© YULIYA V. STEPANOVA

Stepanova_j_v@mail.ru

LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY AND THE ASPECTS OF ITS ANALYSIS

SUMMARY. The article is devoted to one of the actual problems of the modern linguistics — the role of a word in formation of individual picture of the world, and also to analyzing the phenomenon of linguistic personality.

KEY WORDS. Cognitivism, linguistic personality, speech, consciousness.

Being one of theoretical branches of the modern linguistics, cognitivistics covers knowledge and thinking in its linguistic interrelation, as the cognition is closely connected with the science of language. In comparison with culture, language helps cognitivists understand verbal behavior better. It is language and speech that provide a natural access to consciousness and thinking as "we know about structures of consciousness only due to verbal space, which allows us to report about these structures and "describe them in any natural language", but not because many results of the thinking activity are verbalised [1; 21].

The social function of language is realized in linguistic consciousness — collective and individual, so a linguistic collective, on the one hand, and an individual, on the other hand, are carriers of the linguistic culture. Ethnos, nation and an individual are distinctive reference points on a conventional scale of linguistic cognition.

A carrier of the linguistic thinking is a linguistic personality: a man, living in a specific linguistic space — communication, stereotypical behavior, fixed in a language, notions of linguistic units, text meanings. The study of linguistic personality in linguistics of our country is connected with J.N. Karaulov, who understands linguistic personality as "a complex of abilities and characteristics of a human, determining his creation of speech production (texts)" [2; 3].

After Karaulov, who suggested analysing linguistic personality according to three levels (structural-linguistic, cognitive, motivational), other linguists suggested their own three level model. For example, I.P. Susov points out three levels in linguistic personality: formal-semantic, cognitive-interpretational and social-interactive [3; 7-13]. V.D. Lyutikova holds different opinion: "The level model of linguistic personality, developed by linguists, reflects a general type of a personality, so it can hardly be applied to the analysis of every specific personality. Verbal, cognitive and pragmatic levels are identified in an individual verbal situation. Moreover, any personality combines elements of stability and changeability; it is affected by outer influence and is not devoid of inner conflicts. The presence of stability and changeability in linguistic personality, being influenced by various factors, makes the structure of linguistic personality even more complex" [4; 9].

She suggests the following definition of linguistic personality: "Linguistic personality is a set of linguistic characteristics, typical for a specific human" [4; 10].

N.K. Frolov as well touches upon the phenomenon of linguistic personality: "Phenomenon of linguistic personality for a linguist is revealed due to the cognitive assessment of linguistic culture, multilateral verbal activity of homo sapiens. The concept of linguistic personality presupposes the analysis of the fact that a human realizes his thinking behavior, knowledge of a language or a group of languages. In general they both can become a start point of the linguistic personality phenomenon.

Thus, the phenomenon of a personality, in general, and a linguistic one, in particular, is specified in the consciousness of an analyst through the spectrum of a specific, unusual, rich, well-known, original possession, verbal heritage. The phenomenon of linguistic personality is a manifestation of supernatural abilities of a specific individual in his verbal activity. Linguistic personality is realized due to its specific characteristics, reflective abilities of linguistic space cognition" [5; 323].

Linguistic personality can be characterized from the point of linguistic consciousness and verbal behavior as well as linguistic conseptology of discourse. Linguistic consciousness is objectified during the verbal activity, as, according to L.V. Scherba, in the process of speaking, written communication. The verbal activity is carried out by an individual and is conditional on his social psychophysical organization. Verbal activity and verbal organization of a human are closely interconnected; however they can be opposed as a phenomenon and essence. Thus, the three-level model of linguistic phenomena (verbal activity-verbal system-verbal material) is defined more precisely as four-member formation [6; 30].

In terms of communication linguistic personality can be considered as a generalized image of a carrier of cultural-linguistic and communicative values, knowledge, sets and behavioral reactions. As far as communicative personality is concerned, value, cognitive and behavioral plans of this concept can be singled out.

Plan of values of a communicative personality contains ethical norms of behavior, peculiar to an ethnos in a specific period. These norms are preserved in a moral code of a nation, reflecting the history and world-view of people, united by culture and language. The moral code of a nation is partly manifested in a language. Universal statements and other texts, composing the cultural context, understandable to an average language carrier, etiquette rules, communicative strategies of politeness, evaluative meaning of words, including universal values, ethnical and utilitarian; values, peculiar to a specific type of civilization (for example, norms of behavior specific to this or that religious doctrine); values, characterizing a specific ethnos, as well as within-the-ethnos subgroups (such values of ethno groups are revealed in regiolects and sociolects) belong to linguistic (broader — communicative) indexes of this code. Finally, values, peculiar to small groups, and individual values of a personality are singled out. Thus, a communicative personality can be characterized in an aspect of values in correlation of dominant values, in degree of their differentiation and etc. [7; 105].

Cognitive plan of a personality in the process of communication is exposed during the mastering of his world picture. As far as this situation is concerned, we speak about linguistic personality, subject-content and category-formal ways of evaluation of the reality are pointed out, which is a characteristic feature of a carrier of specific knowledge about the linguistic world. The linguistic categorization is revealed, for instance,

in correlations between an ergative construction, complex system of specific differences, presence of the category of definiteness/indefiniteness, presence of enumeratives as a class of words, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, peculiarities of the world perception, specific to carrier of a relevant language. Such correlations have a flexible character, built according to the principle of priority zones of nominalization, and are maintained by dominants of values and behavioral stereotypes.

Cognitive aspect of a linguistic personality is a measure and a degree of mastering of the world by a human through the language. Thereupon linguists, as a rule, consider the world picture in the form of the collective concept sphere, while frame analysis of conceptions, having a linguistic expression, is determined through the prism of mental linguistic formations. Mental concepts, comprising a concept sphere of a linguistic personality, have a heterogeneous nature and are based on a human experience: individual and social. They are multidimensional and can be evaluated from various sides. On the one side, it is reasonable to oppose images and their descriptions, i.e. the size and the content to the concept according to a traditional approach, taking into consideration the fact that terminological concepts are broader than notions, if we correlate notion with thinking and concept with consciousness. Although, there are other approaches to the correlation between language and speech, consciousness and thinking. I.S. Toropov pays special attention to the dichotomy of functions of language and speech. The problem of language function is referred to one of the principal problems, thus it requires a detailed elaboration.

"In the soviet philosophy the definition of function as a characteristic of an object in a system, facilitating its preservation, and as a display of an object outside it, including out of system has been formed", — says N.A. Slyusareva. Thereby we should single out, firstly, functioning, connected with the language existence in the periods, when it was not used in the speech, but this type of functioning does not extinct even in moments of language usage in the speech process. In other words, language in its complete content functions permanently as a saver of knowledge about objective reality (lexis), obtained by carriers of a language; as a saver of abilities to create word forms and to build syntactical speech constructions (grammar), as a saver of abilities to replace conceptions of scales, components of syntactical speech constructions by real scales (pronunciation), which is, indeed, inseparable from language; secondly, functioning of language in relation to speech process, functioning as a usage, use as a mean of communication, cognition etc. It characterizes one of the most important interconnection of a language, directed at the outer world, at what is out of a language. In other words, separate elements of a language functions impulsively, when it is required, during the speech production [9; 16].

Functioning characteristics are specific for language and for speech, but correlative. Neither specificity, nor correlativity of language and speech cannot be discussed from the point of language and speech unity. However, speech is not equalized to language; speech is not a language in act, but a linguistic activity. The specificity of language and speech functions is in the fact that language is defined as a mean, while speech — as a process.

Cognition of an objective reality and generation of new units of language subsystems are thinking operations, and they are not feasible without a support

of verbal language and out of verbal speech, as well as without onomasiological context. Thus, the process of thinking is directed at the solution of vital problems, at the cognition of unknown, at the creation of the thinking means, new units of language subsystems, replenishing them and, thus, changing them, developing language subsystems, and, as a result, language in general. Language is irreplaceable in keeping in generation memory the results of reflection. Ideal (result of thinking, knowledge) is not separable from the material, physiological basis of sound images, arising as a result of reflection of real sound covers of components of syntactical speech construction and as a result of intellectual building of conceptions about the scale of a new lexical unit, if the word building process is accomplished on the bases of inner speech, without pronunciation.

It is important to mention, that language does not have outer relationships with what is reported during the communication, with elements of artistic image, with new knowledge, obtained by a human, with results of a human reflective activity, with new generated units of language subsystems. Lexical units in their meanings contain results of cognition, from which the massage content, elements of verbal artistic images are built. New generated units, for example, new words, enter language as its constituent part. Language is a treasury of all achievements of its carriers thinking activity and a weapon of spiritual values multiplication.

Thus, as far as language functions are concerned, it is a means of communication, means of creation of verbal artistic images, means of emotional expression, human state and his will, means of cognition and generation of language subsystems new units; while speech is a realization and objectification of communication process, process of verbal images creation, process of emotional expression, human state and his will, process of cognition and generation of language subsystems new units [9; 28-29].

Behavioral plan of a communicative personality is characterized by a specific number of intentional and unintentional speech characteristics and paralinguistic means of communication. Such characteristics can be considered from the point of social linguistic and pragma linguistic aspects: in the first the indexes of speech of men and women, kids and adults, educated and less educated language carriers, people, speaking native and second language are singled out, while in the second — speech act, interactive, discursive courses during the natural communication of people. These courses are built as peculiar models according to communicative circumstances. Situational indexes of communication (distance between participants of communication, voice loudness and distinct pronunciation, word choice, types of communications and etc.) are pointed out accordingly. Relationships of situational inequality (for instance, in speech acts of direct and indirect request, apologize, compliment) can be referred to such indexes. Behavioral stereotype includes many distinctive features and is perceived holistically (like gestalt). Any deviation from the stereotype (for example, too broad smile) is perceived as a signal of unnatural communication, as a sign of a partner's adherence to a foreign culture or as a circumstance, which requires explanation.

The suggested aspects of a communicative personality are correlated with a three-level model of a linguistic personality (verbal-semantic, cognitive and pragmatic) [2; 67]. The difference is that the level model suggests hierarchy of plans: the highest level is a pragmatic level (pragmaticon), including goals,

motives, interests, sets and intentionalities; the middle level (semanticon) represents the picture of the world, including concepts, ideas, notions and reflective hierarchy of values; the lowest level (lexicon) is a level of proficiency in mother tongue, level of language units.

From the point of communicative linguistics, the analyzing model is an advance over systemic-structural model, where pragmatics was brought to a list of stylistically important deviations from the standard systemic relationships observed, to some extent, on the semantic level, and , to the full extent, on the syntactical level. Therewith the linguists are more definitely discussing over the idea that the difference between semantics and pragmatics has a conventional character: the relation of a sign to the world, deprived of the human mediation, loses its meaning (pure semantics of linguistic means — radio, working in an empty room), relation of a sign to a human, deprived of a linguistic mediation, articulation, differentiation, turns the communication to an emotional sphere, and it is not essentially important whether we communicate with a human or with a cat. In other words, desemantization (pure pragmatics) is a real communication, going beyond human behavior, and depragmatization (pure semantics) is a lack of communication.

The approach to the study of a communicative personality, developed by A.G.Baranov and his disciples [Yakovenko, 1998; Malzeva, 2000; Lomnina, 2000; Kunina, 2001] is of a great interest. The essence of this approach is that the complex of knowledge about something (cognotype), existing in a specific linguistic community and ensuing from the demanding-motivational characteristics of an activity (demand, motive, goal), is realized through the individual cognitive systems in text dynamics. In a particular communicative situation a human uses both linguistic and extra linguistic knowledge, which contains the experience of an individual, obtained in the course of life.

A linguistic personality is a level of language proficiency as well as a degree of a certain human's influence upon the language development, first of all literal. The communication is not just a conversation between two individuals, it is their grasp of culture of this or that nation, society, as the culture (spiritual culture) reveals a measure of human and sociable in a man.

This feature of a linguistic personality is revealed in language knowledge, in the ability to use it, in style, in syllable, and, finally, in concrete sentences.

Literary text is as well a source of linguistic personality analysis of an author and his characters, taking into consideration that characters are generations of author's thought. The author reveals himself in the text in different ways, but always through a word. The work's creator, as well as a human, has his own behavioral, thinking and linguistic nuances, peculiar only for him. Giving life for his characters on the pages of his work, the author definitely puts a part of his linguistic personality into them. For instance, in M.A. Bulgakov's "Master and Margarita" the author uses colloquial speech quite often — it reveals the characters' coloring as well as author's originality.

One of the vivid examples is a word "of course" in the meaning really. It is used by Azazello, Hippopotamus and Koroviev.

"Of course," replied Azazello [12; 605].

"Of course, they are!" [12; 547].

One of the characteristic peculiarities of the author's lexis is that the usual words in the speech of characters, for example, Koroviev's and Azazello's, gain their own meaning. One of the instances is a word a little matter. Usually, "a little matter", judging by its lexical form, means something unserious, not important. However, it acquires a sinister inflection, pronounced by the characters of Voland's retinue:

"...However, I have been sent on a little matter that concerns you" [12; 548]

"You're in trouble, my dear Behemoth..." [12; 582].

Colloquial and even jargon words and phrases are used quite frequently by the author. It is well-known, that the characters' speech is a crucial fact, defining their inner world. Naturally, being a subtle psychologist, M.A. Bulgakov could not help noticing this fact. The speech of his characters is very often not only simple, but even close to vulgar speech and folklore. For instance,

"... could not help being intrigued by this stranger's extraordinary conversation" [12; 254].

"...done mean tricks beforehand" [12; 668].

"...who had proffered various pieces of rubbish under the illusion that they were banknotes" [12; 669].

"That creature who has been playing the fool is the cat Behemoth" [12; 676].

"...chop off me head" [12; 575].

"Just as Vassily Stepanovich was taking a taxi-ride to meet the suit that wrote by itself..." [12:516].

"Now that we have disposed of that old bore, we shall open a shop for the ladies!" [12; 441].

"...to hell with him!" [12; 430].

"...to sound out the issue" [12; 430].

"Maximilian Andreyevich's head began to spin, his arms and legs gave way so that he dropped his case and sat down in a chair facing the cat" [12; 520].

"May my paws drop off before I touch other people's money" [12; 619]

"Devil knows how,' said the man vaguely. 'I suspect Behemoth might be able to tell you. It must have been a neat job, but why bother to steal a head? After all, who on earth would want it?" [12; 547].

Speech is a speech act as well as its result — text. The speech activity itself is both a speech behavior of a speaker and his linguistic ability (competence). Although speech activity of a linguistic personality is individual in its quality and results, it is socially conditional. Firstly, it is a part of the social activity of a human; secondly, speech act and speech situation presuppose social speakers, having common language of communication, common culture and common theme. The theory of speech activity studies the processes of productions, speech perception and language acquisition, and the speech activity is analyzed with the inseparable connection with thinking activity and consciousness.

Interrelations between a language and a human are of importance in singling out and studying basic linguistic concepts. Philosophical-anthropological approach actualizes the angles of the human's nature and his life activity, which characterize a linguistic personality as a creativity in creation of cultural forms of his being and social consciousness.

REFERENCES

1. Kubryakova, E.S. evolution of linguistic ideas in the second half of XX century // Language and science in the end of XX century. M.:1995. 154 p.

2. Karaulov, Y.N. Russian language and linguistic personality/ AS USSR. Dep.lit. and lang. M.: 1987. 247 p.

3. Susov, I.P. Activity, consciousness, discourse and linguistic system // Linguistic communication: Processes and units. Kaliningrad, 1988. P. 7-13.

4. Lutikova, V.D. Linguistic personality and idiolect. Publ. of Tyumen St.Un., 1999. 185 p.

5. Frolov, N.K. The selected works on the linguistics. T-1. Anthroponimica. Russian language and the culture of speech. Publ. of Tyumen St.Un., 2005. 509 p.

6. Zalevskaya, A.A. a word in the vocabulary of man: psycholinguistic research. Voronezh.:1990(a). 142p.

7. Karaulov, Y.N. General and Russian ideography. M.: Nayka, 1976. 75p.

8. Slyusareva, N.A. About semantic and functional sides of linguistic phenomena. V.kN.: The theory of a language: methods of its research and teaching. L.: 1981. 224 p.

9. Toropzev, I.S. Language and speech. Voronezh: Publ. of Voron. Univ., 1985. 200 p.

10. Bulgakov, M.A. Master and Margarita. M.:Eksmo, 2008. 813 p.