

THE LINGUISTIC PORTRAIT OF A CHARACTER AS AN OBJECT OF
LINGUOPERSONOLOGY

Aziza Marupova Axtamovna

marupova@samdchti.uz

Samarkand state institute of foreign languages

Senior teacher of the department of English Philology

Abstract. this article gives information about linguistic portrait of a character in linguopersonology as well as provide several feasible notions namely three primary avenues for language acquisition and description of the character.

Keywords: *portrait, natural, integral, potential, fictitious, speech portrait.*

The words “speaking portrait”, “speech characteristics”, “language portrait”, “communicative personality”, etc., are used in modern linguistics to refer to individuals who are “speaking” as subjects of scientific inquiry. A basic setting known as antropocentrism, a tendency shared by all current scientific knowledge, unites the observed diversity of terminology.

The anthropocentrism principle in linguistics “is related with an endeavor to analyze linguistic phenomena in the dyad “language and man”, according to E.S. Kubryakova [1]. In keeping with this model, the researcher proposes three primary avenues for language acquisition:

- 1) the influence of natural language and the dominant worldview on human consciousness;
- 2) the influence of consciousness on natural language, or the “human factor”;
- 3) the issue of the fundamental nature of linguistic personality, as seen in the writings of Y.N. Karaulov and B.A. Serebrennikov [2]. Research on lexicography and literary text analysis, however, should be added to the three previously mentioned topics. L.N. Churilina mentions Y.D. Apresyan's writings and the Moscow Semantic School, which focus on the lexical level of language analysis. The “natural” lexical system that the researchers provide explains the “naive picture of the world” and the “naive human model” [3]. Their work is related to the reconstruction of the “integral” worldview of an average linguistic personality as well as the identification of ideas, idioglosses, and stereotypes that constitute the usus of a “naive picture of the world. But the goal of both study paths is to convey the findings lexicographically [3]. The concept of anthropocentrism in the linguistic analysis of a literary work is related to the problem of reconstructing the linguistic personality, claims L.N. Churilina. The reconstruction of linguistic identity in the space of a literary work may be done in three ways since it is a complicated kind of communication: “real” (author), “potential” (reader), and “fictitious” (character) [3]. Y.N. Karaulov attempted to reconstitute the author's linguistic personality.

Such a person's discourse is far wider (here, discourse is defined as the entirety of all writings generated by this individual). Since oral communication differs greatly from written speech, it should have a diverse range of oral sources as well. The first individual to begin reconstructing a “fictitious” or character linguistic personality was Y.N. Karaulov. Since a character or literary hero in this instance only appears in the text, the researcher does not hesitate to look for extensive material for the reconstruction because the linguistic material is deleted on its own. The link between the notions of “linguistic personality” and “artistic image” is the challenge raised by Y.N. Karaulov. His main area of interest is the relationship between the new linguistic approach and the conventional literary examination of the creative image. The linguistic-literary relationship is rather obvious, as the study of creative discourse has demonstrated: a character image of the world may be constructed by linguistic analysis of the speech character (external, internal, conditionally internalized, and not entirely internalized) [4]. To put it another way, a literary hero's hierarchy of values may be constructed using the hierarchy of “key words-themes” or “ideologues” that are disclosed in his discourse (Y.N. Karaulov). Consequently, we will be able to describe the system of creative pictures of the production as a whole by comparing the value orientations of the characters. L.N. Churilina also noted the integration of literary and linguistic approaches to the examination of creative text. She concurs, citing the views of other scholars studying the language of fiction, that a highly literary analysis of the text runs the risk of leading the researcher into an overly subjective interpretation of the production, whereas linguistic analysis, which pays attention to linguistic units, enables the search for “objective” reasons:

Three things are described about the character:

- 1) his “appearance” (face, eyes, figure, clothes, and demeanor);
- 2) his “actions and states” or “dynamic portrait” (facial expression, eyes, gestures, and posture);
- 3) the hero's “appearance” and “actions and states” (a “psychological portrait”), which discloses something about his inner life [5].

Generally speaking, the aspects of portraiture are related to the narrator's voice or the personal subjective realm (L.N. Churilina) of a literary work. However, the “Dictionary” of S.V. Turayeva and L.I. Timofeev cites instances where characters' speech is used to paint a picture of an intrapersonal topic sphere [6]. Language dictionaries provide an explanation for the phrase “speech portrait”. This feature enables the literary hero's speech style to be typified [7]. Instead of offering an interpretation of the speech picture, the current linguistics lexicon defines the term “linguistic personality” [8]. Naturally, the core of the issue of linguistic identity is covered in the encyclopedia produced by Y.N. Karaulov. As an associated idea, the phrase “speech portrait” is

discussed in the dictionary page dedicated to this issue. The phrase “speech portrait” in linguistic studies is relatively loosely defined. While focusing on the shifts in linguistic theory towards the end of the 20th century, E.A. Goncharova analyzes it in line with the class definitions of the second half of the century. She references N.Y. Chernukhina's work, which is responsible for coining the phrase “speech structure of the image”. “The concept of “speech structure of the image” is broader than the concept of “speech characteristic”, as the latter reflects, in essence, the functional specificity of stylistically labeled elements of the character's speech structure, whereas the former includes both stylistically neutral and functionally conditioned, “colorful” linguistic material”, claims E.A. Goncharova, highlighting the key distinction between the two terms [9]. Hence, the phrase “speech structure of the image” is close to how the concept of “linguistic personality” is understood, since Y.N. Karaulov states that the process of reconstructing a linguistic personality starts with a discourse analysis that does not separate speech into “neutral” and “colorful” parts. The phrase “speech portrait” in linguistics has nothing to do with examining a literary work. Works pertaining to the reconstruction of voice portraits of actual people are acknowledged in research practice.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Kubryakova E.S. The evolution of linguistic ideas in the second half of the XX century (the experience of paradigmatic analysis) / E.S. Kubryakova [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <https://rucont.ru/file.ashx?guid=d29aab13-4bcb-4445-8c66-a6dab3f39b1f>
2. Караулов Ю.Н. Русский язык. Энциклопедия / Ю.Н. Караулов; гл. ред. Ю.Н. Караулов. – М.: Большая Российская энциклопедия, 1997. – 703 с.
3. Чурилина Л.Н. Антропоцентризм художественного текста как принцип организации его лексической структуры: дис. ... док. филол. наук / Л.Н. Чурилина; Российский гос. пед. ун-т им. А.И. Герцена. – СПб., 2002. – 513 с.
4. Караулов Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность / Ю.Н. Караулов. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2002. – 264 с.
5. Жеребило Т.В. Словарь лингвистических терминов / Т.В. Жеребило. – Назрань: ООО «Пилигрим», 2010. – 486 с.
6. Тимофеев Л.И. Словарь литературоведческих терминов / Л.И. Тимофеев, С.В. Тураев [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://litena.ru/literaturovedenie/>
7. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов / О.С. Ахманова. – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1969. – 608 с.
8. Бахтин М. М. Эстетика словесного творчества. — 2-е изд. — М.: Искусство, 1986. — 151 р.

9. Гончарова Е.А. Пути лингвостилистического выражения категорий автор – персонаж в художественном тексте / Е.А. Гончарова. – Томск: Изд-во Томск. ун-та, 1984. – 149 с.

