

FOLIA SLAVICA

Volume 3
Number 3

1979

Slavica Publishers
Columbus, Ohio

TYPES OF REPETITION IN RUSSIAN:
A SEMIOTIC POINT OF VIEW

Bronislava Volek
University of Virginia

1. Lexical repetition is a highly polysemous, formally heterogeneous linguistic device that serves many different functions in the text. The realization of the polysemous possibilities of repetition is dependent on various contextual factors: schemes of the functional sentence perspective, intonational patterns, lexical and grammatical modifications, distance between the first occurrence of a lexical item in text and its repeated occurrence, as well as the presence or absence of a radically new context (repetition in the dialogue can be realized either by the same speaker or by different speakers). These dependencies are described in my articles (B. Volková 1973a and 1977).

The diversity of functions, i.e. the polysemy of lexical repetition in Russian is not fully described in the existing literature on the topic and the descriptions usually remain on a superficial level. The functions stated by different authors are classified on the basis of very heterogeneous criteria. So N. Ju. Švedova 1960 and N.D. Arutjunova 1970 distinguish various "subjective-modal" meanings of repetition in utterances of different participants in the dialogue. Švedova classifies repetition on the basis of a great number of heterogeneous nuances, as, e.g., accentuation, assertion, negation, will (wish), elucidation, evaluation and its varieties: astonishment, deliberation, doubt, uncertainty, concession. K. Chlupáčová 1967 distinguishes "emphatic function" without further differentiation, and a "resting function". J. Nosek 1968 cites again a great number of totally heterogeneous functions, such as remembering, astonishment, vacillation, stuttering, emphasis (he does not consider emphasis to be an attitude of the speaker toward the content of an utterance). E.A. Ivančikova 1969 considers repetition a syntactic and a modal-expressive device. S. Prokešová 1962 points out the types of repetition that give evidence of an unclear functional sentence perspective and she calls these types non-functional. H. Křížková 1960 and M. Grepl 1967 treat "emotionally-emphatic" and "intensificative" repetition, developing the concept of V. Mathesius 1946. And finally, E.N. Širjaev 1973 speaks about repetition

as a device that serves to reconnect broken relations ("povtor-sintagma," i.e. "repetition-syntagm") and differentiates it from repetition with an emphatic function ("povtor-fraza," i.e. "repetition-phrase").

The different functions of repetition that we find in these studies are, in fact, different meanings which repetition can express, together with various contextual and extralinguistic (situational) factors. These factors, given their nature, can be quite numerous and their combinations make a huge number of "functions" and their "sub-functions" possible. One can easily imagine many other as yet undescribed situations that generate even more functions and sub-functions, e.g., a memorizing function (together with a remembering function), a scanning function, and identical responses to different partners, or to different questions.

2. In this article I am not going to pursue a complex analysis of the ways in which repetitions operate in Russian, but I will try to provide an answer to the question of what is the basis of all these different functions from the semiotic point of view.

I am starting from the definition of repetition as stated in B. Volková 1973b. I consider lexical repetition as a special kind of lexical parallelism that is realized without formal modifications. A lexical parallelism is then a double or multiple occurrence of a word in text (or discourse) where the recipient is able to perceive the total or partial identity of the two lexical occurrences as two tokens of the same type. This relation can be activated with the help of different contextual factors and can acquire a semantic or other linguistic function.

Let us analyze some examples.

(1) Slavka prišel // Prišel vo-vremja //¹

The expression "vo-vremja" is the new part, or rheme, of the second utterance. The repetition does not add here any new component of meaning; it is possible to leave it out in our mind. In some cases, such repetition can be replaced by a proform (pronoun or a verb like "delat'"). In this usage repetition has a purely anaphoric character, referring to the preceding word; it connects both sentences into one context and constructs the text. There is usually an intonational break and conclusive cadence or semicadence between both parts of the repetition. The repetition can also form a complex sentence with a conjunction. Also, the same repetition can be realized by different speakers:

- (2) A: Slavka prišel //
B: Prišel vo-vremja //

Repetition is equally possible with nouns (3), verbs (1,2) and adverbs (4):

- (3) Prišel Slavka // Slavka nikogda ne obmanet //
(4) Oni pridut zavtra // Zavtra budet bol'shoj prazdnik //

Let us consider now an example typical for Russian colloquial speech:

- (5) Ja prosto ne mogu / slušat' ne mogu //

This example is basically similar to the previous ones. The syntactic relations are, however, interrupted here under the influence of the loss of the functional sentence perspective or of a lexical item and are connected later with the help of a repetition. The repetition serves here as a restorer of the interrupted connection.

Consider an example of a very different kind.

- (6) A: Govori sobaka! //
B: Ja.. ja.. ja ob ètom ni-ničego ne znal //

The first utterance expresses threat or outrage. The partner is shocked and his shock shows in his response. He is not able at first to construct a sentence. He repeats the first word and stutters. He can break the linguistic norm in different ways, his utterance can even become unintelligible. This is an example of an instinctive reaction and the linguistic devices which manifest it are actually secondary.

In (7) the situation is similar to (6):

- (7) A: Govori sobaka! //
B: Èto ved' ne ja sdelal! // Ne ja! //

The first utterance shocks the partner. The second expresses also an emotional attitude of the speaker, but it is not an instinctive, unintentional reaction; it is not accidental nor unorganized. The speaker really answers, intentionally using an arbitrary linguistic device. He emphasizes his utterance with the help of both repetition and intonation. The nucleus of the reply is, in fact, formed by the repeated words and the repetition introduces a new semantic component, the component of emphasis.

Example (8) forms a link between examples (7) and

(1).

(8) Slavka prišel // *Prišel* vo-vremja! //

The sentence stress in the second utterance is on the repetition, in contradistinction to (1): i.e., the repetition becomes the nucleus (rheme) of the utterance and it introduces again a component of emphasis, as in (7). The only difference between (7) and (8) consists in the lexical modification that accompanies the repetition in (7), and this difference is not substantial in this instance.

Consider now an example of a repetition that introduces another semantic component, a component of intensification (for the difference between emphasis and intensification see B. Volková 1977).

(9) Ja uxožu ot vas daleko daleko //

The repetition does not express emphasis here, but it expresses a great quantity of a property or a phenomenon accompanied by an emotive component. It is possible to paraphrase it with a quantifier "očen' daleko". This repetition has an intonational pattern different from that accompanying emphatic repetition. The intonation goes up on the stressed syllable of the first word and stays there until the stressed syllable of the repeated word, where it falls. Both words are pronounced without intonational break. By emphatic repetition, on the contrary, the raised intonation falls immediately after the stressed syllable of the first lexical item. There is a conclusive cadence after this first part and then the same intonational pattern occurs again on the repeated word (perhaps with higher intensity of stress and pitch).

Next we have an example of a repetition pronounced not by the same speaker, but by two different speakers in the frame of a dialogue.

(10) A: Da voobščē-to interesnyj v obščem
 čelovek / German
 B: Interesnyj čelovek /

B's response with the repetition expresses some kind of a reaction (attitude) toward the content of the first speaker's utterance. The attitude may vary from simple consent to astonishment and disapproval combined with emotional emphasis, depending on the intonational line. Such repetition is thus semantically loaded. An extensive use of it is typical for Russian colloquial dialogue and it can become purely

phatic and thus only anaphoric, developing the text formally without adding any new semantic component.

3. The examples given above correspond to three semiotic types: the first type, which is found in examples (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) and in the phatic part of (10), can be called *anaphoric*. Anaphoric repetition does not form a complex sign and does not introduce any new semantic component into the utterance. The second member of the pair of words, i.e. the repetition-forming member, only refers to the preceding one. It is possible to leave it out without changing the meaning of the utterance or to replace it with a proform, when such a proform is available. A repetition in these cases serves only as a formal, auxiliary device to make the development of the text (monological or dialogical) smooth and intelligible or to restore broken syntactic relations. It is especially typical for the Russian colloquial speech, both when realized by the same and by different speakers.

An anaphoric element is actually present in every repetition, since every repetition is in a way a reference to a word already mentioned, but some repetitions form a complex sign with the originally mentioned word. A repetition which forms a complex sign introduces a new complementary component of meaning into the text. Such repetitions represent the second and third types of this semiotic classification.

The second type is represented in our exposition only by the example (6). The repetition reflects here a specific element of the extralinguistic reality and thus becomes its sign. It is a pure *indexical* (symptomatic) type of *sign*, whose status is marginal in human language. The speaker, under the influence of a strong emotion, is not able to continue his utterance. The repetition is here not "used" to express the emotion, it is "born" by it, being thus in an existential relationship with it and becoming its index. The use of a linguistic element is here secondary. The resulting sign reflects in its form directly what it stands for and is thus not arbitrary (a strong emotion impeding the speaker from continuing his thoughts and eo ipso his utterance). We do not have to know the language and its rules to be able to guess what the sign indicates. The same type of sign is in anacoluthon, stuttering, broken functional sentence perspective, nervous laugh, etc. The use of linguistic means as signs is unintentional in all these cases.

The third type of repetition forms a complex sign that has the character of an *indexical symbol* (examples (7), (8), (9), (10)).² These repetitions

express a certain psychological state or attitude of the speaker, either toward his own utterance or toward the utterance of the partner. The use of repetition as an arbitrary linguistic device, normalized for such a situation, is intentional and has its symbolic side. It is accompanied by established intonational patterns. The conclusive cadence and the pause between both parts of repetition, a certain intensity of stress and rhematic position characterize emphatic meaning; lack of intonational break and a different intonational pattern characterize intensificative meaning; special intonational patterns characterize other attitudes expressed by repetition in different speakers. Special types of meaning can be thus established.

At the same time, these repetitions have their basic indexical aspect. The attitude expressed by them is always an actual attitude of the speaker and is thus bound in time, space and person. No two tokens of repetition have the same meaning as far as this basic function is concerned. The bearer of the attitude is not represented (denoted), but only indicated (expressed immediately) through the repetition.

Repetition in the most general sense belongs to two semiotic types (pure index and indexical symbol) and to a non-semiotic type (pure anaphoric function). On this basis, it is possible to make a further concrete classification of its functions and forms that would be based on consequently homogenous criteria.

NOTES

¹Two slashes are used to represent a conclusive cadence, one slash for a semicadence (nonconclusive intonational break). Italicized words represent the rheme of the utterance when double interpretation is possible.

²For the problem of indexical symbol see Ch. W. Burks: "Icon, Index, and Symbol," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* IX, Sept. 1948 - June 1949, Buffalo, 673-89.

REFERENCES

- Arutjunova, N.D. 1970. "Nekotorye tipy dialogičeskix reakcij i 'počemu-repliki' v russkom jazyke." *Filologičeskije nauki* 3:44ff.
- Grepl, M. 1967. *Emocionálně motivované aktualizace v syntaktické struktuře výpovědi*. Brno. 110ff.
- Chlupacova, K. 1967. "K lexikálně-sémantické výstavbě mluvených projevů v ruštině." *Bulletin Ústavu ruského jazyka a literatury* XI. 121ff.
- Ivančikova, E.A. 1969. "Leksičeskij povtor kak èkspressivnyj priem sintaksičeskogo rasprostraneniija." *Mysli o sovremen-*

- nom ruskom jazyke. Moscow. 126ff.
- Křížková, H. 1960. "Opakování slov jako prostředek intensifikace v ruštině a češtině." *Rusko-české studie*. Prague. 309ff.
- Mathesius, V. 1946. "Zesílení a zdůraznění jako jevy jazykové." *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt*. Prague. 203ff.
- Nosek, J. 1968. "Pauzované opakování v moderní angličtině." *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 50, No. 3:152ff.
- Prokešová, S. 1962. "Jak se odráží improvizovanost v jazykové výstavbě mluvených projevů." *Otázky slovanské syntaxe*. Prague. 348.
- Širjaev, E.N. 1973. "Nekotorye sredstva aktualizacii vyskazyvanij v razgovornoj reči." *Russkaja razgovornaja reč'*. ed. E.A. Zemskaja. Moscow. 347ff.
- Švedova, N.Ju. 1960. *Očerki po sintaksisu ruskoj razgovornoj reči*. Moscow. 280ff.
- Volková, B. 1973a. "Emocionálně motivované opakování v replikách ruského dialogu." *Bulletin ruského jazyka a literatury* XVII. 39ff.
- . 1973b. "Lexikální paralelismy v replikách dialogu." *Studia Slavica Pragensia*. Prague. 237ff.
- . 1977. "K charakteristike ěmfazy i intensifikacii v ruskom jazyke." *Zbornik za slavistiku* 12:159ff.