

VERBALIZATION OF LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY IN LITERARY DISCOURSE

Nozliya Normurodova Zarilovna

Navo'i Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature

UZBEKISTAN

nozliyanormurodova1@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present stage of development of linguistics is characterized by anthropocentric paradigm of scientific researches which are conducted within psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, linguoculturology, etc. Article deals with the one of the new trends of an anthropocentric scientific paradigm - linguopragmatics, the basic notion of which is considered to be linguistic personality (LP). The notion of LP and its structure is widely discussed in linguistic literature. As many researchers note, the model of LP is not a constant, it is open/available for further additions, elaboration and specification. The author highlights the problem of LP on the material of literary discourse in the integration of semantic-stylistic, communicative-pragmatic, cognitive, culturological characteristics makes it possible to construct the multilevel model of LP that reflects mental essence of this phenomenon.

Keywords: Linguistic personality, verbal-semantic, linguopragmatic, linguocognitive, discourse.

INTRODUCTION, LITERATURE REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

The modern linguistics is based on the principle of anthropocentric paradigm, which contains "human factor" in the study of language. The anthropocentric scientific paradigm puts forward the new approaches to the research of language which are implemented within a number of new disciplines, such as cognitive linguistics, linguopersonology, linguoculturology, text linguistics, linguopragmatics, communicative linguistics, etc.

It is acknowledged that new perspective trends in linguistics should be investigated through anthropocentric approach. General assumptions are the following:

- the basic notion of paradigm, its historical development and classification are key figures in penetrating deep meaning of linguistic personality;
- anthropocentric paradigm in the light of interdisciplinary approach, which includes cognitive linguistics, linguopragmatics, linguoculturology etc.
- new trends in linguistics are interconnected, interconditioned that imply extralinguistic factors of the language on the whole.

Communicative stylistics has been developing intensively due to a new scientific paradigm – anthropocentric paradigm too, which focuses attention on the “human factor”. That means that the categories of the addresser and addressee should be included in the study of linguistic mechanisms. In this respect the notion of “linguistic personality” is of paramount significance. The term was first introduced by V.V.Vinogradov who brought up the problem of the “author’s image” (Vinogradov, 1971:34). At present, the term "linguistic personality" has several implications:

1) the denomination of complex means describing the linguistic ability of the individual that connects systematic representation of language with the functional analysis of texts (Salkie, 1995:56);

2) the type of representation of personality based on the discourse analysis of language bearer from the point of view of use of system means of this very language for reflection of vision of a certain reality and for achievement of specific communicative goals, i.e. communicative personality (Wierzbicka, 1991);

3) dictionary/lexicographic personality which is the basic national and cultural prototype of the carrier of a certain language that is predominantly attached to the lexical system and is reconstructed on the basis of the world outlook settings, valuable priorities and behavioral reactions reflected in the dictionary (Langacker, 1991:78).

Later the theory of linguistic personality was in full measure elaborated by Yu.N.Karaulov on the material of the Russian language. The scholar designated a model of linguistic personality consisting of three levels: 1) verbal-semantic; 2) pragmatic; 3) cognitive (Normurodova, 2012). This model makes the basis of all other researchers related to the structure of linguistic personality and lays foundation for new ideas. In further researches this model was to some extent modified and specified. For example, on the material of the English language, viz. literary dialogues, the problems of linguistic personality and its structure in conformity with the regularities of a fictional text were discussed in the dissertation paper by N.Z.Normurodova (Normurodova, 2012).

In literary discourse linguistic personality is regarded as a linguistic correlate of the person's spiritual features, his communicative abilities, knowledge, aesthetic and cultural values. Linguistic personality in the fictional text is presented in two forms: the author's image and that of the personage. It must be made clear that linguistic personality can be presented by all verbal means used in different compositional forms: description, narration, reasoning and discourses. But the most conspicuous form of presenting linguistic personality is his speech reflected in literary discourses. It is expedient therefore to say a few words about literary discourses and their typology.

Some more assumptions of the same linguists arose great interest among the researchers. They represent the notion of discourse as a living phenomenon, which is born, lives and dies; and this description is all about the discourse when it loses its relevance and actuality. Text is eternal, i.e. manuscripts don't get burnt. There is no incoherent text in the nature. Written text was once discourse, and the text when it gets the human hand touched and has his/her consciousness joined, it will turn into discourse. Text is a means and unit of communication. Discourse is a form in which this communication proceeds. The text provides sustenance for thought, and the discourse is the reflection that is explicitly expressed (Normurodova, 2012:23).

As E. S. Kubryakova fairly notices, opposition of text and discourse should not be absolutized. Even though these notions are considered as mutually exclusive; nevertheless, they are still connected by "genetic relationship". In other words, there is no text out of discourse activity, i.e. any recorded or fixed text is preceded by discourse. In addition, the thing which text and discourse analysis have in common is that each of them certainly need to decode implicit meanings in order to get the clear understanding, which is significant for both (Whorf, 2013:67). Thus, even though the notions of text and discourse are quite distinguishable, they do not oppose each other completely since their relations are characterized by cause and effect relationship: text is the result of discourse. Text arises in the

process of implementation of a certain process, but it is studied in its complete look, and discourse is investigated in a certain mode and time. In any case, discourse analysis presupposes reactivation of this process even if its result is studied (Ashurova, 2014:98). At this point, it is important to mention that mode of discourse is a term which denotes "what part the language is playing, what is that the participants are expecting the language to do for them in that situation: the symbolic organization of the text, the status that it has, and its function in the context, and also the rhetorical mode, what is being achieved by the text" (Ashurova, 2012:77).

As surveys has shown, besides the opposite features sketched between the notions of text and discourse, there are some more properties that they two have in common, as well. For instance, it was noted that the "users" of both text and discourse are considered to be the author and the reader who are believed not always to contact with each other directly [Wierzbicka, 1997:3].

The abovementioned assumption would be true especially in case of the creation of a scientific text which comes into existence in a specific socio-cultural and historical environment, and this is exactly what is reflected both in its formal (expression) and substantial (content, semantic) structure. When creating the scientific text, the author does not simply fix certain background knowledge in his/her writing, but also he/she includes the elements of imaginary dialogue with the addressee of the text, he/she seek out to realize his intentions by means of certain language structures in order to deliver certain pragmatic settings to the addressee. In other words, the author is plunged into the discursive space of that science or knowledge, and tends to use every single possibility of discourse aimed at reasoned statements of views, assumptions and inferences, as result of which a concrete text is formed.

Further reflecting on the concepts of text and discourse, a number of certain authors regard discourse as a complex system of knowledge hierarchy, (Ashurova, 2014:8) which contains the knowledge of the world, the language that people speak, and the knowledge of relevance of situation (Verdonk, 1999); and according to the same linguists, text, being the result of discourse, possibly, can be considered as a representative of almost identical knowledge hierarchy.

Representation of discourse as a complex communicative phenomenon, which assumes not only the creation of a certain text, but also which reflects the dependence of speech production created by means of certain amounts of extralinguistic circumstances that are shown at the text perception, helps certain scientists to claim that the cognitive processing model of discourse naturally fits into comprehension model (or processings) of discourse.

Literary discourse as an essential part of the belles-letters text can be viewed from different angles: from the point of view of its structure, semantics, stylistics, pragmatic and cognitive functions. As for typology of discourse, they are classified according to different criteria:

1. According to the length and expansion: short and prolonged discourses;
2. According to the semantic and thematic content: the discourses of philosophical, religious, everyday, professional character;
3. According to the character of interpersonal relations: discourse -argument, discourse -quarrel, discourse -discussion, etc.

In addition to these criteria dialogues can be differentiated in accordance with the structure of linguistic personality. In literary communication the structure of linguistic personality, in our

opinion, consists of the following levels: semantic-stylistic, linguo-pragmatic, linguocognitive.

Let us turn to the analysis of each level with the aim to define peculiar features of linguistic personality presented in the character's image. The first level characterizes the inner psychological state of the personages, their feelings and emotions:

- *Shut up! Who let them in?! It's unfortunate you wandered in ocean of life, as stranger in wonderland?! However, that is life – full of ironies – some of them pleasant? Some rather ugly – I've never thought life was a gift – it's a burden – a sentence – cruel and unusual punishment – everybody says prayers should pray for this sinful citizens.*
- *What has happened now, I'll tell you! In this city, it seemed, Sodom and Gomorrah had come to a second birth. Life is here – as you said in general about it really difficult, and – easy in its plain way, - but this will end at last, this sentence, yes, yes, this sentence – cruel and unusual punishment – MUST END. (P.James, "Wings of Eagles").*

This dialogue expresses the individual emotive perception of the notion "life". The speech of the character is highly emotive, full of expressive means and stylistic devices: **epithets**: (*unfortunate, pleasant, ugly, cruel, sinful, difficult, unusual*); **simile**: (*as life was a gift*); **allusion**: (*Sodom and Gomorrah*); **antithesis**: (*pleasant/ugly, difficult/easy*); syntactical stylistic means: nominative sentences, gradation, repetition, rhetorical question.

The linguopragmatic level of linguistic personality presupposes the analysis of pragmatic factors describing various characteristics of the communications: their age, sex, nationality, social status, role relations, cultural and educational levels. The dialogues from Bernard Shaw's play "Pigmalion" can serve as a very convincing example of the pragmatic parameters of linguistic personality. The play narrates about the bet made between colonel Pickering and professor of phonetics Higgins who argued that within three month he would be able to turn Liza, a poor flower girl, into a perfect lady of the upper classes. Here is an example illustrating Liza's low social status and education:

The flower girl: *I want to be a lady in a flower shop stead of sellin at the corner of Tottenham Court Road. But they wont take me unless I can talk more genteel. He said he could teach me. Well, here I am ready to pay him – not asking any favor – and he treats me zif I was dirt... I aint got no mother. Her that turned me out was my sixth stepmother. But I done without them. And I'm a good girl, I am.*

The next dialogue is illustrative of the fact that due to Prof. Higgin's efforts Liza was accepted in the society as a real lady.

Many other examples of represented speech, descriptive contexts, stylistic devices, poetic details are used to characterize old Jolyon, his inner world, thoughts and reflections upon life, admiration for nature and music, Beauty and Youth. It will suffice to give some of these examples:

With the years his dislikes of humbug had increased...leaving him reverent before three things alone – beauty, upright conduct and the sense of property; and the greatest of these now was beauty. He had always had wide interests, and , indeed, could still read The Times, but he was liable at any moment to put it down if he heard a blackbird sing. Upright conduct – property – somehow, they were tiring, the balckbirds and the sunsets never tired him, only

gave him an uneasy feeling that he could not get enough of them. Storing into the stilly radiance of the early evening and at the little gold and white flowers on the lawn, a thought came to him: This weather was like the music of "Orfeo", which he had recently heard at Covent garden... The yearning of "Orpheus" for the beauty he was losing, for his love going down to Hades, as in life, love and beauty did go – the yearning which sang and throbbed through the garden music, stirred also in the lingering beauty of the world that evening.

The implications and inferences drawn from this extract are indicative of the particular conceptual structures and cognitive habits that characterize an individual's world view.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the efforts put forth in the systemic description of LP makes a certain contribution to the development of anthropocentric linguistics, theories of discourse, problems of interpretation of literary discourse, and also new trends in linguistics (cognitive linguistics, pragmalinguistics, linguopersonology, linguoculturology). The disclosed and systematized parameters of LP in this research (semantic-stylistic, pragmatic, cognitive) and particularities of their verbalization are important for further scientific researches in this field.

On the basis of cognitive-discursive features of LP in literary discourse it is possible to define it as a polyconceptual phenomenon that has internal structure and external signs of realization. The model of LP consists of the following levels: a) semantic-stylistic; b) linguopragmatic; c) linguocognitive. It is important to emphasize that in our model, unlike many models presented in linguistic literature, each of the specified levels has two-sided character which reflects substantial characteristics of LP (semantic-stylistic, pragmatic, cognitive, cultural) and verbal means of their realization. In other words, each level is presented in the ratio of linguistic and mental structures.

In conclusion the major points may be summarized as follows:

- Linguistic personality is a manifold, multicomponent, structurally organized set of linguistic competences, a certain linguistic correlate of the spiritual world of a personality in the integrity of his social, ethnic, psychological aesthetic characteristics;
- In fictional texts linguistic personality is presented in the image of the author and that of the personage, the latter is manifold.
- The study of linguopragmatic features of LP is aimed at revealing social and professional status, the role and personal relations between LPs, age, local, national characteristics, emotional state of LPs, traits of character and cultural belongings of LP. Besides, pragmatic aspect includes the study of role relations which assume the analysis of speech behavior, role expectations, factor of mutual understanding.
- The conducted research confirms the suggested hypothesis that the peculiarity of LP in literary discourse is revealed in a specific linguistic form of reflection of its semantic-stylistic, pragmatic, cognitive, national and cultural characteristics that represent a certain correlate of features of spiritual aspect of LP.

REFERENCES

1. Ashurova D.U. (2017) New Trends in Stylistics//Foreign languages in Uzbekistan //Scientific-methodological journal. –Tashkent,. –№3 (17) www.fledu.uz
2. Ashurova D.U., Galieva M.R.(2014) Stylistics of Literary Text. – Tashkent: Turon-Iqbol,. – 272 p.

3. Ashurova, Galieva M.R. (2016) Text Linguistics. – Tashkent: Turon-Iqbol,– 324 p.
4. Арнольд И.В. (1974) Стилистика декодирования. –Л.: ЛГПИ,
Arnold I.V. (1974) Decoding stylistics. – L., LGPI,
5. Vinogradov V.V. (1971) Language and world of people, 2 nd edited version. – M.: Languages of Russian culture, – 896 с.
6. Humboldt W. von. (1988) On Language: The Diversity of Human Language. Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind (Texts in German Philosophy). – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
7. Langacker R. W. (1991) Concept, Image and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar. – Berlin, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter. – 395 p.
8. Normurodova N.Z. (2018) Linguistic personality in the light of antropothentric paradigm: basic notion, best practices, challenges and perspectives. – LangLIT, INTERNATIONAL PEER OPEN JOURNAL, India, №2.
9. Normurodova N. (2012). Representation of linguistic personality in literary dialogue. Tashkent: Tafakkur qanoti.
10. Salkie R. (1995) Text and discourse analysis. – London, NY: Routledge, 115 p.
11. Swan M. (1996) Practical English Usage Text. – Oxford University Press,. 654 p.
12. Sapir E.(2012) Selected Writings in Language, Culture, and Personality. By David G. Mandelbaum (Editor). – London: University of California Press.
13. Whorf B. (2013) Language, Thought, and Reality; Selected Writings. – New York, Hardpress Publishing.
14. Wierzbicka A. (2006) English: meaning and culture. – Oxford: Oxford University Press.
15. Wierzbicka A. (1991) Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction. – Berlin: Language Arts and Disciplines. – 502 p.
16. Wierzbicka A. Understanding Culture through Key Words: English, Russian, Polish and Japanese. –N.Y.-L.: Oxford University Press, 1997
17. Verdonk P. (2002) Stylistics. Oxford Introductions to Language Study Text. Series Editor H.G. Widdowson. – Oxford University Press,– 124 p.