

10. Bakhtin M.M. Tvorchestvo Fransua Rable i narodnaya kul'tura Srednevekov'ya i Renessansa. 2-ye izd. M.: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1990. 543 s.

11. Isayev S.G. Literaturno-khudozhestvennyye maski: Teoriya i poetika. SPb.: Dmitriy Bulanin, 2012. S.319.

12. Klimontova A. A. Formy avtorskogo prisutstviya v romane U. Tekkereya «Yarmarka tshcheslaviya»// Vestnik NovGU. 2013. №72. [Elektronnyy resurs]. Rezhim dostupa: <https://cyberleninka.ru> (data obrashcheniya: 26.10.2021).

13. Zatonkiy D. Iskusstvo romana i XX vek. M.: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1973. S.169

## ANALYSIS OF LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY IN THE CONTEXT OF DISCOURSE

**Abitaev A.E.**

*(supervisor - PhD associate professor Kitibaeva A.K.)*

*Karaganda University named after Academician E.A. Buketov*

*Karaganda, Kazakhstan.*

**Abstract:** This article discusses the problems of describing and analyzing modern linguistic discourse. Modern linguistics focuses on the structure and behavior of a linguistic personality, filling the model proposed by Yu. N. Karaulov. At the same time, other aspects of the study and scientific knowledge of the authors for a detailed disclosure of the concept. An example of the relevance of the article is the unexplored aspects of the linguistic personality in linguistic research.

**Key words:** structure of linguistic personality, stereotype of behavior, discourse, psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics

When analyzing the concept of a linguistic personality, proposed by Yu. N. Karaulov [1], it can be considered from the standpoint of various scientific knowledge and at the same time highlight various strata and aspects for study. V.I. Karasik identifies five aspects in the human speech organization: linguistic ability, communicative need, communicative competence, linguistic consciousness and speech behavior [2, p. 24-25]. Linguistics is primarily interested in speech behavior, discourse which is a complex set of all these services that determine the individual and collective cognitive space of a person.

V. I. Karasik believes that the typology of linguistic personalities can be based on various foundations. From the standpoint of ethnocultural or psycholinguistics, it is appropriate to contrast the types of personalities distinguished in psychology and consider the linguistic and speech ways of manifesting the corresponding personalities. From social linguistics, linguistic personalities are distinguished according to objective status criteria - age, gender,

level of education, lifestyle, etc. [3, p. 25-26]. One of the approaches to the study of a linguistic personality can be the allocation of relevant features of a model personality, that is, a typical representative of an ethnosocial group, recognizable by the specific characteristics of verbal and non-verbal behavior and the conclusions of a value orientation. Such model personality is a prototypical image, according to V.I.Karasik.

Although, it's clear, that any linguistic personality represents some algorithms of stereotyped patterns of behavior. TM Nikolaeva identifies three types of stereotypes in speech behavior: 1) speech stereotype - a segment of an utterance included in the context represented by "free" components of the utterance, that is, it is someone else's speech in the speaker's speech; 2) communicative stereotype - in the same situations, the same phrases, clichés are used, that is, these are etiquette formulas, clichéd turns of business communication, etc. .; 3) mental stereotypy - the desire to think in dual or gradual categories, that is, these are attitudes and habitual reactions, clothed in a linguistic and non-linguistic form and describing a linguistic personality [4, p. 162-178].

E.A. Nichiporovich thinks that it's important not to analyze the properties of a linguistic personality as a separate entity, but to analyze the modes of its verbal and non-verbal existence in the form of micro-unions (microcrowds) with one or another period of disintegration and considers a linguistic personality as necessarily existing in an open discursive episode or, in other words. in other words, in such a chronotope, in which there are no strict restrictions on the use of the macro etiquette and thematic code typical for Russian communication. In a word, EA Nichiporovich seeks not only to describe the habits of a cooperative linguistic personality, but also to reveal deep attitudes (cooperative archetypes) that can analyze not only the verbal manifestations of a cooperative personality, but also describe its socio-psychological image [5].

I'm confident that the concept of "implantation" - the insertion of foreign elements that transforms a canonized verbal environment into an uncanonized environment - is promising for the study of a linguistic personality in media-political discourse. These "implantations" make it possible to build a model of the discursive behavior of a linguistic personality, to behave as such linguistic means cease to be foreign in the structure of the discourse of a given personality. It is significant that such "implants" in media-political discourse (and not only in it) are often cited by various speech effects - humor, irony, sarcasm, satire, etc. internal). In other words, there is something that, following VL Vartanyan, should be called momistic, one correlation of verbal and non-verbal, a transition to another in the discursive activity of a linguistic personality [6]. MA Kulinich, in turn, proposes to systematically consider those modes of human behavior that are laughed at [7]. The so-called "targets for jokes" and the addressee ("target shooters"). ") And the qualities, values of speech (" taking the spotlight ").

The productivity of using the concept of "implantation" in the characterization of the linguistic personality, proposed by EA Nichiporovich, is confirmed, in my

opinion, by the results of the work of S. G. Vasilyeva, although she does not use this term [8]. The main goal of her work is to identify the forms of multilingualism in the ethnic heterogeneous linguocultural community, mainly paying attention to the verbally-unconstrained forms of functioning of the form of speech. S.G. Vasilieva disputes the correctness of using the concept of bilingualism to comprehend speech events taking place in such a community. In her opinion, “eavesdropping linguistics” and meta-field discourse analysis based on the facts of spontaneous speech and written sources will be more heuristic and corresponding to linguistic realities.

However other forms of intra-subject multilingualism or diglossia are also of greater interest, when a linguistic person demonstrates a type of linguistic behavior that is discordant with his social status, age, level of education, gender, etc. The most obvious example of such intra-subject diversity of languages is the widespread use of jargon in media-political discourse [9].

According to S.G. Vasilieva, there is an intra-subject space of a native speaker and an intra-subject image as a unity of the form and content of a linguistic sign. They are of different orders of magnitude, but not antagonists. Intra-subject multilingualism is a set of nuclear typical, peripheral typical and zero communicative situations. Undoubtedly, the study of such communicative situations, their discursive analysis will give a detailed description of an individual linguistic personality, will help to find the key to its discursive behavior.

When analyzing these discursive phenomena in the structure of a linguistic personality, one cannot, of course, be limited to exclusively linguistic procedures. Particular importance playing the cognitive, cultural, psychological and other tools. Thus, D. B. Gudkov believes that the nature of our verbal and non-verbal actions is predetermined by memes or cultural genes. He offers his version of the system of cultural genes - precedent phenomena as linguistic and cultural communities, manifested in various forms of behavior of a linguistic personality [10].

An interesting approach is also to identify the components of a cooperative discursive personality, as typologizing them into Leaders and Performers. At the same time, under the Leader we mean a person with a voluminous diverse communicative field and registers of speech, and under the Executor - a person with a focused field of communicative speech. The Leader offers to choose, and the Executor offers to choose from the chosen, from those language means that the Leader uses and recommends.

Materials that testify to the conflict or non-conflict of discursive behavior will also be highly promising for the study of the discursive personality. In particular, the presence in speech of various kinds of invectives that ensures aggressive and pejorative sense in verbal behavior.

So, modern linguistics offers many approaches and parameters in the description of the modern linguistic personality, which is a multidimensional education. This article, of course, does not pretend to be any complete reflection of the scientific positions on this issue. It is quite clear that the concept of the structure of a linguistic personality according to Yu. N. Karaulov remains as a

given. That is, the idea of a linguistic personality, realized through its verbalisms, existing only in language and with the help of language, striving to fit into the rules of being in its written or oral form, continues to remain basic. In addition to these parameters of considering a linguistic personality, one should add observations of variations or displacements in the verbal canon, of its realizations in space and time of discursive communication-behavior.

#### **Literature:**

1. Karaulov Yu. N. Russian language and language personality / Yu. N. Karaulov. - M.: Nauka, 1987. -- 264 p.

2. Karasik V. I. Speech behavior and types of linguistic personalities // Mass culture at the turn of XX - XX! centuries: Man and his discourse: collection of scientific. tr. / [ed. Yu. A. Sorokina, MR Zheltukhina] / VI Karasik. - M.: Azbukovnik, 2003. - S. 24-46.

3. Krysin LP Modern Russian intellectual: an attempt at a speech portrait / LP Krysin // Russian language in scientific coverage, 2001. - No. 1. - P. 90-107.

4. Nikolaeva TM From sound to text / TM Nikolaeva. - M.: School "Languages of Russian culture", 2000. - 680 p.

5. Nichiporovich EA Cooperative linguistic personality in an open communicative episode: author. dis. for competition sch. degree of Cand. philol. Sciences: spec. 13.01.01. "Russian language" / E. A. Nichiporovich. - M., 1999. -- 20 p.

6. Vartanyan VL Fragments of the psycholinguistic theory of humor: author. dis. for competition sch. degree of Cand. philol. Sciences: spec. 13.01.01. "Russian language" / V. L. Vartanyan. - M., 1994. -- 20 p.

7. Kulinich MA Semantics, structure and pragmatics of English-language humor: author. dis. for competition sch. degree doct. cultures. Sciences: spec. 24.00.04 "Applied Culturology" / M. A. Kulinich. - M., 2000. -- 25 p.

8. Vasilyeva S. G. Diversity of languages (mixed speech) and typology of personality bilingualism: author. dis. for competition sch. degree doct. philol. Sciences: spec.

"Russian language" / S. G. Vasilyeva. - M., 1999. -- 26 p.

9. Soboleva I. A. Multi-vector palette of media-political jargon / I. A. Soboleva / 2010. - P. 101-106.

10. Gudkov DB Precedent phenomena in linguistic consciousness and intercultural communication: author. dis. for competition sch. degree doct. philol. Sciences: spec.

### **ШЕТЕЛ ТІЛІН МОДУЛЬДІК ОҚЫТУ ЖАҒДАЙЫНДА ОҚУШЫЛАРДЫҢ КОММУНИКАТИВТІК ҚҰЗІРЕТТІЛІГІН ДАМЫТУ**