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Related to state/government	✓ / x	x	✓	✓	✓
positive	Compliance with laws	✓ / x	x	✓	✓	✓

The word *örgüt* stands out with its negative connotational features such as 'illegal, destructive, anti-system' as well as its semantic preference 'bureaucratic/administrative structure'. However, the study revealed deficiencies in terms of description, semantic prosody and exemplary collocations in Turkish Language Association-Grand Turkish Dictionary and the Contemporary Turkish Dictionary. In a similar vein, the dictionaries seem to have ignored the negative semantic prosody and collocations of *şebeke*, and most importantly there seems to be irregularities in meaning sequences for the same word, that is an old-fashioned meaning is used in the first place. The words *teşkilat*, *kurum*, and *kuruluş*, contrary to *örgüt* and *şebeke*, are mainly used with a neutral semantic prosody, in other words, these three words do not assume negativity and they center around the semantic preference of 'related to state/government; bureaucratic formation'. The deficiencies encountered in the above-mentioned dictionaries are of two types, namely pre-definition mistakes (up-to-dateness) and in-definition mistakes (definition, exemplification and meaning sequence), as suggested by Usta (2006:227-232).

Analyses of the concordance lines revealed that each lexical item in the scope of the study might exhibit various semantic features, and in this way, they could assume different semantic prosodies. As

Sinclair (2004:30) and Partington (2004:150-153) indicates, meaning belongs to a unit larger than a lexical item. In this case, as we came across in the usage of *örgüt*, the negative semantic prosody comes into existence as a result of the interaction between two or more words.

To sum up, with reference to the fact that there are restrictions on the interchangeability of near-synonymous words, language users should pay attention to using appropriate lexical items in corresponding contexts, and in order to avoid communication failures, corpus-based dictionaries and language materials should provide relevant nuances and information about semantic prosody/preference, stylistic features and collocational behaviors.

#### REFERENCES

- AKSAN, Yeşim et al (2012). "Construction of the Turkish National Corpus (TNC)". In N. Calzolari, (Ed.). *Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*, pp. 3223-3227. İstanbul, Türkiye.
- CHIEF, L. Cheng et al (2000). "What can near synonyms tell us?", *Computational Linguistics and Chinese Language Processing*, Vol.5, No.1, pp. 47-60.
- CRUSE, D. Alan. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. CUP.
- DIMARCO, Chrysanne, HIRST, Graeme and STEDE, Mamfred. (1993). "The semantic and stylistic differentiation of synonyms and near-synonyms". In B. Dorr (Ed.). *AAAI Spring Symposium on Building Lexicons for Machine Translation*, pp. 114-121, CA: Stanford.
- DOĞAN, Nuh (2011). "Türkiye Türkçesi Fiillerinde Eş Anlamlılık". *The Journal of International Social Research*. Vol.4, No. 19, pp. 78-88.
- FIRTH, J. Rupert (1968). "A synopsis of linguistic theory 1930-1955". In Palmer, F. R. (Ed.). *Selected Papers of J. R. Firth 1952-59*, pp. 1-32. Bloomington: IUP.
- HOEY, Michael (1991). *Pattern of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: OUP.
- LOUW, Bill (1993). "Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies". In M. Baker, G. Francis, and E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds). *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*, pp. 157-176. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- LOUW, Bill (2000). "Contextual prosodic theory: Bringing semantic prosodies to life". In Heffer, C., H. Sauston, and G. Fox (Eds.). *Words in Context: A Tribute to John Sinclair on his Retirement*, pp. 41-55. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- PAN, Fan and FENG, Yue-Jin (2003). "Corpus-based analysis of semantic prosody and its applications". *Contemporary Linguistics*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 359-366.
- PARTINGTON, Alan (1998). *Patterns and Meanings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- PARTINGTON, Alan (2004). "Utterly content in each other's company: semantic prosody and semantic preference". *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, Vol. 9, No.1, pp. 131-156.
- SINCLAIR, John (1991). *Corpus, concordance, and collocation*. Oxford: OUP.
- SINCLAIR, John (2004). *Trust the Text: Language, Corpus and Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- STUBBS, Michael (1996). *Text and Corpus Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- STUBBS, Michael (2002). "Two quantitative methods of studying phraseology in English". *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*. Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 215-244.
- USTA, H. İbrahim (2006). "Türkçe Sözlük Hazırlamada Yöntem Sorunları". *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*. Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 223-242.
- XIAO, Richard and MCENERY, Tom (2006). "Collocation, Semantic Prosody, and Near Synonymy: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective". *Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 103-129.