

Samira MUSAVI,

orcid.org/0000-0002-9358-8303

PhD student at the Department of General Linguistics

Azerbaijan University of Languages

(Baku, Azerbaijan) rus_rahimli@yahoo.com

VERBALIZATION OF BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE WITH LEXICAL REPETITIONS

The phenomenon of repetition actually exists in language. The general concept of repetition can be defined as the repetition of separate elements of the language (glossems) – sounds, morphological parts of the word, words and syntactic constructions. Accordingly, it is possible to say that there is a whole system of repetitions in the language: sound repetition, morphological repetition, lexical repetition, syntactic repetition. Thus, the place of lexical repetition in the general repetition system is determined. More or less research work has been carried out on syntactic and morphological, as well as phonetic repetitions in Azerbaijani linguistics. But lexical repetitions have not yet attracted attention. However, in our language, such repetitions are very widespread and have rich features. All types of repetition that will be discussed here are related to grammatical events and the sentence structure of the Azerbaijani language. We would like to pay particular attention to the words “sentence structure” (also “sentence structure”). Because sometimes “lexical repetition” means that two expressions (sentences, phrases) have the same structure or the phenomenon of syntactic parallelism. However, lexical parallelism is more of a stylistic phenomenon than a grammatical one. One of the verbalization ways of background knowledge is the use of constructions with lexical repetitions. In theory, background knowledge can be described on the basis of three tandems:

- Extralinguistic and metadyl knowledge*
- Descriptive and prescriptive*
- General and local knowledge*

The first one of these tandems deals with either extralinguistic factors in reality or linguistic conventions, the latter concerns with either statistic norms based on inductive generalizations or normative imaginations. The third one deals with the scope of information or its importance for the speaker of a given language. Interpretations of the texts can be realized not only with linguistic knowledge, but also extralinguistic and contextual knowledge.

Key words: *lexical repetitions, tautological, descriptive, prescriptive, background knowledge, addresser, addresat.*

Саміра МУСАВІ,

orcid.org/0000-0002-9358-8303

аспірант кафедри загального мовознавства

Азербайджанського університету мов

(Баку, Азербайджан) rus_rahimli@yahoo.com

ВЕРБАЛІЗАЦІЯ ДОПОМОГИ З ЛЕКСИЧНИМИ ПОВТОРАМИ

Явище повтору реально існує в мові. Загальне поняття повтору можна визначити як повторення окремих елементів мови (гlosem) – звуків, морфологічних частин слова, слів, синтаксичних конструкцій. Відповідно до цього можна сказати, що в мові існує ціла система повторів: звуковий повтор, морфологічний повтор, лексичний повтор, синтаксичний повтор. Таким чином, визначається місце лексичного повтору в загальній системі повторів. В азербайджанському мовознавстві проведено більш-менш дослідницьку роботу щодо синтаксичних і морфологічних, а також фонетичних повторів. Але лексичні повтори поки не привертають уваги. Однак у нашій мові такі повтори дуже поширені й мають багаті особливості. Усі типи повторів, про які йтиметься тут, пов'язані з граматичними подіями та структурою речень азербайджанської мови. Особливу увагу хочемо звернути на слова «структура речення» (також «структура речення»). Бо інколи «лексичний повтор» означає, що два вирази (речення, словосполучення) мають однакову структуру або явище синтаксичного паралелізму. Проте лексичний паралелізм — явище скоріше стилістичне, аніж граматичне. Одним із способів вербалізації фонових знань є використання конструкцій з лексичними повторами. Теоретично базові знання можна описати на основі трьох тандемів:

- Екстралінгвістичні та метадитичні знання*
- Описово-наказовий*
- Загальні та місцеві знання*

Перший з цих тандемів має справу або з екстралінгвістичними факторами в реальності, або з мовними умовностями, останній стосується або статистичних норм, заснованих на індуктивних узагальненнях, або

нормативних уявлень. Третій стосується обсягу інформації або її важливості для носія даної мови. Інтерпретації текстів можуть бути реалізовані не тільки за допомогою лінгвістичних знань, але також екстралінгвістичних і контекстуальних знань.

Ключові слова: лексичні повтори, тавтологічні, дескриптивні, прескриптивні, фонові знання, адресат, адресат.

Introduction: Language and society each develop closely and inseparably with each other despite internal and external laws of development. Belonging to a specific culture is determined by the existence of a core of stereotyped knowledge that is constantly repeated during social relations. The conceptualization of the category of culture is reflected in the language to which it belongs. Background knowledge, which is not clearly expressed during communication, can be represented in the brain through lexical-structural repetitions.

Discussion: One of the concepts considered important to study in cognitive linguistics is the term concept. One of the distinguishing features of this concept is that it is complex and important. It is difficult to study and imagine any specific culture without the concept.

Specific concepts belonging to specific cultures are formed on the basis of cultural freedom and behavioral psychology of that society. If the two factors we mentioned above shape local knowledge, the analogous way of thinking that is common to all people shapes global knowledge. The specific concept can be replaced by the term local background knowledge, and the universal concept by the term universal background knowledge. (Mammadov, 2013, p. 49).

In the description of lexical repeated structures, the tautology «a person is a person», constructions identical to the word forms «winter as winter», «summer as summer», «man as man» and lexical pairs (lexical clones) «woman-woman», «friends-friends», including «love – love», it is argued that their interpretation requires reference to the general background knowledge of the participants of communication. The speaker's use of repetitions as modifiers or predicates instead of their more informative analogues declares to the addressee (listener) that the intended characteristic is, firstly, known and comprehensible to him, and secondly, its association with the category is generally accepted. (Fraser, 1988).

It should be noted that in daily speech practice, including in the interpretation of sports programs, lexical repeated constructions are used a lot. The introduction of these constructions into the speech, as a rule, has a strengthening character. For example: «Germany is Germany» or «Brazil is Brazil». Now

we would like to expand these lexical repeated constructions within concrete sentences: /Germany is Germany, they fight until the last minute on the field// or /Brazil is Brazil, other teams score as much as they can in the game, and they score as many goals as they want//.

In these sentences, the addressee appeals to the background knowledge of the listener(s) and thereby creates an idea about the will and football skills of the members of those teams, and the tautologies «Germany is Germany» or «Brazil is Brazil» have both removed the doubts of the fans about the results and made it easier for them to lose to such teams. It reduces feelings of shame a lot.

It is known that there is a gap in Azerbaijani linguistics regarding types of general knowledge and lexical repetitive constructions in addressing them, so we can guess that this attempt is aimed at filling that «gap».

Theoretical sources mention the possibility that background knowledge can be described in three binary terms. These tandems consist of:

a) extralinguistic and metalanguage knowledge;
b) descriptive (which can be evaluated according to «true» – «false» parameters) and prescriptive knowledge (normative knowledge that defines a certain behavior model and is usually expressed in Azerbaijani with /mali/-meli/ connectors. For example: /My friend must come to the city tomorrow//);

c) general and local knowledge. The first of these tandems refers to the surrounding reality or language agreements (conventions) of the conversation, the second to statistical norms based on inductive generalizations, or to the normative ideas of exemplary objects or situations, and the third to the degree of dissemination of information and its importance for a member of an arbitrarily chosen language collective.

Let's note the fact that for some constructions consisting of repetitions, separate meanings are not available: for example, «family as a family» or «work and work» constructions (ordinary family), (ordinary work) to meaningful descriptive knowledge (Shvedova, 1960), whereas the construction «family is just a family», on the contrary, directs to the perspective norm – (how the family should be) (Kopotev, 2016).

Among the signs of general background knowledge, extralinguistic and metalinguistic knowledge is

important. Therefore, in research studies, along with the constructions that lead to extra-linguistic realities, tautologies that indicate the way expressions are used in the language are also considered. For example /My friend, history is an exact science//. «In August» means «in August».

Tautology is a unique guide to the understanding of a linguistic expression. In this example, the addressee tries to note with its help that the expression «in August» is used in its true and correct meaning and does not allow for a wide, additional and figurative interpretation. In such a case, tautology can be interpreted as «so» or «how it should be understood». Therefore, all objects that we conventionally call category X require interpreters (people) to have certain norms of behavior in relation to them, or rather, in Vejbicka's words, «a tautology of obligations» (Wierzbicka, 1991).

Let's remember the fact that tautologies refer not only to common connotations (shades of additional meaning), but also to the "thinking dossier of the referent" in communication participants. For example, /Akhmaq is a fool/ or /Ahmad is Ahmed/ (general information for communicants, a common familiar person), etc.

It is clear that in a specific conversational situation, repetitions usually refer to three signs. Thus, according to the distribution of repetitions accepted in the literature on extralinguistic and metalanguage, we will have eight possible options and four options for each of them separately.

In the first case, that is, in the combination of extralinguistic, descriptive and general knowledge, tautology is realized when it is directed to a common characteristic, to what is standardly attributed to the members of the category. For example:

/The ladies who were still in the situation started to give advice. Don't worry, maybe he has another girlfriend. Men are men, mine sometimes comes home late for days//.

In this example, tautology focuses on stereotypical perceptions of male behavior. Since such explanations are well known, it does not need further explanation.

If we change the meaning of the second feature, i.e. take the combination of extralinguistic, prescriptive and general knowledge, then we will have rules that are not only real, but also true for potential members of the class. For example:

/As a human he was quite strong and trained. I remember that he had a great misfortune. His little son drowned in the sea. In this regard, the entire team congratulated him. But in all cases "business is business"//.

In this example, along with other facts, one fact, or rather the main fact, is noted that in any case "work is work" and it does not allow deviations or negligence depending on the situation. Moreover, such inductive generalization tautologies can be used as directives in the speech act. On the other hand, statements containing certain rules express a special implicature, and in our example, the meaning "you can't do anything".

For this purpose, let's consider another example. For example:

/One thing is known, if a client wants to cheat you, even the best friends will not be able to stop him from doing so. As they say. friendship is in its place, but business is business, business is business//.

In this example, certain rules about the business world, even unwritten rules, are reflected. Because in the given piece of text, the lexical repetition of "work is work, business is business" in the last sentence acts as a special implicature, and it forms the red line of the business world despite all mutual relations and trust.

Now let's consider another case. In this case, the meaning of the third sign – local inductive generalization – changes. For example:

/History shows how many cruel and merciless rulers have migrated from this world. Warriors who conquered countries, cities, and castles ended up buried in the soil. Despite this, their names have been passed down from generation to generation and remained in memory. History has not been able to forget them, as they say, Genghis Khan is Genghis Khan, Teymurlang is Teymurlang//.

In this example, human qualities such as the cruelty and ruthlessness of the rulers are mentioned, but even so, this text requires the readers to refer to the historical context. Thus, the orientation of knowledge in this text is local in nature and, in turn, demonstrates a prescriptive interpretation of tautology.

Let's turn to one more example:

/Let me remind you of some words that our grandmothers told us. This is what they usually say to their children who raise and educate their grandchildren. I was stuck between home and work while raising you. But I've done my duty as a parent, and now it's your turn. Your children are your children. I have the right to live my own private life//.

In this piece of text, the addressee refers to "parental duty" and, using the tautology "Your children are your children", insists that he is not responsible for the upbringing of his grandchildren. Thus, referring to the analysis, we can say that the addressee tried to take advantage of the prescriptive interpretation of tautology.

Realization of all types of background knowledge in relation to tautology requires discussing the

meaning of a specific word by instructing how to understand a linguistic expression. Thus, any metalanguage tautology has a prescriptive tone, and the resulting linguistic rules are only general in nature. For example, if the local rule for buying family tickets in amusement parks – “family – two parents and one child” presumption is valid, then it is possible to refer to it with the metalanguage tautology “family, therefore, is family”.

In the end, we would like to note that if tautology refers to extralinguistic knowledge, metalanguage tautology, on the contrary, is not used to refer to descriptive and local knowledge, and the universal rule valid for the entire language collective is valid. It

includes many issues, including information retrieval and information extraction, for the incorporation of all knowledge about the world.

Conclusion: Thus, the knowledge of grammatical and combinatoric vocabulary alone is not enough to develop texts from a semantic point of view. For this, contextual and extralinguistic information should be used. The development of extralinguistic information is an important and unique condition for extracting the information implicitly transmitted in the context. Explicit and implicit information in the text can be revealed only as a result of the unity of linguistic and extralinguistic information, which makes it possible for the listener (reader) to fully understand the text.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Мəммədov A.У, Мəммədov M. Diskurs tədqiqi. Bakı : Bakı nəşriyyatı, 2013, 78 s.
2. Воейкова М.Д. Тавтологические двусоставные конструкции, Материалы для проекта корпусного описания русской грамматики (<http://rusgram.ru>), Москва, 2011.
3. Кобозева И.М. Немец, англичанин, француз и русский: выявление стереотипов национальных характеров через анализ коннотаций этнонимов, Вестник МГУ, Филология, Вып. 3, 1995, с. 102–116.
4. Копотев М.В., Стеклова Т.И. Исключение как правило: переходные единицы в грамматике и словаре. Москва: Языки славянских культур, 2016.
5. Крюкова А. В. Лексические клоны в русском языке, ВКР на степень бакалавра, СПбГУ, 2019.
6. Падучева Е. В. Динамические модели в семантике лексики. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2004.
7. Санников В.З. Русский синтаксис в семантико-прагматическом пространстве. Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 2008.
8. Урысон Е. В. Об одном типе русских предложений тождества (Платье и платье, ничего особенного). Москва, 2020.
9. Шведова Н. Ю. Очерки по синтаксису русской разговорной речи. Москва, 1960.
10. Endresen A. Ну работа и работа: Russian constructions with reduplication. Доклад на семинаре November Seminar 2019 in Russian and Russian Studies, Тромсе, 2019.
11. Fraser B. Motor oil is motor oil: an account of English nominal tautologies, Journal of Pragmatics, Vol. 12, 1988, pp. 215–220.
12. Horn L. The lexical clone: pragmatics, prototypes, productivity, in Exact Repetition in Grammar and Discourse, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin: 2018, pp. 233–264.
13. Wierzbicka A. Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, 1991.

REFERENCES

1. Məmmədov A.У, Məmmədov M. Diskurs tədqiqi. [Discourse study] Baku: Baku publishing house, 2013, 78 p. [in Azerbaijani]
2. Voejkova M.D. Tavtologicheskie dvusostavnye konstrukcii, Materialy dlja proekta korpusnogo opisanija russkoj grammatiki [Tautological two-part constructions, Materials for the project of corpus description of Russian grammar] (<http://rusgram.ru>), Moscow, 2011. [in Russian]
3. Kobozeva I.M. Nemes, anglichanin, francuz i russkij: vyjavlenie stereotipov nacional'nyh harakterov cherez analiz konnotacij jetnonimov [German, Englishman, Frenchman and Russian: Revealing Stereotypes of National Characters through the Analysis of Connotations of Ethnic Names], Bulletin of Moscow State University, Philology, Vol. 3, 1995, p. 102–116.
4. Kopotev M.V., Steklova T.I. Iskljuchenie kak pravilo: perehodnye edinicy v grammatike i slovare [Exception as a rule: transitional units in grammar and vocabulary] Moscow: Languages of Slavic Cultures, 2016 [in Russian]
5. Krjukova A. V. Leksicheskie klony v russkom jazyke, VKR na stepen' bakalavra [Lexical clones in the Russian language, Master's thesis for a bachelor's degree] St. Petersburg State University, 2019. [in Russian]
6. Paducheva E. V. Dinamicheskie modeli v semantike leksiki [Dynamic models in the semantics of vocabulary] Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2004. [in Russian]
7. Sannikov V.Z. Russkij sintaksis v semantiko-pragmaticheskom prostranstve [Russian syntax in the semantic-pragmatic space.] Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2008. [in Russian]
8. Uryson E. V. Ob odnom tipe russkih predlozhenij tozhdestva (Plat'e i plat'e, nichego osobennogo) [About one type of Russian identity sentences (Dress and dress, nothing special)] Moscow, 2020. [in Russian]
9. Shvedova N. Ju. Oчерki po sintaksisu russkoj razgovornoj rechi [Essays on the syntax of Russian colloquial speech] Moscow, 1960. [in Russian]

10. Endresen A. Nu rabota i rabota: Russian constructions with reduplication. Doklad na semynare [Well work and work: Russian constructions with reduplication. Report at the seminar] November Seminar 2019 in Russian and Russian Studies, Тромсе, 2019. [in Russian]
11. Fraser B. Motor oil is motor oil: an account of English nominal tautologies, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 12, 1988, – pp. 215–220.
12. Horn L. The lexical clone: pragmatics, prototypes, productivity, in *Exact Repetition in Grammar and Discourse*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin: 2018, pp. 233–264.
13. Wierzbicka A. *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Mouton de Gruyter, -Berlin and New York, 1991.