

A Study on the Phenomena of the Linguistic Persona

В статье рассматриваются основные подходы к изучению языковой личности в современной лингвистике; систематизированы основные направления и результаты изучения языковой личности; предлагается определение статуса языковой личности для различных направлений современной лингвистической теории.

Ключевые слова: языковая личность, речевые возможности, антропоцентризм, лингвокультурология, лингводидактика

The article deals with the main approaches to the study of the linguistic persona in modern linguistics; the main directions and results of the study on the linguistic persona are systematized; the definition of the status of the linguistic persona for integrated directions of modern linguistic theory is proposed.

Keywords: language persona, speech abilities, anthropocentrism, cultural linguistics, linguodidactics

The phenomenon of linguistic persona is one of the central in modern linguistics, it attains a categorical status in science. Since the 90-s of the XX-th century the concept of “linguistic persona” “...becomes a pivotal system-forming philological concept. Most researchers now assess it as integrative, serving as the beginning of a new stage in the development of linguistics – anthropolinguistics” [9, с. 15]. The widespread use of a new term is associated by scientists with its synthesizing nature, reflecting the interdisciplinarity in modern human research, the integration of the humanities, and within linguistics – the integration of its various areas in the study on the phenomenon under consideration [1].

The object of this paper is to analyze the main approaches developed in modern integrated linguistics to the study of the linguistic persona.

The concept of “linguistic persona”, developed by V. V. Vinogradov on the fiction material to describe the linguistic persona of the author and the character, is quite well developed in modern linguistics (Ju. Apresyan, V. Gak, Ju. Karaulov, M. Kitaigorodskaya). We propose to distinguish between different approaches that cover many interpretations: 1) linguocultural and linguodidactic; 2) narrow and wide. The proposed directions are distinguishable by the ways in describing the linguistic persona and, accordingly, by the scale of the scope covered.

For cultural linguistics, the emphasis on a collective cultural-historical image is characteristic; on the persona existing in the cultural space and reflected in the language; to a national-cultural prototype of a native speaker. In this regard, the

subject of research is the synthetic image of a linguistic persona, formed by many incarnations of different language individuals. Therefore, cultural linguistics pays its attention to the relationship “language – culture – ethnos”, setting before a researcher the task to study the material and spiritual culture embodied in a living national language and manifested in linguistic processes. This approach allowed linguists to distinguish a subtype of a linguistic persona – a historical linguistic persona, the research method of which is based on the linguistic analysis of materials from texts created by one person or different people and materials from dictionaries [12]. Such a reconstruction in the linguistic persona of a certain era, in our opinion, is somewhat one-sided, although laborious in its nature. After all, the compilation of a linguistic passport or a sketch of a linguistic persona in a particular era by highlighting its idiostistic features in its analysis relies on texts that are always limited in genre, ideological-thematically, stylistically, and these restrictions inevitably affect the character of the restored linguistic persona [10]. The lexicographic way of reconstructing the latter is limited by the need to use a statistical method, which is always relative for holistic modeling of a natural language, although it is promising for applied linguistics.

The linguocultural approach, based on the structural organization of the linguistic persona, proposed by Yu. N. Karaulov, predetermined the identification of different variations in the linguistic persona: multihuman and particular human persona (V.G. Neroznak), ethnosemantic persona (S.G. Vorkachev), Russian linguistic persona (Yu. N. Karaulov), linguistic and speech persona (Yu. E. Prokhorov, L. P. Klobukova), emotional linguistic persona (V. I. Shakhovsky).

Thus, in the linguocultural aspect language, culture and ethnos are inextricably linked and form the focus of the persona – the conjugation place of its physical, spiritual and social *I*.

In the linguodidactic approach the focus is on the individual as a set of speech abilities, which allows us to consider the linguistic persona as a set of hypostases in which the individual is embodied in the language. Such a study of the linguistic persona is carried out mainly in synchronicity, therefore, researchers in this aspect are characterized by attention to the relation between linguistic norm and speech embodiment [2], [3], [4]. The material analogue for the study on speech ability is, according to Yu. N. Karaulov's definition, the associative-verbal language network, which is expressed in the associative thesaurus. Actually, the linguodidactic aspect in the definition of a linguistic persona is the basis of this concept in Yu. N. Karaulov's theory, who wrote that a linguistic persona is understood as “the totality of a person's abilities and characteristics that determine the creation and reproduction of speech works that differ a) the degree of structural and linguistic complexity, b) the depth and accuracy in the reflection of reality, c) a certain target orientation” [7].

In linguodidactics the main aspects of the study on a linguistic persona are value (axiological), cognitive and behavioral, with an obligatory reliance on sociolinguistic principles [6, c. 22]. The linguodidactic aspect in the analysis of the linguistic persona seems promising for influencing the linguistic culture of society through the development of a person linguistic individuality, because “linguistic individuality distinguishes a person as a persona, and the brighter this persona is, the more fully it reflects the linguistic qualities of society” [11, c. 98].

In the concept of a broad approach to the study of a linguistic persona, we mean the understanding of the latter as any person using a language. This approach makes it possible: a) to study a person in the aspect of social psychology by considering the discursive model of persona to construct it as an aggregate set of “*I*”; b) to combine the psychoanalysis ideas and literary criticism, in which a literary work appears as the result of a synthesis of conscious and unconscious persona processes; c) to develop the method of neurolinguistic programming, using knowledge about the language and the person. That is, a possible paradigm of subsequent methods for studying a linguistic persona is associated with the use of initial data that have been accumulated in linguistics, which is relevant to the concept of “linguistic”, and personology, which is related to the concept of “persona” in the binomial “linguistic persona”.

For a narrow approach, we assign a purely linguistic interpretation of the concept of “linguistic persona”, which has a different categorical status, depending on the level of linguistic analysis. So, a) in linguistic genology, which is a section of communicative linguistics, the linguistic persona is assigned the status of an external influence category on communication and speech genres; b) in the theory of communicative acts, which also belongs to the section of communicative linguistics; a linguistic persona with all its inherent social, psychological, cognitive, worldview features is a component of a communicative act; c) in linguopragmatics the linguistic persona is presented as a category of personalization, which is defined as a speaker's actualization of the communicative correlation of the participants in a speech situation, expressed by multilevel explicators of persona within the framework of the norms and conventions existing for a given linguistic culture; d) in functional grammar the linguistic persona is embodied in the functional-semantic category of authorization, through which the utterance and preposition regarding the speech and thought subject is authorized in the theory of the modal frame in the utterance and in non-classical (evaluative) modal logics [5, c. 14].

Summing up the proposed retrospections in the study on a linguistic persona in modern linguistic aspects, we note that it will be meaningless to determine which of the proposed description models is correct, all of them are equivalent ways of understanding a person in the language space, each one has its own advantages and disadvantages. But when studying the multifaceted phenomenon of a linguistic persona, an integrated approach to its analysis is required, taking into account the qua-

lifying characteristics: linguistic, linguistic-cultural, linguodidactic, since each of them correlates with the levels of linguistic persona proposed by Yu. N. Karaulov. Accordingly, a person appears as an apprentice who must master the linguistic resources to describe himself [8]. The researcher must re-reflect and analyze what was originally acquired unconsciously. Determining the status of a linguistic persona in linguistics, we propose to define it as a category that has an internal structure and external signs of implementation. A clear definition in the type of such a category (sociolinguistic, communicative, cognitive, etc.) is promising for anthropologically oriented linguistics.

References

1. Бутова А. В. Роль иницирующих реплик в организации текстов интервью // *Libri Magistri*. 2017. № 4. С. 79-83.
2. Дубских А. И. Реализация коммуникативной стратегии самопрезентации личности в масс-медиаальном дискурсе (на материале «звездных» интервью): автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.19. Челябинск, 2014. 24 с.
3. Дубских А. И., Бутова А. В., Севастьянова В. С. Средства вербализации оценки в «звездном» интервью // *Вестник Томского государственного педагогического университета*. 2017. № 6(183). С. 61-65.
4. Дубских А. И., Бутова А. В., Залавина Т. Ю. Средства вербализации положительной самопрезентации в «звездном» интервью // *Вестник Томского государственного педагогического университета*. 2018. № 4(193). С. 53-58.
5. Залавина Т. Ю. Когнитивные и прагматические аспекты фразеологизмов со значением «порицание»: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.19. Челябинск, 2007. 25 с.
6. Карасик В. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. М., 2004. 390 с.
7. Караулов Ю. Н. Русский язык и языковая личность. М., 1987. 264 с.
8. Кисель О. В., Дубских А. И., Бутова А. В. Мотивы самопрезентации личности в интернет-пространстве посредством никнейма // *Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики*. 2019. Т. 12. № 5. С. 222-225.
9. Кочеткова Т. В. Проблема изучения языковой личности носителя элитарной языковой культуры // *Вопросы стилистики*. Вып. 26. Саратов, 1996. С. 14-24.
10. Линёва А. С., Залавина Т. Ю. The Inner Form of Phraseological Units and the Linguistic Picture of the World // *Актуальные проблемы современной науки, техники и образования*. 2013. Т. 2. № 71. С.132-134.
11. Потебня А. Мысль и язык // Потебня А. А. Слово и миф. М.: Правда, 1989. С. 17-200.
12. Севастьянова В. С., Дубских А. И., Харитоновна С. В. Изучение архетипических структур в языковой и ментальной картинах мира (на примере романтического и символистского дискурсов) // *Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики*. 2017. № 1(50). С. 33-38.