Original Research

Precedence-setting tokens: Issues of classification and functional attribution

by Elena N. Malyuga and Asya S. Akopova

Elena N. Malyuga Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Russia malyuga-en@rudn.ru

Asya S. Akopova Southern Federal University, Russia asakopova@sfedu.ru

The study identifies and classifies the criteria instrumented to categorise and analyse precedence-setting tokens as units of sociocultural experience expressed in language and encapsulating some primary knowledge transmitted in the process of national, cultural and global development of a community. The authors set out to define and describe the essence of precedence-setting tokens as linguoculturological and socially and culturally significant units and offer an explanation for their typological categorisation based on theoretical observations cumulated from available studies on the concept in question. The study uses typological analysis to distinguish significant, internally homogeneous, qualitatively different groups of examined objects characterised by type-forming features of varying nature, as well as the functional approach whereby the perspectives of both the speaker and the listener are considered systemically to describe the functional potential enabling fulfillment of their communicative needs and intentions. The study claims that considered as units of language and speech that perform a set of specific communicative functions, precedence-setting tokens carry an extensive applicative potential, which can be highlighted by examining their eight key functions – nominative, persuasive, aesthetic, expressive, evaluative, comic, euphemistic, and the function of identity assessment.

KEYWORDS: *precedence-setting token, linguistic precedence, precedent text, precedent utterance, precedent name, precedent situation, linguocultural community, intertextuality*

1. INTRODUCTION

The process of speech production is often associated with a reference to certain information, whereby its content is directly related to the universal, social and national components of culture. Such cultural components act as a kind of a communicative 'weapon' in the hands of the speaker, who gets to express certain ideas and attitudes without resorting to the resources of their own speech-making potential. This feature of communicative and verbal behaviour is referred to as 'precedence'. The term and the linguistic possibilities and mechanisms behind it have quite recently become the object of close attention on the part of

'In the framework of language studies, precedence-setting tokens are researched through the lens of intertextuality, which assumes that 'any text is a mosaic of citations and represents the uptake and transformation of some other text' (Hodges, 2015, p. 44). In this interpretation, the text appears as an entity consisting of a set of composite text units reflecting the experience, knowledge, ideas, feelings and thoughts of previous authors'

linguists, as well as experts in intercultural communication, linguistic culturology, and pragmatics of communication.

Precedence-setting tokens that lie at the heart of the concept of linguistic precedence have been subjected to a close study since the end of the 20th century and have since received various interpretations. The linguistic and cultural analysis of their varieties – precedent texts, utterances, names, and situations – is considered the most productive method in studying precedent phenomena. Such an analysis, however, often lacks consistency, mainly because of the multidimensional nature of precedent phenomena that complicates their scientific analysis in general and classification in particular.

This paper attempts to distinguish and describe the classification criteria for precedence-setting tokens, which are herein viewed as units of sociocultural experience expressed in language and encapsulating some primary knowledge transmitted in the process of national, cultural and global development of a community. The study also elaborates on the issue of functional attribution of precedence-setting tokens, highlighting one of their key functions of identity assessment that plays the key role in distinguishing between the items recognised as 'innate' or, alternatively, 'alien' within a single linguocultural community.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study uses typological analysis as a set of methods intended to research social and linguocultural phenomena for the purposes of distinguishing significant, internally homogeneous, qualitatively different groups of examined objects characterised by type-forming features of varying nature. This entails dividing the objects under study – precedence-setting tokens in our case – into groups (classes) and considering homogeneous correlations by choosing and using classification criteria and analysing the results. The study also uses the functional approach whereby the perspectives of both the speaker and the listener are considered systemically to describe the functional potential enabling fulfillment of their communicative needs and intentions.

3. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In the framework of language studies, precedence-setting tokens are researched through the lens of intertextuality, which assumes that *'any text is a mosaic of citations and represents the uptake and transformation of some other text'* (Hodges, 2015, p. 44). In this interpretation, the text appears as an entity consisting of a set of composite text units reflecting the experience, knowledge, ideas, feelings and thoughts of previous authors. At the same time, not only literary works are viewed as texts, but society as a whole, with its history, culture and people, which is why one might view culture as an intertext acting as a 'pretext' of each new text (Lähdesmäki, 2017, p. 58).

This take on modern reality, the projection of culture through the prism of intertextuality responds to a variety of factors, in particular, the growing availability of works of art and literature, the development of mass education, the evolution of mass media and, as a result, the spread of mass culture. As a result, everything new is inevitably compared with the known, traditional, textbook knowledge, and a reference to the legacy of predecessors becomes an integral component of both research and creative activity, penetrating and merging with the norms of both formal and informal communication practices.

The study of the intertextual characteristics of language production in many respects laid the ground for the emergence of studies on precedence-setting tokens, which through intertextual premise require apprehension on three fundamental levels – those of language, cognition and culture (see Farrelly, 2020; Baron, 2019; Forstall & Scheirer, 2019; Mason, 2019).

Since the actual meaning of a precedence-setting token is very closely associated with some culture-specific background, the term has found a synonymous counterpart in the scientific literature with many studies referring to the same concept as 'cultural referents'. For example, Santamaria (2010) discusses the cognitive information carried by cultural referents to understand how exactly it is being grasped by the target audience in the process of translation, and defines the term in question as *'culturemes or cultural references which have a distinctive cultural capital within the society and which are capable of influencing the expressive value that we assign to the individuals who are associated with them'* (Santamaria, 2010, p. 517). Betancourt Ynfiesta and Treto Suárez (2011) address the problem of abbreviations and acronyms acting as cultural referents in medical texts and interpret the term as follows: *'A cultural referent is any kind of expression (textual, verbal, non-verbal or audiovisual) denoting any material, ecological, social, religious, linguistic or emotional manifestation that can be attributed to a particular community (geographic, socio-economic, professional, linguistic, religious, bilingual, etc.), and would be admitted as a trait of that community by those who consider themselves to be members of it'* (Betancourt Ynfiesta & Treto Suárez, 2011, p. 12).

As language units, precedence-setting tokens exhibit the following characteristics: (1) they have a verbal expression (Siertsema, 2018); (2) they are not recreated but reproduced in the process of communication (Borghi et al., 2019); and (3) they may be modified (transformed) providing they retain their recognisability potential (Sibul et al., 2020). As units of cognition, precedent phenomena: (1) are the result of certain cognitive operations (reduction, minimisation, etc.) (Luchkina & Waxman, 2021); (2) serve as a means of encoding and transforming information (Connell, 2019); and (3) set the models for the processing assessment and comparison of incoming information (Louwerse, 2018). As cultural units, precedent phenomena: (1) act as bearers of some cultural knowledge (Griber et al., 2018; Grishechko et al., 2021); (2) require correlation with other texts as cultural facts (Smith et al., 2018); and (3) determine the specifics of the cultural space (Mayes & Tao, 2019).

4. STUDY AND RESULTS
4.1. Issues of classification
4.1.1. Precedent texts
The most common classification of precedence-setting tokens differentiates between precedent texts, utterances, names, and situations. According to Gudkov (1999), a precedent text is *'a model text of a national culture, regularly reproduced within a given linguocultural community and generating an invariant perception, which content highlights the actions and character traits that are encouraged or, au contraire, condemned within a given society'* (Gudkov, 1999, p. 159).

Precedent texts are known to mould certain notions in the consciousness of a linguistic community, which can appeal to both positive and negative associations. At the same time, its efficiency primarily depends on the competence of the speaker, who is expected to be fully aware of their own intention and the very fact of reference being made. This fact of reference is sometimes termed 'reminiscence' or, alternatively, 'textual reminiscence' (Slyshkin, 2000, p. 51). In addition, the speaker is supposed to be familiar with the original text to a sufficient degree so that the parallel line of reminiscence being drawn out turns out valid, consistent and acceptable. Finally, before sending a reminiscent message referring to a precedent text, the speaker should evaluate the addressee's ability to adequately recognise it (Maschler & Schiffrin, 2015, p. 209).

When fulfilled, these three conditions ensure efficient communication and help avoid communication failure which ultimately implies achieving

'The proverbial nature of a precedent text implies the canonical, alphabetical nature of its form and content. This feature reflects the fact that a text is categorised among well-established linguistic, philosophical or cultural units. Popularity, on the other hand, emphasises the text's prevalence in the speech of a significant part of the representatives of a linguocultural community'

the common goal of communication, establishing or maintaining mutual understanding between the participants of communication, etc. Notably, however, while non-compliance with these conditions may induce communicative failure, the source text will still technically remain a precedent, even if one of the communicating parties failed to recognise it as such.

Analysing the role of precedent texts as part of a person's speech activity, Karaulov (2010) notes that a careful review of the corresponding lexical and stylistic means can help identify a person's system of values, detect their individual character traits, highlight a set of motives that determine their views and judgments, make assumptions about their communicative competence, educational background, etc.

In his comprehensive study, Karaulov (2010, p. 112) lists the following basic properties of precedent texts: (1) their proverbial nature; (2) their popularity; and (3) their re-interpretation value. The proverbial nature of a precedent text implies the canonical, alphabetical nature of its form and content. This feature reflects the fact that a text is categorised among well-established linguistic, philosophical or cultural units. Popularity, on the other hand, emphasises the text's prevalence in the speech of a significant part of the representatives of a linguocultural community. Finally, re-interpretation value implies diverse interpretation of precedent texts of various genres. This variability, of course, is limited in that only some minor

deviation from the basic, standard, traditional meaning is viewed as acceptable. Re-interpretation can also be genre- and time-sensitive. For example, while in the past precedent texts were mostly sourced from fiction and cinema, the torch has now been passed to advertising, TV series, so-called Internet memes, etc. The original source of the precedent text may overtime lose its relevance, which, however, does not prevent the concept itself from functioning as a cultural symbol (Toolan, 2016, p. 191).

4.1.2. Precedent utterances

Another type of precedence-setting tokens, precedent utterances, is represented primarily by well-established phraseological units defined as word combinations, which general meaning is not derived from the independent meanings of each individual word included in their composition (Naciscione, 2017, p. 57).

Another linguistic form embodying precedent utterances is represented by so-called linguistic aphorisms, which, unlike phraseological units, exhibit syntactic features of a phrase, rather than a word combination. Linguistic aphorisms can be defined as *'phrases widely used and well known to a significant part of a linguocultural community, derived from memory and not constituting part of original linguistic creativity'* (Grant, 2016, p. 18). The concept of linguistic aphorism incorporates language units such as proverbs and sayings, bywords, slogans, mottos (e.g. *All you need is love*; *Never say never*, etc.).

Gudkov (1999) insists that precedent utterances need to be differentiated from phraseological units proper and offers the following four criteria for differentiation:

(1) presence/absence of precedent semantics (while phraseological units are not associated with any precedent phenomenon whatsoever, a precedent utterance will always imply a reference to some precedent, i.e. a reminiscence);

(2) structural design evidenced in the syntactic differences reflecting syntactic dependence vs independence (while phraseological units can be reduced to a single word, as in *to pull the wool over*

somebody's eyes vs *to deceive*, precedent utterances cannot be equated to one word and at all times retain their syntactic independence);

(3) affiliation with the system of language and discourse (while phraseological units present special units of language, precedent utterances are also units of discourse);

(4) semantic stability (while phraseological units may lose their meaning when contracted, as in *out of sight, out of mind* vs *out of sight*, precedent utterances are often more resistant to this kind of change, retaining as a result their *superficial* meaning) (Gudkov, 1999, p. 192).

Considering the possibilities for typologisation, Gudkov (1999) suggests that precedent utterances can be differentiated based on the degree of 'depth' attributed to their meaning:

(1) precedent utterances bearing a prevailingly superficial semantics (e.g. the meaning of *If you see something, say something* is understandable even if one is not familiar with the corresponding precedent utterance);

(2) precedent utterances bearing both superficial and deep semantics (e.g. perceiving the superficial meaning of *We are the next generation* implies it is comprehended as a fact, a given, while its deep meaning may be associated with campaigning and promotion of certain moral values);

(3) precedent utterances bearing no superficial semantics yet exhibiting a distinctly marked deep semantics (e.g. *Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown* cannot be adequately interpreted through literal perception that ignores the deep meaning behind the utterance) (Gudkov, 1999, p. 199).

In keeping with another classification, precedent utterances are also divided into canonical (i.e. unchanged) and transformed (i.e. subjected to certain changes, while at the same time retaining their recognisability potential). Transformation can be implemented in various ways, such as:

1) substitution (a word traditionally used as part of a precedent utterance is replaced by another word with similar morphological characteristics, rhythmic structure and syntactic composition, as in *Crime and impoverishment* instead of *Crime and punishment*);

2) reduction (cuts in the compositional structure of a precedent utterance, as in *Don't trouble trouble* instead of *Don't trouble trouble until trouble troubles you*);

3) contamination (combining two or more precedent phenomena into a single unit, as in *Two is a company, and three is the Musketeers* as a combination of precedent utterance *Two is a company* and precedent name *Musketeers*);

4) supplementation (the initial precedent utterance is supplemented with additional components bearing the main semantic load, as in *War does not determine who's right. War determines who's left*).

Thus, a transformed precedent utterance functions as a unit comparable with the canonical precedent utterance, explicating its deep semantics at the expense of transforming elements through substitution, reduction, contamination or supplementation.

4.1.3. Precedent names

In keeping with the classification of precedent phenomena described above, these also include discourse units termed 'precedent names'. A precedent name is associated with a name originating from a well-known text and can be defined as a symbol associated with a certain set of qualities (e.g. *Ivan Susanin, Hamlet, Columbus, Napoleon, Faust,* etc.). Precedent names are used to colourfully describe a person, and this characteristic can relate to a variety of qualities of the described object, such as appearance, character, actions, social status, mental or creative abilities, origin, etc. (Sytar, 2016, p. 21). For example, by calling the object of description 'Napoleon', the speaker may refer to the external characteristics of the addressee (short stature), their character (militancy, purposefulness) or status (leader).

Currently, researchers address a variety of issues associated with the key characteristics and features of precedent names, as well as peculiarities of their functioning. One of the concerns lies in designating criteria for categorisation, so that a certain discourse unit could be classified as a precedent name. Such criteria primarily include

associative connection with classical works of literature and art, popularity and recognisability for a significant part of the representatives of a linguistic and cultural community (Smith, 2017).

This particular line of research, however, may prove difficult, since there are obviously no clear parameters to classify a work as classical, just as there are no intelligible means of 'measuring' recognisability. However, within the framework of less stringent selection criteria, one might suggest that a precedent name is distinguished by regular repeatability and non-denotative use of an associative name functioning as a cultural mark.

Researchers also pay attention to the way precedent names function in various types of discourse. For example, media texts most often operate with precedent names that, through the most generalised approach, could be qualified as the most recognisable, common, known within the national borders (Calka et al., 2014, p. 99). This primarily has to do with the specific way the media functions, for it is mostly oriented to appeal to a wide range of readers/listeners (Chadwick, 2017, p. 39).

Judging from the scientific literature available on the subject, whenever precedent names are concerned, a pertinent issue of originating sources arises, and these seem to include religion, theatre, media, politics, folklore, literature and many more (Ainiala & Ingemar Östman, 2017). Scholars involved in the study of this issue basically support either a narrow or a broad approach to the classification of originating sources giving 'birth' to precedent names. Thus, following the narrow approach, precedent names arise in the framework of philological and socio-historical practices (narrow approach) (Felecan, 2019), while the broad approach proposes to expand such a strict framework to consider the Bible, mythology, classical and popular music, political and scientific texts, medicine, politics, sports, etc., as initial areas giving rise to precedent names (Ikbol, 2021).

Notably, the semantic structure of a precedent name determines its denotative vs connotative use, meaning that it is viewed both as a part of a community's cognitive base, and as a proper name.

4.1.4. Precedent situations

The varieties of precedent phenomena discussed above (precedent texts, utterances and names) can be actualised within the framework of discourse through so-called precedent situations that exhibit an associative connection with them. A precedent situation is a reference, an ideal situation bearing certain connotations and explicated based on association with a precedent text, utterance or name. For example, the banishing of Adam and Eve from paradise, appealing to such concepts as shame, apostasy and disobedience, can be introduced into the context of communication through associative words such as *serpent, apple, sin,* etc. Another example is the precedent name *Judas* referring to the precedent situation of betrayal by Judas of Christ, which can be regarded as the 'standard' of treachery in general.

Considering that precedent phenomena can be recognisable to a varying degree, to classify them, one will have to distinguish between precedents that are most effectively actualised on an individual, social, national, or universal levels (Grishechko & Akopova, 2016). This approach is relevant when applied to precedent situations in particular: while some of them can only be clearly comprehended within a certain community, others can be accessible and apprehensible for wider groups of people. Therewith, precedent situations can be sourced from both events of a global scale, and texts known to a significant part of the linguocultural or world community that over time turn into a kind of standard for certain phenomena.

A distinctive feature of precedent situations in comparison with other precedent phenomena is their non-verbal nature. Hence, a precedent situation refers to some real single situation actualised against a certain context and intention through indirect verbalisation to generate a minimised invariant of perception (Neznayeva, 2018). Indirect verbalisation in this case highlights associative links connecting trigger words (trigger texts, utterances, or names) with the situations they generate. A precedent word is thus verbalised to create a precedent situation, while the situation itself does not receive verbal description.

4.2. Issues of functional attribution

Suggested classifications of precedence-setting tokens can serve as a valuable point of reference for their functional analysis. Following a comprehensive overview of available research, the functions identified in this paper and discussed below should be considered fundamental in considering the concept under study.

In linguistics, the *nominative function* is associated with the purport of a language unit to serve as a name for objects, concepts, their properties and relations (Gaby, 2017). The nominative function of precedence-setting tokens emerges in speech by way of direct quotations referencing the corresponding content, which furthers concise representation of subtext for the explicated meaning. In other words, by allowing the speaker to express a 'capacious' meaning in the form of a short precedent quotation, the nominative function appears inextricably linked with the function of linguistic minimalism, whereby ideas are expressed succinctly, and crucial points are highlighted with no 'extra' language means involved in the speech production process. Thus, the nominative function consists in naming and isolating fragments of reality and moulding concepts of them.

Having considered some of the major research issues having to do with the four types of precedence-setting tokens, we can argue that a recurrent 'common denominator' uniting them as cultural and linguistic units reproduced within a community is the *function if identity assessment* that basically identifies whether the speakers engaged in the conversation belong to a certain cluster (be it social, age, political, etc.), where the precedent texts, names, utterances and situations of similar content are being recurrently used and, consequently, apprehended.

The function of identity assessment can be best described in terms of the 'friend-or-foe' opposition, which is a part of cultural self-awareness and is one of the key concepts of a collective worldview that categorises every item of the surrounding reality as something innate (belonging to the inner circle) or alien (belonging to the outer circle). Any culture looks to distinguish between

'The function of identity assessment can be best described in terms of the 'friend-or-foe' opposition, which is a part of cultural self-awareness and is one of the key concepts of a collective worldview that categorises every item of the surrounding reality as something innate (belonging to the inner circle) or alien (belonging to the outer circle)'

the innate and the alien through a system of control signs that are developed in this culture in the process of its evolution (Baysha, 2020). Such control or reference signs can be described as collective ideals that are formed within the framework of a sociocultural community. The content of collective ideals is fixed through culturally significant objects, such as written texts (literature), works of art (paintings), and verbalised 'formulas' of interaction (speech). When it comes to precedence-setting tokens used as part of linguistic practices of a community, the actualisation of such ideals by the participants in the communicative exchange lies at the heart of the function of identity assessment.

Thus, it can be argued that the members of the group, resorting to some unique and commonly accepted precedence-setting tokens, are using language as an instrument for revealing group identity and cultural affiliation. At the same time, the reproductive nature of such tokens can be considered as a catalyst for integration processes within a group, for by developing the skills in using certain precedent allusions, each individual member of this group becomes more clearly aware of the line separating the innate from the alien (Vasileva & Ivanova, 2021). Therefore, the function of identity assessment is somewhat integrating in nature.

The potential of identity assessment through precedence-setting tokens in the communication process is most fully explicated in situations of intergroup conflicts, where the task of separating 'friends' from 'foes' comes to the forefront as an important imperative.

'The persuasive function of precedence-setting tokens emerges in the form of both opposed and argument-amplifying component of manipulation. At the same time, the persuasive potential of precedent texts appears extremely high due to their cultural authority among representatives of a linguocultural or a global community. Precedent texts can function as argumentative tools, often proving extremely effective as a means of campaigning'

Considering that the function of identity assessment implies successful decoding of a message by the recipient, we can also argue that it is associated with a certain feeling of satisfaction: the speaker formulates a text reminiscence using a precedence-setting token, while the recipient of the message successfully decodes the message, recognising the value of the reminiscences being transferred. Given the interlinear, somewhat veiled nature of the message, both sides of the dialogue are satisfied with both their own verbal behaviour and the communicative competence of the interlocutor, who can evaluate and interpret the general text associations generated by a particular stimulus.

From the point of view of functional linguistics, language is understood as a tool for implementing a purposeful activity (Martin et al., 2019), which facilitates interest in the methods of implicit and explicit manipulation of the recipient. Persuasiveness giving rise to the *persuasive function* of precedence-setting tokens in this context is considered as one of the effective forms of manipulating the interlocutor's post-communicative behaviour.

Persuasiveness is viewed as a special form of speech behaviour with a distinct intentional nature. At the same time, the distinctive characteristics of persuasiveness are mostly due to its close connection with argumentation, defined as a logical process designed to substantiate judgments through various methods of constructing an evidence base (Hann, 2018). Considering the relationship between these forms of speech activity, persuasiveness can be considered as: (1) speech impact, aimed primarily at manipulating emotions as opposed to influencing the recipient's rational domain (Heilmann et al., 2020); (2) a set of techniques used to strengthen the argumentation (El Baff et al., 2020); and (3) stylistic variation of argumentation, practical argumentation in real communicative situations (Tseronis, 2018).

The persuasive function of precedence-setting tokens emerges in the form of both opposed and argument-amplifying component of manipulation. At the same time, the persuasive potential of precedent texts appears extremely high due to their cultural authority among representatives of a linguocultural or a global community. Precedent texts can function as argumentative tools, often proving extremely effective as a means of campaigning. The persuasive function of precedence-setting tokens is most clearly manifested within the framework of speech genres such as a dispute or a discussion (Pessoa et al., 2017).

The target content of the persuasive function of precedence-setting tokens is aimed at addressing certain communicative tasks: (1) encouraging general consideration and/or acceptance of a point of view; (2) arousing interest in the content of the message; (3) emphasising certain information contained in the message (idea, characteristics, facts, etc.); (4) clarifying and correcting the views (Musi, 2018).

At the same time, seeking to change the interlocutor's post-communicative behaviour, one can set related yet different goals, namely: (a) to induce co-thinking by making oneself heard; (2) to induce sympathetic comprehension by modifying the addressee's emotional state); (3) to induce co-operation by pushing the addressee to perform a certain action that meets the needs of the speaker (Akopova, 2013, p. 79-80).

Obviously, the persuasive function of precedence-setting tokens can be primarily traced in texts of manipulative genres, such as political speech or advertising.

'Precedence-setting tokens are an effective means of emotional evaluation as they do not profess logical completeness or precise formulation, and yet they clearly express the subjective evaluative attitude of the author of the message and can be realised both at the pragmatic and grammatical levels. Most researchers who consider the evaluative function of precedence-setting tokens, emphasise their pronounced subjective nature, which often practically excludes any degree of objectivity of the evaluative judgment'

The *aesthetic function* of precedent-setting tokens emerges as their ability to express an assessment of the surrounding reality, perceived by the recipient as an aesthetically significant mental explication. Considering that the functioning of precedent-setting tokens is often based on the use of various tropes (such as metaphor, comparison, hyperbolisation, etc.) which are an important means of aesthetic influence in language and speech, precedent texts, names and situations often adopt the corresponding properties perceived by the recipient as aesthetically representative fragments of speech (Bennett, 2021).

The *expressive function* of precedent phenomena lies in their ability to explicate the emotional state of the speaker, their subjective feelings, generated by the phenomena of reality, which are the subject of a specific communicative exchange. Speech expression generated using precedence-setting tokens can be based on the use of various elements of the language, including intonation contours modified in the process of interaction (Malyuga & Tomalin, 2017).

Precedence-setting tokens are an effective means of emotional evaluation as they do not profess logical completeness or precise formulation, and yet they clearly express the subjective evaluative attitude of the author of the message and can

be realised both at the pragmatic and grammatical levels (Malyuga et al., 2016). Most researchers who consider the *evaluative function* of precedence-setting tokens, emphasise their pronounced subjective nature, which often practically excludes any degree of objectivity of the evaluative judgment (Gudkov, 1999).

The comic effect that can be achieved via using precedence-setting tokens in speech is also one of their important and productive functions – the *comic function*. The comic effect in this case can be based on a clash of different discourses, a partial modification of the original precedent text, a violation of the associative series of the narrative, etc. (Malyuga, 2016).

Using precedence-setting tokens can also help to soften the statement, make it less harsh, less specific and – ultimately – convey the necessary information in a non-aggressive way (Grishechko, 2011), which is why the *euphemistic function* can be added to the list as one of the crucial ones when considering the applicative potential of precedence-setting tokens.

5. CONCLUSION

The study was concerned with precedence-setting tokens herein defined as units of sociocultural experience expressed in language and encapsulating some primary knowledge transmitted in the process of national, cultural and global development of a community. As units actualised within the framework of communicative activity, precedence-setting tokens exhibit a number of features including a relatively conventional level of application, associative nature, relative freedom in the choice of the form of expression (which degree depends mostly on the context and the type of specific discourse), the active role of the recipient, and their inventory to deliver both linguistic and extralinguistic meaning.

The existing classifications of precedence-setting tokens as elements of linguistic and speech activity imply the differentiation of their four fundamental types: (1) precedent texts, defined as exemplary texts of national culture, regularly reproduced in a given linguocultural community and

generating invariant perception; (2) precedent statements, interpreted as phraseological units, phrases, aphorisms or logoepystems, implying a reference to some precedent (reminiscence), retaining their syntactic independence and emerging as units of discourse conserving their 'superficial' meaning; (3) precedent names associated with names originating from a well-known text; and (4) precedent situations, which are reference, ideal situations with certain connotations, explicated on the basis of association with a precedent text, utterance or name. The study showed that the existing criteria for the classification and analysis of precedence-setting tokens reflect the diverse na-

ture of the very concept of linguistic precedence. This concept occupies an important place in the processes of evolution and functioning of linguo-cultural systems, which activity is determined by experience being recorded, preserved, and transmitted as precedents of varying degrees of associativity and recognisability.

The functions of precedence-setting tokens considered in the paper indicate a rather extensive potential for their operation in language and speech, which, in turn, determines the relevance of studying specific techniques for using them to achieve a certain effect in certain communicative contexts.

References

Ainiala, T., & Ingemar Östman, J. O. (Eds.). (2017). *Socio-onomastics: The pragmatics of names.* John Benjamins. https://dx.doi.org/10.1075/pbns.275

Akopova, A. S. (2013). Linguistic manipulation: Definition and types. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education, 1*(2), 78-82. https://www.ijcrsee.com/index.php/ijcrsee/article/view/13/13

Baron, S. (2019). *The birth of intertextuality: The riddle of creativity.* Routledge. https://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203711057

Baysha, O. (2020). Dividing social networks: Facebook unfriending, unfollowing, and blocking in turbulent political times. *Russian Journal of Communication, 12*(2), 104-120. https://doi.org/10.1080/19409419.2020.1773911

Bennett, T. J. (2021). Incompatibility, unlimited semiosis, aesthetic function. In E. Sütiste, R. Gramigna, J. Griffin, & S. Salupere (Eds.), *Tartu Semiotics Library 23: (Re)considering Roman Jakobson* (pp. 149-163). University of Tartu Press.

Betancourt Ynfiesta, B., & Treto Suárez, L. (2011). *Analysis of the use of acronyms and initialisms as cultural referents in medical texts* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidad Central Marta Abreu de Las Villas). UCLV Institutional Repository of the Central University Marta Abreu of Las Villas (UCLV). https://goo-gl.me/ItdRq

Borghi, A. M., Barca, L., Binkofski, F., Castelfranchi, C., Pezzulo, G., & Tummolini, L. (2019). Words as social tools: Language, sociality and inner grounding in abstract concepts. *Physics of Life Reviews, 29,* 178-184. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.plrev.2019.06.004

Calka, M., Denker, K. J., Dunn, R. A., Henderson, C., Manning, J., Stern, D. M., & Willits, M. D. (2014). *Beyond new media: Discourse and critique in a polymediated age.* Lexington Books.

Chadwick, A. (2017). *The hybrid media system: Politics and power.* Oxford University Press.

Connell, L. (2019). What have labels ever done for us? The linguistic shortcut in conceptual processing. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience, 34*(10), 1308-1318. https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2018.1471512

El Baff, R., Wachsmuth, H., Al Khatib, K., & Stein, B. (2020, July). Analyzing the persuasive effect of style in news editorial argumentation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (pp. 3154-3160). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://dx.doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.287

Farrelly, M. (2020). Rethinking intertextuality in CDA. *Critical Discourse Studies, 17*(4), 359-376. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2019.1609538

Felecan, O. (Ed.). (2019). *Onomastics between sacred and profane*. Vernon Press.

Forstall, C. W., & Scheirer, W. J. (2019). What is Quantitative Intertextuality? In C. W. Forstall & W. J. Scheirer (Eds.), *Quantitative intertextuality* (pp. 3-21). Springer. https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23415-7_1

Gaby, A. (2017). Kinship semantics: Culture in the lexicon. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *Advances in cultural linguistics* (pp. 173-188). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4056-6_9

Grant, B. (2016). *The aphorism and other short forms*. Routledge.

Griber, Y. A., Mylonas, D., & Paramei, G. V. (2018). Objects as culture-specific referents of color terms in Russian. *Color Research & Application, 43*(6), 958-975. https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/col.22280

Grishechko, E. G. (2011). *Sredstva realizatsii kommunikativnoi strategii vezhlivosti v sovremennom Angliiskom yazyke* (Author's abstract, Southern Federal University). Elibrary National Electronic Library. https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=19359409

Grishechko, E. G., Sharma, G., & Zheleznova, K. Y. (2021). Peculiarities of Indian English as a separate language. *Propositos y Representaciones, 9,* Article e913. https://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2021.v9nSPE1.913

Grishechko, O. S., & Akopova, A. S. (2016). The concept of precedent phenomena and their role in shaping social consciousness. *Philology. Theory & Practice, 12*(66), 71-74. https://gramota.net/materials/2/2016/12-1/21.html

Gudkov, D. B. (1999). *Pretsedentnye fenomeny v yazykovom soznanii i mezhkul'turnoi kommunikatsii* (Doctoral dissertation, Lomonosov Moscow State University). Russian State Library. https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01000290494 (In Russian)

Hann, D. (2018). Persuasive language. In P. Seargeant, A. Hewings, & S. Pihlaja (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English language studies* (pp. 252-264). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351001724

Heilmann, J., Malone, T. O., & F. Westerveld, M. (2020). Properties of spoken persuasive language samples from typically developing adolescents. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 51*(2), 441-456.

Hodges, A. (2015). *Intertextuality in discourse*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Ikbol, K. (2021). Aesthetic onomastics and its functions in artistic and intertext. *International Journal of Integrated Education, 4*(4), 132-136.

Karaulov, Yu. N. (2010). *Russkii yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost'*. LKI. (In Russian)

Lähdesmäki, T. (2017). Narrativity and intertextuality in the making of a shared European memory. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies, 25*(1), 57-72. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2016.1159544

Louwerse, M. M. (2018). Knowing the meaning of a word by the linguistic and perceptual company it keeps. *Topics in Cognitive Science, 10*(3), 573-589. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/tops.12349

Luchkina, E., & Waxman, S. (2021). Acquiring verbal reference: The interplay of cognitive, linguistic, and general learning capacities. *Infant Behavior and Development, 65,* Article 101624. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2021.101624

Malyuga, E. (2016, August 24-30). Exploiting the potential of ICT: Assessment of students' knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social Sciences and Arts SGEM 2016* (pp. 319-325). STEF92 Technology. https://doi.org/10.5593/SGEMSOCIAL2016/B13/S03.042

Malyuga, E., Shvets, A., & Tikhomirov, I. (2016, July 13-15). Computer-based analysis of business communication language. In *Proceedings of 2016 SAI Computing Conference SAI 2016* (pp. 229-232). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/SAI.2016.7555987

Malyuga, E. N., & Tomalin, B. (2017). Communicative strategies and tactics of speech manipulation in intercultural business discourse. *Training, Language and Culture, 1*(1), 28-45. https://doi.org/10.29366/2017tlc.1.1.2

Martin, J. R., Doran, Y. J., & Figueredo, G. (Eds.). (2019). *Systemic functional language description: Making meaning matter*. Routledge.

Maschler, Y., & Schiffrin, D. (2015). Discourse markers: Language, meaning, and context. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 189-221). John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584194.ch9

Mason, J. (2019). *Intertextuality in practice.* John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lal.33

Mayes, P., & Tao, H. (2019). Referring expressions in categorizing activities: Rethinking the nature of linguistic units for the study of interaction. *Studies in Language, 43*(2), 329-363. https://dx.doi.org/10.1075/sl.16066.may

Musi, E. (2018). How did you change my view? A corpus-based study of concessions' argumentative role. *Discourse Studies, 20*(2), 270-288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445617734955

Naciscione, A. (2017). *Stylistic use of phraseological units in discourse.* John Benjamins.

Neznayeva, O. S. (2018). Peculiarities of precedent names functioning in student speech as symbols of the precedent texts and precedent situations. *Bulletin of Saratov University, 18*(2), 153-157. https://doi.org/10.18500/1817711520 18182153157

Pessoa, S., Mitchell, T. D., & Miller, R. T. (2017). Emergent arguments: A functional approach to analyzing student challenges with the argument genre. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 38,* 42-55. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.10.013

Santamaria, L. (2010). The translation of cultural referents: From reference to mental representation. *Meta, 55*(3), 516-528. https://doi.org/10.7202/045068ar

Sibul, V. V., Vetrinskaya, V. V., & Grishechko, E. G. (2020). Study of precedent text pragmatic function in modern economic discourse. In E. N. Malyuga (Ed.), *Functional approach to professional discourse exploration in linguistics* (pp. 131-163). Springer. https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9103-4_5

Siertsema, B. (2018). Linguistic de-stigmatization? In M. Black & W. A. Smalley (Eds.), *On language, culture and religion* (pp. 315-336). De Gruyter Mouton.

Slyshkin, G. (2000). *Ot teksta k simvolu: Lingvokul'turnye kontsepty pretsedentnykh tekstov v soznanii i diskurse.* Academia. (In Russian)

Smith, G. W. (2017, September 5-7). An elaboration on the symbolic meanings of names. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Onomastics 'Name and naming'* (pp. 35-44). Baia Mare.

Smith, V., Florence, K., & Maria, F. (2018). Semantics in cultural perspective overview. *Linguistics and Culture Review, 2*(1), 24-31. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v2n1.9

Sytar, H. H. (2016). Syntactic idioms and precedent phenomena: Intersection aones. *Lìngvìstičnì Studìï, 31*(1), 20-25.

Toolan, M. (2016). *Language, text and context: Essays in stylistics.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315402383

Tseronis, A. (2018). Multimodal argumentation: Beyond the verbal/visual divide. *Semiotica, 220,* 41-67. https://dx.doi.org/10.1515/sem-2015-0144

Vasileva, V., & Ivanova, L. (2021). Speech etiquette of professional online communities. *Russian Journal of Communication, 13*(2), 183-198. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19409419.2021.1899563

ELENA N. MALYUGA

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia | 6 Miklukho-Maklay Str., 117198 Moscow, Russia

malyuga-en@rudn.ru

ASYA S. AKOPOVA

Southern Federal University | 105/42 B. Sadovaya Str., 344006 Rostov-on-Don, Russia

asakopova@sfedu.ru