

Magyar Tudományos Journal

№ 53 (2021)

ISSN 1748-7110

Magyar Tudományos Journal (Budapest, Hungary)

The journal is registered and published in Hungary.

The journal publishes scientific studies,
reports and reports about achievements in different scientific fields.

Journal is published in English, Hungarian, Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, German and French.

Articles are accepted each month.

Frequency: 12 issues per year.

Format - A4

All articles are reviewed

Free access to the electronic version of journal

Edition of journal does not carry responsibility for the materials published in a journal.

Sending the article to the editorial the author confirms it's uniqueness and takes full responsibility for possible consequences for breaking copyright laws

Chief editor: Ambrus Varga

Managing editor: Bardo Németh

- Vilmos Takács — Eötvös Loránd University, FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND PSYCHOLOGY, d.p.s.
- Gazstav Lakatos — The Hungarian University of Fine Arts, Graphics Department / Specialization in Graphic Design, d.f.a.
- Janos Oláh — UNIVERSITY OF PÉCS, Faculty of Pharmacy, d.ph.s.
- Imrus Simon — Corvinus University of Budapest, Faculty of Economics, d.e.s.
- Kalman Fekete — University of Szeged, Faculty of Agriculture, doctor in agriculture sciences
- Matias Fehér — University of Debrecen, Faculty of Law, d.l.s
- Orban Kocsis — University of Debrecen, Faculty of Medicine, PHd, candidate of medicine
- Pisti Fodor — UNIVERSITY OF PÉCS, Faculty of Business and Economics, PHd in economic
- Ricard Szalai — University of Szeged, Faculty of Law and Political Sciences, phd in law
- Sani Lukács — Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of Social Sciences, phd in sociology
- Tamas Király — University of Szeged, Faculty of Pharmacy, phd in pharmacy
- Fabian Jakab — Corvinus University of Budapest, Faculty of Social Sciences and International Relations, phd in sociology
- Frigies Balog — University of Szeged, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, phd in economic
- Egied Antal — — Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of Primary and Pre-School Education, phd in pedagogical sciences

«Magyar Tudományos Journal»

Editorial board address: EMKE Building, Rákóczi út 42, Budapest, 1072

E-mail: editor@magyar-journal.com

Web: www.magyar-journal.com

CONTENT

CHEMISTRY

Zamanova A.
NEW OLIGOMER SURFACTANTS FOR DECREASING
THE RATE OF GASOLINE EVAPORATION.....3

EARTH SCIENCES

Talzhanov S., Turebayev S.
HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF OIL AND GAS
PRODUCTION IN THE TERRITORY OF MANGYSTAU7

Talzhanov S., Turebayev S.
ECONOMIC AND GEOGRAPHICAL ASSESSMENT OF OIL
AND GAS RESERVES OF MANGYSTAU REGION.....8

ECONOMICS AND LAW

Shogelbaeva G.
IMPLEMENTATION OF AN EFFICIENT INCENTIVE
SYSTEM IN HOTEL ENTERPRISES11

Akhmettaev D.
IMPROVING STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT IN A
NATIONAL ENTERPRISE IN KAZAKHSTAN13

Chentsova O., Zhydyk A.
THEORETICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL
FUNDAMENTALS OF DEVELOPMENT OF INNOVATIVE
ACTIVITY BASED ON TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES BY
SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES.....15

Krasnova I., Koptiukh O.
COORDINATION OF MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICIES
IN ACHIEVING ECONOMIC EQUILIBRIUM.....18

Akpambetova K., Kuantaev Z.
SINGLE-INDUSTRY TOWNS OF CENTRAL KAZAKHSTAN
DEVELOPMENT PROSPECTS21

Akpambetova K., Kuantaev Z.
ANALYSIS OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF CONSUMERS IN
SINGLE-INDUSTRY TOWNS, SMALL TOWNS AND
DISTRICT CENTERS BY GENDER23

LINGUISTICS AND PHILOLOGY STUDIES

**Ushkho Y., Tseeva N., Chuvakin A.,
Tutarishev A., Shishhova A.**
THE IMAGE OF A COACH TEACHER IN THE SYSTEM OF
PROFESSIONAL TRAINING26

Kholod I.
BASIC APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF REPETITION IN
MODERN LINGUISTICS.....29

MEDICAL SCIENCES

Kuznetsova V., Kuznetsova T., Kolosunin I.
CONDUCTING DIFFERENTIAL DIAGNOSIS OF DISEASES
OF THE BONE-MUSCULAR SYSTEM AT THE STAGE OF
THE AMBULATORY-POLYCLINICAL LINK (ANALYSIS OF
THE CLINICAL CASE)35

PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES

Galkina L.
FORMATION OF SPIRITUAL, MORAL AND
SOCIOCULTURAL VALUES IN THE PROCESS OF
COGNITIVE CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENT40

Musa Djamil Salim Alsarayreh
GROUND OF THE PROFILED PHYSICAL EDUCATION OF
SPECIALISTS OF CREATIVE PROFESSIONS42

TECHNICAL SCIENCES

Biliaieva V.
MATHEMATICAL MODELLING OF POLLUTANT
DISPERSION NEAR ROAD WITH BARRIER48

Kit D., Kataeva E.
ANALYSIS OF THE ACTUALITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT
OF THE SYSTEM OF PROFESSIONAL SELF-
DETERMINATION OF ADOLESCENTS55

Rebrikov A., Kataieva Ye.
USING VIDEO FILES AS A STEGOCONTAINERS IN
HIDDEN DATA TRANSFER58

**Tretyak T., Gutsalenko Y.,
Mironenko A., Mironenko S.**
PROFILING METHOD OF SHAPED HOB CUTTER FOR
SHAPING OF GEAR WHEELS WITH NON-INVOLUTE
TOOTH PROFILE.....60

BASIC APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF REPETITION IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Kholod I.*teacher of the department of the Ukrainian and foreign languages,
Vinnytsia National Agrarian University
Vinnytsia, Ukraine***Abstract:**

The classifications of lexical-syntactic repetition available in linguistics are analyzed, they are generalized. The criteria by which repetition is usually classified are clarified, in particular: functions in language, linearity, semantics, frequency of use in the text, explicitness, specificity of language expression, accuracy of language units reproduction, corresponding language levels, structural-semantic criterion.

Keywords: repetition, synonymous repetition, antonymous repetition, identical repetition, paradigmatic repetition, press language.

Repetition as a manifestation of the principle of redundancy in language

In any language, there are two opposite tendencies: to the economy of expression and to strengthen its redundancy. The tendency to save language resources is more characteristic of the recipient – he seeks to highlight the main and minimize the value of the secondary, leaving only those language signs that contain specific information, devoid of descriptions, indents, comments and remarks. Without saving language resources, information cannot be presented effectively. Linguists call the language economy the omission of linguistic signs in the structure of expression, as well as the advantage of using words with specific semantics over abstract, clarity and accuracy of expression over imagery. V. Kodukhov believes that the principle of language economy is manifested in the contradiction between the speaker and the recipient [Kodukhov, 1974, p. 200–201], between information and the means of its presentation, as the statement cannot be a complete reflection of reality, but only a reflection of its individual moments. Savings of language means are achieved by compression at all language levels through replacement, ellipse, partial verbalization of information. However, if the communicative goal is the emotional interaction of the speaker and the recipient and the verbal selection of elements that require increased attention in the overall flow of information, then saving language can not only be an effective means of information exchange, but also significantly harms this interaction. In this case, the contextual meaning of what is said is lost, and one of the main functions of such messages - to attract the reader's attention - can not be observed at all.

In addition, excessive savings of language resources often lead to language failure, because the information message needs to be detailed, concretized. In this regard, it is advisable to apply additional content load, ie language redundancy, caused primarily by the need to achieve a stylistic effect, to ensure clarity and persuasiveness of the utterance, to compensate for excessive language economy.

V. Gak notes that any structural component of the text, which does not express the semantic meaning directly, performs a stylistic (secondary) function. Thus, the linguistic unit, which is redundant in terms of semantics, is a mandatory element in the structure of syntax or style [Gak, 1998, p. 518]. A. Martine believes

that linguistic redundancy is the presence in the expression of an element that is unnecessary in terms of semantics, but necessary to achieve effective communication [Martine]. Thus, language redundancy is mainly a saving of mental energy and at the same time an accumulation of additional articulation or written signs.

In the language of the modern Ukrainian press there are many means of linguistic redundancy, which compensate for the semantic inadequacy of what is said. This means is mostly the repetition of the same or similar lexical or syntactic units. Using repetitive language elements, journalists provide an active perception of the message by the recipient, convince the facts, promote the will of the recipient in the desire to participate in the implementation of public initiatives: support or inhibition of certain social processes. Modern newspaper text abounds in both lexical and syntactic repetitions (syntactic convergence). They are a way of expressing additional semantic nuances that realize the category of intensity as a result of increasing the meaning. Lexical repetition is often created on the basis of the transformation of language clichés. It serves as a means of connecting parts of the proposal, as well as to reproduce the gradation of the intensity of action [Pokrovskaya, 2006, p. 84].

Repetition helps the reader to focus on logically emphasized lexical or lexico-syntactic elements, to choose them from among a number of secondary structural components of expression. Under such conditions, the reader perceives the essence of the message on a better level, despite the "communicative noises", the fight against which, according to A. Martine, is the main function of linguistic redundancy [Martine].

Linguistic redundancy in the communicative flow also implies the presence of additional information in the text, which is not mandatory in terms of semantics (ie the word to denote a specific semantic meaning is already used in the text), but in terms of style it is very important. In addition, without repetition, which is a connecting element between the image and the units of language, redundancy can be interpreted ambiguously [Korbut, 1995, p. 154].

The need for linguistic redundancy is largely due to the presence of a large flow of information in which the recipient must place emphasis on stylistically significant elements. Then there is a need to re-highlight them in the text by the author to help the reader quickly and correctly understand the information provided and pay special attention to the selected elements. In this

way we observe a close interaction AUTHOR – REPEAT – READER, which most fully demonstrates the importance of lexical and syntactic repetition in the language of newspapers. Therefore, using different types of repetition in the text (paradigmatic, identical, synonymous, antonymous), the author takes an active part not only in the process of creating textual information, but also in the process of its perception by the reader.

Since repetition is a representative of the psychophysical state of the speaker, it can be attributed to the stylistic techniques of planned communication [Miller, 1963, p. 105]. Lexical repetition as a stylistic device is a means of linguistic redundancy, as it involves the optional repetition of already known information. Redundancy in speech Yu. Skrebnev considers a categorical sign of explicative (excessive) colloquial syntax [Skrebnev, 1985, p. 109].

The formation of language redundancy is mostly preceded by:

- 1) division of the text by positional and intonation separation of its elements;
- 2) excessive use of lexical and syntactic units [Skrebnev, 1985, p. 160].

According to these criteria, M. Kobzev divides repetitions into "proleptic constructions, or interrogative-appropriate structuring of a cue, interrogation; proper repetition, repetition of pronouns, paraphrases, forms of hesitation; involuntary repetition (filling in speech pauses)" [Kobzev, 2014, p. 24]. Here, the elements of repetition are distinguished by the nature of the novelty of the information presented in the text, especially in proleptic constructions.

According to R. Budagov, due to the widespread synonymy of lexical and syntactic units, stylistic and stylistic multifacetedness, the ability of vocabulary to change rapidly to influence the consciousness of the recipient, the linguistic richness may seem excessive and unnecessary at first glance [Budagov, 1972, p. 18].

In our opinion, repetition is a justified manifestation of the redundancy of language, as it serves to effectively convey information and perception of the reader. In a particular text, only the lexical-syntactic repetition that does not contain additional stylistic load, creates an unjustified tautology can be superfluous.

Classification of repetition in modern linguistics

The variety of approaches to the interpretation of repetition in modern linguistics has led to an extensive system of its types. Depending on the stylistic meaning, location of recurring units, language levels at which repetition occurs, there are different classifications.

In modern linguistics, repetitions are traditionally classified into "sound, morpheme, lexical (synonymous, antonymous, identical, paired), syntactic (connective, unconnected), compositional (anaphora, epiphora, polyconnectedness)" [Krashennikova, 2010, p. 173].

B. Genç, M. Mavaşoğlu, E. Bada classify repetitions according to the morphological criterion, considering repetitions of nouns, adjectives, pronouns, adverbs, verbs, conjunctions, prepositions [Genç, Mavaşoğlu, Bada, 2010, p. 220].

I. Halperin divides repetitions into significant (perceived by the speaker) and insignificant (accidental) [Halperin, 1981].

In the context of stylistic figures Z. Kulikova distinguishes the types of repetition by location of repeated units:

- 1) anaphora – vertical repetition of a word (phrase) at the beginning of a sentence;
- 2) simplotke – repetition of the middle part of the line (poem);
- 3) epiphora – repetition at the end of the sentence;
- 4) plexus – a combination of anaphora with epiphora;
- 5) framing – repetition of the same unit at the beginning and end of the line (stanza);
- 6) color (ring repetition) – repetition of the sentence at the beginning and end of the stanza;
- 7) anadiplosis – repetition of the same unit at the end of one sentence and at the beginning of the next;
- 8) chiasm – one of the means of creating an antithesis, the effect of which is based on conflicting values that contradict each other [Kulikova, 2007, p. 37–41].

Researcher O. Metlyakova classifies repetition in three aspects: syntagmatic, paradigmatic, functional. In the syntagmatic aspect, distinguishes the distant, which involves the use of repeated tokens at a distance, and contact – the location of repeated tokens next to each other. Such "repeating tokens do not serve as a means of connecting words in a sentence, but as a means of expressing emotional and evaluative sound." In the paradigmatic aspect, the scientist distinguishes between identical and variable repetitions, and in the functional – neutral and expressive [Metlyakova, 2009, p. 171].

T. Zhuk classifies repetitions according to the nature of structural organization into five types: 1) simple contact repetition, which can be expressed by a common or uncommon phrase; 2) extended repetition – repetition of a token with in-depth semantic layering; 3) ring repetition – repetition at the beginning and end of the statement; 4) repetition-pickup – repetition of a language unit at the end of one phrase and at the beginning of the next; 5) chain repetition – multiple repetition of phrases one after another. Repetition as a means of semantic connection of the text is divided by the researcher into four types: 1) nominative-chain; 2) identical; 3) synonymous; 4) antonymous [Zhuk, 2004].

The classification of structural-semantic types of repetition, proposed by I. Sokolova, was developed taking into account explicitness and implicitness. The researcher distributes repetitions by phono-morphological and lexical-syntactic language levels. At the phono-morphological level distinguishes morpheme repetition and repetition of grammatical forms, and at the lexico-syntactic - lexical, keyword repetition, title repetition, synonymous and antonymous, substitution of thematic elements, lexical-syntactic parallelism [Sokolova, 2002].

S. Balashova considers repetition from the point of view of text semantics as a three-level system of sound, verbal-image and plot repetitions.

The researcher determines sound repetitions from the standpoint of the application of sound imitation of the phenomena of nature and technology through the

prism of the emotional and psychological state of the speaker.

Verbal and figurative repetitions are the most branched organization and are divided into:

- 1) repetitions, which are a means of enhancing emotional and expressive expression;
- 2) repetitions of portrait details to create a holistic image that is easily perceived and remembered;
- 3) repetitions of the most common means of psychological characterization;
- 4) repetitions of the epithet.

The researcher defines plot repetitions as a means of expressing the characteristics of the characters of a work of art [Balashova, 2008, p. 8–11].

Yu. Vasilieva considers repetition from the standpoint of the structural organization of the folklore text and distinguishes: sound, derivational, lexical and phrasal, semantic and syntactic repetitions [Vasilieva, 2004]. Instead, L. Pryshlyak focuses only on syntactic repetition, differentiating it into the following types: repetition of subject syntax, repetition of predicate syntax, repetition of simple sentences [Pryshlyak, 2002].

Researcher Yu. Volyanska systematized the material on repetitions, developing classifications that take into account different criteria: structural-semantic, correspondence to language levels, accuracy of reproduction of language units, linearity, peculiarity of language expression, explicitness, frequency of use in the text, functional varieties, semantics [Volyanska, 2013]. Consider them in more detail.

According to the structural-semantic criterion, the linguist distinguishes the following types of repetition: 1) euphonic: iterative (amplification, anaphora, epanalepsis, epanastrophe, epiphora, ring (cycle, annular anadiplosis, anepiphora), refrain and simplicity) and anastich-stylography assonance, metaphony, rhyme); 2) stylistic and syntactic (parallelism, polysyndeton, chiasm); 3) emphatic (gradation, dieresis, epexesis).

According to the appropriate language levels, repetitions are divided into six groups:

- 1) phonetic (alliteration, anagram, assonance, metaphony);
- 2) morpheme (affixal and root);
- 3) word-forming (derivational and paradigmatic);
- 4) lexical-semantic (antonymic, proper-lexical, hyponymic, repetition of words of one thematic group, occasional (individual-author's), homonymous (repetition of homographs, homoforms), paronymic, synonymous and tautological;

5) morphological (repetitions of independent parts of speech - noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun, adverb, verb; repetitions of non-independent parts of speech - prepositional, conjunction, repetition of particles);

6) syntactic, which are divided into three groups: 1) explicit repetition (repetition of phrases; repetition of sentences or their parts); 2) implicit repetition (duplication of syntactic structures under the condition of different lexical content of repeated units); 3) explicit-implicit or semi-implicit repetition (duplication of syntactic structure under the condition of partial duplication of lexical content of reduplicated sentences); use of incomplete sentences; reduplications based on formal-syntactic destruction.

Complete (exact) and incomplete (partial) repetitions are distinguished according to the accuracy of language units reproduction.

By linearity (location of repeating components) repetitions are divided into contact (repetition of words, phrases located next to each other), compatible (repetition of language units located next to each other, which are part of different syntactic units), distant (repetition of language units at a distance).

According to the specifics of linguistic expression, repetitions are intralingual (monolingual - repetition of tokens within one language) and foreign (bilingual, due to the influence of bilingualism, and interlingual - repetition of tokens with the same meaning from different languages).

By explicitness (manifestation in the work) repetitions are divided into implicit, explicit, semi-implicit. Explication is a detailing, clarification of the main content by repeating lexical and syntactic elements. Implication is "formal vagueness of elements of deep expression, which cannot be manifested in the form of words, morphemes or phrases" [Katznelson, 1972, p. 185].

According to the frequency of use in the text, Yu. Volyanska, following T. Zhuk, distinguishes between concentrated and permanent. T. Zhuk notes that "concentrated repetition is a distant or contact lexical repetition of repeated use in the text [Zhuk, 2004, p. 33], while permanent repetition is a repetition that occurs occasionally, sporadically.

According to the functions in the language, repetitions are differentiated into compositional, emotionally-expressive, phono-rhythmic (rhythmic, rhyming), cumulative, linguistic-game, connecting-creative, actualization-semantic, pragmatic-communicative.

According to semantics, repetitions are divided into a priori (to denote semantic relations) and a posteriori (repetitions that convey the hidden meaning of the utterance - the position, views, mood of the speaker). A priori repetitions are divided into intensifying (aimed at increasing the significance of repetitive components), gradational (each subsequent repeating element strengthens / weakens the previous one) and gradual (expressing the degree of semantic load). A posteriori repetitions have the following varieties: intertextual (repetition in different texts), connotative (repetition of tokens with additional semantic layering), repetitions of the leitmotif (repetition of the main idea) and semantic parallelisms.

Due to the multifunctionality of repetition, modern scientists call it a multifaceted phenomenon that requires more detailed and systematic study, which, in turn, makes it impossible to create a unified classification. Linguists offer a significant number of classifications of repetition developed according to different criteria, which were most fully systematized in the dissertation by Yu. Volyanska. However, the researcher does not single out a group of lexical and syntactic repetitions. In her work, lexical-semantic and syntactic repetitions are distinguished [Volyanska, 2013], they are analyzed in detail on the material of poetic speech. The most appropriate for our study are the classifications of L. Pryshlyak [Pryshlyak, 2002], which distinguishes repetitions of syntax and I. Sokolova [Sokolova, 2002],

which distinguishes repetitions of title, keywords, synonymous and antonymous repetitions, lexical-syntactic parallelism. Based on these classifications, we will build our study.

The essence of lexical-syntactic repetition and its place in the system of repetitions

The phenomenon of repetition attracts the attention of researchers in various fields of knowledge. The available heuristic approaches to its study are applicable mostly in the areas of analysis of the language level at which repetition operates, or the place of the repeated unit in the structure of expression. From the point of view of linguistic stylistics, repetition is analyzed as a means of accentuation, semantic connection, specificity of text creation, authorial modality and pragmatic instruction of the text.

Lexical-syntactic repetition can be considered in terms of lexicology, syntax and stylistics. L. Bulakhovsky, in particular, notes that "repetition of a word in the same form within one sentence often has emotional significance. In such cases, repetition is the object of study of stylistics, not syntax" [Bulakhovsky, 1973, p. 120]. I. Cherednychenko considers repetition in terms of functional and stylistic features and defines it as "an aesthetic technique that enhances the artistic and pictorial properties of syntactic units and at the same time serves as a means of contextual organization of expression" [Cherednychenko, 1962, p. 381].

O. Skovorodnikov developed a classification of lexical-syntactic repetition, distinguishing lexical-compositional and positional-lexical repetitions according to the place of the repeated element in the structure of expression. Lexical-compositional repetition is the repetition of lexical units in different compositional elements, which serves as a means of semantic coherence of the text. Within the positional-lexical repetition, the linguist distinguished contact and non-contact repetitions of predicative and non-predicative units. To the structural types of positional-lexical repetition, the researcher includes chain lexical, identical lexical, prefixal tokens, synonymous, antonymous repetitions [Skovorodnikov, 2014].

Scientist E. Geller divides expressive syntactic units into eleven groups, highlighting the lexical-syntactic repetition [Geller, 1991], which is one of the brightest, most expressive means of attracting the recipient's attention, a call to actively perceive the information presented in the newspaper. Lexical-syntactic repetition, - notes Z. Kulikova, - "is based on partial or complete repetition of lexical content within a certain syntactic structure" [Kulikova, 2007, p. 14].

As a result of studying repetition as one of the text-forming factors, in addition to the traditional functional and stylistic aspect, the communicative-pragmatic direction of text analysis was singled out, where repetitions serve as a stylistic means of expressing the author's intentions.

In our study, lexical-syntactic repetition is qualified as a stylistic device that is formed by repetition of lexical and syntactic units within a sentence, superphrase unity, text and implements a certain pragmalinguistic function, is a means of semantic coherence of the text, has the ability to form figures. According to

the classification of repetition by language levels, lexical-syntactic repetition is on the border of two language levels: lexical and syntactic, because repeated tokens perform a certain syntactic role, organically intertwined with the structure of the text.

Repetition in the context of stylistic figures: status and specifics

In the Literary dictionary-reference book stylistic figures are defined as "unusual syntactic inflections that violate language norms are used to decorate speech. Stylistic figures are designed not only to individualize the author's speech, but also to enrich it with emotional nuances, to express the artistic image. A stylistic figure, which is also called a figure of poetic speech (anaphora, epiphora, ring, parallelism, gradation, ellipse, chiasm, inversion, anacoluf, etc.) should be distinguished from tropes that are not built on a syntactic principle" [Literary Dictionary, 2006 with. 641].

Researchers refer to repetition figures as figures based on the expansion of syntactic structure (excessive use of speech components). Such figures include simple repetition, framing, anadiplosis, syntactic tautology, polysyndeton, repetition-enumeration [Kuznets, Skrebnev, 1960, p. 65–94; Morokhovsky, 1984].

T. Znamenskaya also identifies stylistic figures depending on the type of change in syntactic structure. To the figures of expansion of syntactic structure the researcher belongs anaphora, epiphora, ring, joint. But such figures of repetition as syntactic parallelism, gradation, is included in the group of figures formed by the interaction of compositional syntactic techniques [Znamenskaya, 2004].

To the repetitions that occupy a separate position in the system of syntactic stylistic means, I. Halperin includes anaphora, epiphora, ring, joint, phraseologized repetitions, root repetitions, synonymous repetitions based on ambiguity [Halperin, 1958].

Modern linguists consider repetition in the context of stylistic figures in three aspects: repetition is a stylistic figure, repetition is a means of creating stylistic figures, stylistic figures are types of repetition.

Repetition as a separate stylistic figure is analyzed by M. Pryshlyak [Pryshlyak, 2018], R. Rizhko [Rizhko, 2014], L. Struhanets [Struhanets, 2000], I. Degtyareva [2009], A. Moisienko [Moisienko, 1991], O. Khorosheva [Khorosheva, 2010]. According to L. Struhanets, "repetition is a stylistic figure that consists in the repetition of individual words or phrases in one statement to highlight certain thoughts, phrases, details in descriptions, to enhance the expressive and pictorial properties of language" [Struhanets, 2000, p. 49–50]. R. Ryzhko qualifies repetition as a stylistic figure that "cooperates" with other syntactic units (anaphora, epiphora, anepiphora, palindrome, paronymic attraction, monophones, epanalepsis, gradation, amplification, tautology, polysyndeton, refrain, etc.). Instead, M. Pryshlyak and O. Khorosheva define syntactic parallelism, alliteration, assonance, polysyndeton, chiasm, antithesis, simplex, anaphora and epiphora as separate stylistic figures without tracing the connection with repetition [Pryshlyak, 2018; Khorosheva, 2010]. I. Degtyareva, unlike other researchers of repetition, qualifies anaphora and epiphora as stylistic figures that

appear on the basis of repetition, and syntactic parallelism, amplification and antithesis - as separate figures [Degtyareva, 2009]. Stylistic figures formed on the basis of repetition are defined as types of repetition by other researchers. In particular, Yu. Kalashnyk characterizes repetition, repetition-picking, anaphora and epiphora as stylistic figures, which are types of repetition, and does not associate amplification and antithesis with repetition, as these figures do not involve the use of identical tokens [Kalashnyk, 2015]. L. Muzhelovska distinguishes such types of repetition as anaphora, epiphora and gradation [Muzhelovska, 2012].

Repetition as a means, a method of creating stylistic figures is characterized by O. Babelyuk [Babelyuk, 2011], N. Berber [Berber, 2017], T. Vilchynska [Vilchynska, 2015], Yu. Zelenska [Zelenska, 2009], L. Pryshlyak [Pryshlyak, 2002], I. Sidorenko [Sidorenko, 2007]. In particular, O. Babelyuk qualifies stylistic reception as "different ways of combining language units of one level within higher-level units, based on syntagmatic relations between stylistically marked and stylistically unmarked units in the text" [Babelyuk, 2011, p. 10]. T. Vilchynska and N. Berber define anaphora, epiphora, anepiphora (ring), epanaphora (joint), polysyndeton, refrain, gradation as stylistic figures, which are based on the technique of repetition, describe the specifics of their functioning [Vilchynska, 2015; Berber, 2017]. I. Sidorenko includes amplification, anacrostic, antithesis, gemination, epanalepsis, prosopopoeia, similes, chiasm, syntactic parallelism [Sidorenko, 2007].

She developed the differentiation of stylistic figures as types of repetition in O. Beketov's dissertation. The researcher classified the figures of repetition into three groups: phonomorphological, lexical-syntactic, textual. Phonomorphological figures of repetition include alliteration, assonance, paronomasia, homoioteleuton (same sound of phrases or parts of a sentence), homoeptoton (same sound of endings of a phrase or parts of a sentence). Beketov's lexical-syntactic figures of repetition include anaphora, gemination, epiphora, similes, puppet, anadiplosis, gradation, epanalepsis, asyndeton, polysyndeton, pleonasm, polyptoton, which function within one sentence. Textological figures are divided into two groups: figures of cohesion and figures of composition. Cohesion figures contain anaphora, anadiplosis, epiphora, gemination, asyndeton, polysyndeton, epanalepsis, which function in one period or in adjacent sentences. The figures of the composition include anaphora, anadiplosis and puppet, which are a means of communication between paragraphs [Beketova, 1998, p. 24–30].

Thus, there is no single approach to determining the status of repetition in the context of stylistic figures in modern linguistics. This is due to its versatility and a large number of structural and semantic varieties. Repetition is a separate stylistic figure and at the same time can be a stylistic device by which, subject to certain structural and semantic features, other figures are formed. In such a two-sided interpretation, we analyze the repetition and we in the dissertation.

At the present stage of development of society, the reader comes across a fairly large amount of information. The need to place logical emphasis, to distinguish the main and secondary in the flow of information, to specify the statement determines the use of repetition as an important means of updating the content of the newspaper text. At the same time, repetition can serve as a means of linguistic redundancy. This happens when it does not contain additional stylistic load, does not detail, does not emphasize specific phenomena. However, authors of newspaper publications are increasingly resorting to the use of stylistically significant repetitions, without which the text could be perceived as a model of language insufficiency. Such repetition will never be superfluous in a newspaper text, as it serves as a means of active perception and analysis of information by the reader.

There are a number of repetition classifications according to different criteria: functions in language, semantics, frequency of use in the text, explicitness, linearity, specificity of linguistic expression, accuracy of reproduction of language units, corresponding language levels, structural-semantic criterion.

In modern linguistics, therefore, there is no single approach to the analysis of the phenomenon of repetition: it is mostly analyzed by the language level at which it operates, or by the location of the repeated unit in the structure of expression. From the point of view of linguistic stylistics, repetition is described as a means of accentuation, semantic connection, specificity of text creation, authorial modality and pragmatic instruction of the text.

However, despite frequent attempts by linguists to develop a holistic classification of repetition, this question is still open due to the multifunctionality of this phenomenon. To date, no single approach has been developed to determine the status of repetition in the context of stylistic figures, as it can be both a stylistic figure and a stylistic device that participates in the creation of other stylistic figures.

References:

1. Babelyuk O. Stylistychni zasoby i pryomy kriz' pryzmu linhvosynerhetyky. Visnyk Kyyivs'koho natsional'noho linhvistychnoho universytetu. Seriya: Filolohiya. 2011. 14. № 1. S. 7–17.
2. Balashova S. E. Vydy y funktsyy povtorov v tvorchestve M.A. Sholokhova : avtoref. dyss. ... kand. fylool. nauk : 10.01.01. Moskva, 2008. 21 s.
3. Beketova O. Strukturno-semantychni ta funktsional'ni osoblyvosti fihur povtoru v arhumentatyvnykh tekstakh (na materialy nimets'koyi movy): dys... kand. filol. nauk : 10.02.04. Kyyiv, 1998. 164 s.
4. Berber N. Stylistychni fihury povtoru yak zasib vyvraznennya poetonimiv u khudozhn'omu movlenni Mariyi Matios. Zapysky z onomastyky. 2017. №20. C. 30–40
5. Budahov R. Opredeleyaet ly pryntsy ékonomyy razvytye y funktsyonyrovanye yazyka. Voprosy yazykoznanyya. 1972. № 1. S. 17–36.
6. Bulakhovs'ky L. A. Vynyknennyya i rozvytok literaturnykh mov. Vybrani pratsi: u 5 t. T. 1. Kyyiv: Naukova dumka, 1973. 332 s.
7. Cherednychenko I. H. Narysy z zahal'novy stylistyky suchasnoyi ukrayins'koyi movy. Kyyiv: Radyans'ka shkola, 1962. 386 s.

8. Dehtyar'ova I. Stylistychnyy syntaksys ukrayins'koyi postmodernist-s'koyi prozy. Ukrayins'ka mova. 2009. № 3. S. 27–38.
9. Hak V. Povtornaya nomynatsyya, ee struktorno-orhanyzuyushchye y stylstycheskye funktsyy v tekste. Linyhvyestycheskye y metodycheskye problemy prepodavanyya russkoho yazyka kak nerodnoho. Moskva, 1987. S. 24–33.
10. Hak V. Yazykovye preobrazovanyya. Moskva: Shkola «Yazyky russkoy kul'tury», 1998. 768 s.
11. Hal'peryn Y. Ocherky po stylstyke anghlyyskoho yazyka. Moskva: Yzd-vo lyt. na ynostr. yazykakh, 1958. 459 s.
12. Hal'peryn Y. R. Tekst kak ob'ekt linyhvyestycheskoho yssledovanyya. Moskva: Nauka, 1981. 139 s.
13. Heller É. S. Syntaksycheskye sredstva ékspresyvnosti y ykh rol' v abzatsé nauchnykh tekstov: avtoref. dys. ... kand. fylol. nauk: 10.02.01. Linyhhrad, 1991. 18 s.
14. Kalashnyk YU. Osoblyvosti stylstychnoho syntaksysu povisti Mykoly Vinhranov's'koho «U hlybyni doshchiv». Visnyk Kharkivs'koho natsional'noho universytetu imeni V. N. Karazina. Seriya «Filolohiya», (73), 40–43. URL: <https://periodicals.karazin.ua/philology/article/view/5613>
15. Katsnel'son S. Typolohyya yazyka y rechevoe myshlenye. Moskva: Prosveshchenye, 1972. 213 s.
16. Khorosheva O. Stylstychni fihury v systemi arkhitektoniky ese Yuriya Andrukhovycha. Aktual'ni problemy ukrayins'koyi linyhvyestyky: teoriya i praktyka. 2010. № 20. 169–183.
17. Kobzyev M. V. Leksychnyy povtor v anghlyys'koy i ukrayins'koy movakh: avtoref. dys. ... kand. fylol. nauk: 10.02.17. Donets'k, 2014. 20 s.
18. Kodukhov V. Obshchee yazykoznaneye. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola, 1974. 303 s.
19. Korbut A. Povtor kak sredstvo strukturnoy orhanyzatsyy khudozhestvennoho prozaycheskoho teksta (élementy symmetry): avtoref. dys. ... kand. fylol. nauk: 10.02.01. Moskva, 1995. 16 s.
20. Krashenninnikova T. Povtor yak khudozhnii zasib v ukrayins'koy literaturniy kaztsi KHKH stolittya. Naukovyy visnyk Kryvoriz'koho derzhavnogo pedahohichnoho universytetu. 2010. Vyp. 5. S. 172–180. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/PhSt_2010_5_26/
21. Kulykova Z. P. Povtor kak sredstvo ékspresyvnosti y harmonyzatsyy poétycheskykh tekstov M. Tsvetaevoy y RM Ryl'ke: avtoref. dys.... kand. fylol. nauk: 10.02.19. Rostov-na-Donu, 2007. 25 s.
22. Kuznets M., Skrebnyev YU. Stylstyka anghlyyskoho yazyka: posob. Linyhhrad: Hosud. uchebno-pedahoh. yz-vo Myn-va Prosveshchenye RSFSR, Linyhhradskoe otdelenye, 1960. 175 s.
23. Literaturoznavchyy slovnyk-dovidnyk / Za red. R. Hrom'yaka, YU. Kovaliva, V. Teremka. Kyiv: VTS «Akademiya», 2006. 752 s.
24. Martyne A. Osnovy obshchey linyhvyestyky. URL: <https://scicenter.online/obschaya-lingvistika-scicenter/izbyitochnost-162098.html> (data zvernennya 14.05.2020)
25. Metlyakova E. Typolohyya y funktsyy povtorov v khudozhestvennom tekste. Yazyk. Kul'tura. Kommunyatsyya: materyaly nauch.-prakt. konf. Yzhevsk, 2009. CH. 2. S. 170–175.
26. Morokhovskyy O. M., Vorobyova N. I., Lykshosherst N. I., Tymoshenko Z. V. Stylstyka anghlyys'koyi movy: navch. posib. Kyiv, 1984. 247 s.
27. Moysiyenko A. K. Povtor yak dynamizuyucha odyntysya (na materialy poeziyi T. H. Shevchenka). Ukrayins'ka mova ta literatura v shkoli. 1991. №5. S. 57–61.
28. Muzhelov's'ka L. Povtor yak stylstychnyy zasib tvorenniya ekspresiyi v poetychnomu movlenni Oleksandra Olesya. Pedahohichna osvita: teoriya i praktyka 2012. Vyp. 12. S. 224–229. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/znp_2012_12_42 (data zvernennya: 20.05.2020).
29. Pokrovskaya E. Prahmatyka sovremennoho hazetnoho teksta. Russkaya rech'. 2006. № 3. S. 81–87.
30. Pryshlyak L. B. Povtor yak zasib ekspresyvnoho syntaksysu poetychnoho movlennya 60-kh rokiv KHKH stolittya: dys. ... kand. fylol. nauk: 10.02.01. Donets'k, 2002. 212 s.
31. Pryshlyak M. Stylstychni fihury yak zasoby lohichnoho vydilennya ta vporядkuvannya tekstu v orators'komu dyskursi starodavn'oyi Hretsii. Naukovyy visnyk KHDU. Seriya «Perekladoznavstvo ta mizhkul'turna komunikatsiya». 2018. № 1. S. 79–83.
32. Rizhko R. Funktsional'no-stylstychni osoblyvosti povtoru v poetychnykh tekstakh kintsya KHKH – pochatku KHKHI stolittya. Linyhvyestyka i poetyka tekstu. Filolohichni studiyi. Kryvyi Rih, 2014. Vyp. 10. S. 220–227.
33. Skrebnev YU. Vvedenye v kolokvyalystyku. Saratov: Yzd-vo Saratov. un-ta, 1985. 210 s.
34. Sokolova I. V. Prahmatyko-komunikatyvni kharakterystyky katehoriyi povtoru v tekstakh-anonsakh: dys. ... kand. fylol. nauk, spets.: 10.02.04. Kharkiv, 2002. 211 s.
35. Struhanets' L. Kul'tura movy. Slovnyk terminiv. Ternopil': Navchal'na knyha–Bohdan, 2000. 88s.
36. Sydorenko I. Povtor yak klyuchovyy pryntsyp funktsionuvannya stylstychnykh fihur u suchasnykh anghlomovnykh dramatychnykh tvorakh. Aktual'ni problemy romano-hermans'koyi filolohiyi ta prykladnoyi linyhvyestyky. 2007. URL: http://www.kamts1.kpi.ua/sites/default/files/files/sydorenko_povtor.pdf (data zvernennya 06.10.2017).
37. Vasyl'eva YU. V. Povtor kak pryntsyp orhanyzatsyy fol'klornoho teksta: leksyko-syntaksychesky povtor v prozvedennyakh russkoho y anghlo-shotlandskoho fol'klora: dys. ... kand. fylol. nauk: 10.02.19. Saratov, 2004. 213 s.
38. Vil'chyn's'ka T. Leksyko-semantychnyy povtor u memuarystytsi Ulasy Samchuka: do pytannya typolohiyi. Filolohichni nauky. 2015. Vyp. 38. S. 99–103.
39. Volyans'ka YU. YU. Typolohiya povtoru v poetychnomu movlenni kintsya KHKH – pochatku KHKHI stolittya: dys. ... kand. fylol. nauk: 10.02.01; Donets'kyy nats. un-t. Donets'k, 2013. 212 s.
40. Zelens'ka YU. Stylstychni fihury iz povtorom u suchasnomu poetychnomu movlenni. Linyhvyestychni studiyi. Linguistic Studies. 2009. Vyp. 19. S. 180–182.
41. Zhuk T. V. Leksychnyy ta syntaksychnyy povtor v ukrayins'koy narodnyy tvorchosti (na materialy ukrayins'kykh narodnykh kazok): dys... kand. fylol. nauk: 10.02.01. Nizhyn, 2004. 201 s.
42. Znamenskaya T. Stylistics of the English Language: Fundamentals of the Course: uch. posobiye. 2-e izd., ispravl. Moskva: Edytorial URSS, 2004. 208s.