

DISCOURSE AND RHETORICAL POSSIBILITIES OF A LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY

Usmonova Nilufar Adhamovna

Lecturer, Fergana State University

ABSTRACT

The article discusses the concept of "linguistic personality" and its rhetorical possibilities. The problem of the concept of "discourse" and its interaction with the linguistic personality is considered. The author investigates the actual problems of the modern linguistic personality in the context of the modern language situation.

Keywords: *discourse, linguistic personality, rhetoric, critical discursive research, conceptual sphere, perlocative effect of utterance.*

ДИСКУРС И РИТОРИЧЕСКИЕ ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ ЛИЧНОСТИ

Усмонова Нилуфар Адхамовна

преподаватель, Ферганский государственный университет

АННОТАЦИЯ

В статье рассматривается понятие «языковая личность» и его риторические возможности. Рассмотрена проблема понятия «дискурс» и его взаимодействие с языковой личностью. Автором исследуются актуальные проблемы современной языковой личности в контексте современной языковой ситуации.

Ключевые слова: *дискурс, языковая личность, риторика, критические дискурсивные исследования, концептосфера, перлокутивный эффект высказывания.*

DISKURS VA TIL SHAXSIYATINING RITORIK IMKONIYATLARI

Usmonova Nilufar Adhamovna

o'qituvchi, Farg'ona davlat universiteti

ANNOTATSIYA

Maqolada "til shaxsiyati" tushunchasi va uning ritorik imkoniyatlari ko'rib chiqiladi. "Nutq" tushunchasi va uning tilshunos shaxs bilan o'zaro ta'siri ko'rib chiqildi. Muallif zamonaviy tillardagi vaziyat nuqtai nazaridan zamonaviy til shaxsining dolzarb muammolarini o'rganadi.

Kalit so'zlar: nutq, til shaxsiyati, ritorika, tanqidiy nutqiy tadqiqotlar, kontsepsiyalar, bayonotning ta'sirchan ta'siri.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of linguistic personality was introduced into philology by V. Vinogradov (1930), and developed by Yu. Karaulov, having proposed its structure in a linguo-pragmatic perspective. Yu. Karaulov considers the concept of "Linguistic personality" as pivotal and defining, around which the discussion of the most interesting problems of general linguistics unfolds, and interprets it as "a set of human abilities and characteristics that determine the creation and perception of speech works (texts), which differ in a) degree of structural and linguistic complexity, b) depth and accuracy of reflection of reality, c) a certain target orientation", as well as "any native speaker of a particular language, characterized on the basis of the analysis of the texts generated by him from the point of view of using the system tools of this language in these texts to display his vision of the surrounding reality (worldview) and to achieve certain goals in this world [4].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The problem of defining the concept of discourse still remains unresolved. There are even disputes about where to put the stress in this word correctly. But first of all, the difficulty lies in the fact that this concept is interdisciplinary, namely it is used in such sciences as linguistics, anthropology, literary studies, ethnography, sociology, sociolinguistics, philosophy, psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology and many others. This also determines the variety of approaches to the definition of the term "discourse", to the interpretation of its meaning and essence. Let's consider approaches to the definition of the concept of "discourse" in linguistics. So N.A. Yemelyanova in her dissertation identifies four main approaches to the definition of the concept of "discourse": communicative (functional), structural-syntactic, structurally stylistic and socially pragmatic.

According to the first approach, "discourse" is considered as the functioning of language in speech, a certain oral message in conjunction with the accompanying time, place, situation, etc. Speech, in turn, can take the form of a dialogue, conversation, or be viewed from the speaker's position in opposition to the narrative.

The second approach defines "discourse" as a part of a text, a super-phrasal unity, a paragraph or even several paragraphs exceeding the level of a sentence, where the logical coherence of sentences is the defining property of discourse.

The structural-stylistic approach considers "discourse" as a non-textual organization of colloquial speech, characterized by an indistinct division into parts, the dominance of associative connections, spontaneity and high contextuality.

In the socio-pragmatic approach, which was studied by such Russian and foreign scientists as Arutyunova N.D., Stepanov G.V. and Serio P., discourse is considered as a text immersed in a communication situation, as a rule characteristic of a certain social group or limited ideologically.

The most complete list of existing definitions of the concept of "discourse" is given in his writings by the Swiss linguist P. Serio, he identifies eight meanings, namely:

1) the equivalent of the concept of "speech" (according to F. Saussure [41]), i.e. any specific utterance;

2) a unit larger than the phrase;

3) the impact of the utterance on its recipient, taking into account the situation of the utterance;

4) conversation as the main type of utterance;

5) speech from the position of the speaker as opposed to the narrative, which does not take into account such a position (according to E. Benveniste [6]);

6) the use of language units, their speech actualization;

7) socially or ideologically limited type of statements, for example, feminist discourse;

8) a theoretical construct designed to study the conditions of text production [2].

Based on the latter definition, it is important to mention that the study of such a phenomenon as "discourse" received a special development during the heyday of text linguistics, and now one can observe the emergence of a new scientific discipline dealing with the problem of discourse. There is a need to classify the communicative intentions of texts (intentional text analysis) Thus, the possibility of classifying texts in accordance with the prevailing intention is emphasized, as well as determining the nature of the implicit information contained in the text, and ways of expressing it, such as, for example, reminiscence, which serves as a means of appeal to previously created texts: mentions, direct quotation, allusion, etc., which is now usually designated in modern linguistics by the term "intertextuality".

"Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary", gives the following definition of the concept of "discourse" - "a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic, pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological, etc. factors". These factors include the communicative intentions of the author, the relationship between the author and the

addressees, all kinds of "circumstances", significant and accidental, common ideological features and stylistic climate of the era as a whole and of that particular environment and specific personalities to whom the message is directly or indirectly addressed, in particular, genre and style features of both the message itself and the communicative situation in which it is included, a lot of associations with previous experience, somehow or otherwise caught in the orbit of this linguistic action [10].

If critical discursive research (CDI) is defined as an academic project focused on creating a theory and critical analysis of the discursive reproduction of abuse of power and social inequality, then the central task of the CDI is a detailed study of the concept of power. At the same time, as is the case with many fundamental concepts of social sciences, the concept of power is complex and unclear. It is not surprising that a large number of books and articles are devoted to the analysis of this key concept in many disciplines. I consider it necessary to turn to those dimensions of power that are directly related to the study of language practice, discourse and communication.

Nevertheless, the subject of my research - the discursive reproduction of abuse of power and social inequality - is hardly an unproblematic concept in itself, and therefore should also be subjected to a detailed theoretical analysis. For example, how are special intonation, pronouns, title, topic, lexical units, metaphors, color or angle, among many other semiotic characteristics of discourse, related to such an abstract and general phenomenon as power social relations? In other words, we must somehow link typical features of text, speech, interaction and semiotic practices as objects of micro-analysis with typical characteristics of society, such as groups or organizations and their dominance relationships, as objects of macro-analysis.

Moreover, the CDI is not aimed at the study of any power, but mainly at the study of the abuse of power or, in other words, at the study of such forms of domination that result in social inequality and injustice. Such a normative concept ("abuse" is "bad") requires analysis using other normative concepts and criteria of social science, such as legitimacy, which, in turn, involve ethics and moral philosophy. So, in this book I often turn to the discursive reproduction of racism, and a critical analysis of such discursive practices, in my opinion, proceeds at least from the fact that racism is bad, since racist practices are incompatible with the norms of social equality.

The main purpose of the CDI - the study of discursive abuse of power - also involves the study of differences in access to social power, and therefore I pay special

attention to the various ways of access to public discourse as one of the resources of social power.

In other words, it can be seen that many concepts of KDI require formulation in the context of the most fundamental concepts of the social sciences.

The famous French linguist K. Azhezh in the book "The Man who Speaks: the Contribution of linguistics to the humanities" introduces the concept of "Psychosocial speaker", referring to the speaker in all his psychological and social aspects. The linguist builds a model of such an exponent on the dialectical interaction of two spheres: 1) the spheres of subjugation of the language user and 2) the spheres of freedom, the language initiative of the user. The first sphere includes the language system itself, the conditions of communication and a number of constant factors, such as "biolect" (age and gender), sociolect (social status, professional affiliation, education, place of birth, lifestyle), "symbololect" (attitude to language), "ethnolect" and "politicolect". The second sphere is based on the variability of language and its ability to evolve due to both unconscious collective and conscious individual creativity [1]. Sociolect and, above all, symbololect and politicolect are on the verge of these two spheres and, with a strong (including creative) linguistic personality, they move into the sphere of freedom, where the speaker is able to go beyond the dictates of language as a system. This can be observed in the speech of modern writers, journalists, and politicians who use the language quite freely, initiating, for example, the use of neoplasms and thus influencing the language of certain segments of society through the mass media. A similar trend can also be traced in the speech of outstanding translators (M. Lukash, I. Kostetsky, Yu. Shkrobinets) the sphere of freedom, which in translations (in the speech sense) is much wider than the sphere of freedom of other translators.

K. Azhezh's arguments are directly related to the question that we set ourselves - to identify the influence of various factors on the personality of the translator, which, in turn, will affect the translation product. We adhere to the opinion, accurately expressed by M. Novikova, that the skill of the translator is "a personal and personal category."

The followers of the scientist G. Bogin, I. Prozhogin, V. Maslova, Naumov, L. Ivanova, I. Sinita, S. Vorkachev and others, developing this theory in various aspects and exploring linguistic personalities, made additions to the conclusions of their predecessor: it was proposed to distinguish between linguistic, speech and communicative personality, standard and non-standard linguistic personality, the concept of "Model personality" was introduced.

Russian Russian language personality Among the studies that go beyond the analysis of linguistic personality, we highlight the thesis of T. Ishkov "The concept of linguistic personality in English in comparison with Russian (using the example of the analysis of translations of B. Shaw's play "Pygmalion")", in which the author characterizes the linguistic personality of one of the characters in the English original and in Russian translations. Such a comparison makes it possible to identify a number of features of the linguistic personality both in terms of its formation and in the linguistic and cultural aspect. Especially interesting for us are the researcher's arguments regarding the linguistic personality and the establishment of the fact that there are significant differences in its reproduction by various Russian translators, which indicates the influence of the translator's linguistic personality on the adaptation of foreign material to their linguistic and cultural audience.

The means of ensuring the perlocative effect of utterance are traditionally considered in rhetorical science. Thus V.B. Kasevich defines rhetoric as a set of means designed to ensure the perlocative effect of a statement (text). Rhetorical techniques are considered by this scientist as means that simultaneously perform two functions: increasing the redundancy of information and encouraging the listener to look at the proposed information through a text that is strongly marked aesthetically and emotionally [1]. E.N. Zaretskaya emphasizes the need to use all expressiveness techniques (tropes and figures) in public communication [8]. N.A. Bezmenova says that rhetorical figures are a way of relief representation of an argument. The tropes are used to reveal the main idea, to give more vividness to the expression, have an ornamental meaning. [1]. A long-term study of public speech and artistic and linguistic competence allows us to state that the tendency to limit rhetoric to tropes and figures is hopelessly outdated. To some extent, this limitation can be attributed to poetic speech. It is there that trails and figures are used to the maximum extent. They are also fixed in public speech, but it is appropriate to talk about the most popular means of artistic expression (metaphors, comparisons of periphrases, repetitions, parallelisms, antitheses, gradations, etc.). Moreover, there are certain patterns when using these means. For example, there are frequency metaphorical models that more organically enter the addressee's conceptual sphere and allow you to accept this or that idea.

CONCLUSION

It should be noted that in addition to tropes and figures in rhetoric, a whole arsenal of means that deserve attention is relevant, and some of them are more frequent in public speech than in fiction (for example, pseudo-citation, language

game with precedents, etc.). Our analysis of statements in the press by representatives of the Russian business elite [7] allows us to single out one of the speech strategies of public business discourse - the pragmaesthetic strategy of persuasion. It consists in the selection of linguocreative language resources.

REFERENCES

1. Bezmenova N.A. Rhetorical model of speech activity // Speech impact in the field of mass communication. - M.: Nauka, 1990. - pp. 15-27.
2. Zaretskaya E.N. Rhetoric: Theory and practice of speech communication. - M.: Delo, 1998. - 480 p.
3. Karasik V.I. Discursive manifestation of personality // Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. Series: Linguistics. - No.4. - 2016. - pp. 56-77.
4. Kasevich V.B. Theory of communication and theory of language // Speaker and listener: linguistic personality, text, problems of learning. - St. Petersburg, 2001. - pp. 70-75.
5. Kozlova E.A. Linguocreativity of the manager. - Kirov: Vyatka State Agricultural Academy, 2014. - 190 p.
6. Kozlova E.A. Speech impact in public business communication: monograph. - Kirov: Vyatka State Agricultural Academy, 2018. - 103 p.
7. Kozlova E.A., Gretskov V.V. The significance of the natural philosophy period for modern science // Economics, finance, education: problems and prospects of development collection of scientific papers of the International Scientific and Practical Conference. - Kirov: Vyatka State Agricultural Academy, 2019. - pp. 100-104.
8. Plotnikova S.N. The speaker/writer as a linguistic, communicative and discursive personality // Bulletin of Nizhnevartovsk State University for the Humanities. - 2008. - No. 4. - pp. 37-42.
9. Khazagerov G.G. Rhetoric, grammar, discourse, homeostasis // Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. Series: Linguistics. - 2018. - Vol. 22. - No. 2. - pp. 357-372.