

Discourse and Rhetorical Possibilities of a Linguistic Personality

Usmonova Nilufar Adkhamovna
Lecturer, Ferghana State University

ABSTRACT

The article examines the rhetorical possibilities of a linguistic personality from the point of view of sociolinguistic research, and also gives a detailed definition of the terms "linguistic personality", "rhetoric", "discourse".

KEYWORDS: language personality, speech, oratory, ethnicity, language discourse, rhetoric, ability.

The term "linguistic personality" refers to the beginning of the XX century and defines a person as a unit of a certain linguistic community. According to this definition, every native speaker of a particular language is a linguistic personality described on the basis of texts and speech reproduced by her with her inherent abilities and means of presenting any events and surrounding reality.

The capabilities of each individual linguistic personality cannot be identical, since their development is influenced by social, intellectual, cultural, spiritual and ideological factors. In this regard, science identifies several levels of linguistic personality:

- The structural-linguistic or semantic (zero level) provides for a rather primitive semantic context in the speaker's speech. As a rule, this is low-content and uninformative colloquial speech, which, however, is a prerequisite for the formation of a linguistic personality at higher levels. An example of such communication can be everyday phrases and sayings: "it's raining", "what time is it", etc.
- Linguistic-cognitive (first level) emphasizes the ability of a linguistic personality to present a well-founded, complete picture of the world based on generally accepted and well-known knowledge about the surrounding reality. Of course, in this context, we can only talk about the individual understanding of things by each individual.
- Finally, pragmatic (second level) language personality reveals the ability to logical reasoning, presentation of cause-and-effect relationships, motives and goals of the speaker. At this stage, a holistic worldview of the individual is formed, with its inherent hierarchy of meanings.

Rhetoric is the art of self-expression

If we talk about the methods of expressing the personality of its level and the possibilities of transmitting information, the most important aspect here is speech. In all epochs, speech has been the subject of in-depth analysis and study, as a result of which the concepts of "culture of speech", "oratory", "eloquence", "rhetoric" have emerged.

The roots of the development and formation of these terms go back centuries and belong to the I-V centuries BC. The mention of rhetoric and oratory is found in the works of Plato and Aristotle – Greek philosophers and scholars of ancient Greece. In parallel, the art of

eloquence developed in Ancient Rome, as evidenced by the early treatises on the rhetoric of Cicero.

Rhetoric has stepped far forward, having passed millennia of continuous development, but still the art of speech remains a living topic of debate and discussion, study and improvement.

The subject of rhetoric as a philological discipline is the theory of eloquence, and the goal is to acquire the skills of effective communication and competent speech. Such qualities are by no means limited to verbal literacy and the ability to correctly construct speech in the context of a language structure. Speech is a unique form of communication that conveys intelligence, experience, feelings, character, goals and interests of the speaker, capable of carrying a deep semantic load, both informational and emotional.

In general, rhetoric and oratory form the theoretical basis of concepts, definitions and practices aimed at obtaining a practical result, an answer to the question – how? How to speak competently, convincingly, intelligibly, how to attract an audience, how to learn how to use speech in solving complex problems. Rhetoric is inextricably linked with philosophy, psychology, and sociology and is therefore popular in politics, economics, and culture.

It would seem that people have studied the art of words for centuries and finally achieved perfection, which means that everyone can become equally effective in their self-expression. However, in this matter, not everything is so clear. Despite the objective achievements of rhetoric available under certain conditions to all native speakers, the eloquence of linguistic personalities in relation to each other will never be identical. This is due to many factors united by a common concept of linguistic discourse.

Discourse is a language within a language

Although the concept of linguistic discourse was born along with the art of rhetoric itself quite a long time ago, it received a significant impetus to its development only in the middle of the XX century. In the 60-70 years of the last century, discourse was interpreted as a sequence of sentences or speech blocks. As a result of such a narrow approach, the most appropriate definition of this concept was "text". Later, in the 1980s of the XX century, discourse became the subject of scientific research and was considered as a combination of linguistic and extra-linguistic factors. This approach to the interpretation of discourse was proposed by the French philosopher and cultural theorist Michel Foucault, who meant by discourse a text or speech with social and historical ideofoms integrated into their context.

Today, discourse is most often viewed from the point of view of a socially constructionist approach. It talks about the influence of social and professional factors on the structure of the language in each of its areas of application.

In simple terms, the speaker's rhetoric will always contain certain patterns in the context, conditioned by:

- Social environment of communication;
- The sphere of activity in which the speech act takes place;
- Professional features of the topic;
- Individual characteristics of the speaker;
- The author's intentions.

It is quite obvious that the speech of the same person, depending on the factors that determine its reproduction, is likely to be different. The connection between rhetoric and these very factors is the discourse.

Rhetorical possibilities of a linguistic personality in the context of discourse

In general, the totality of factors influencing the rhetoric of personality in the studies of various groups of foreign and domestic sociolinguists looks like this:

- Social class;
- Paul;
- Age;
- Ethnicity;
- Belonging to a specific speech community.

It is interesting to consider them in detail.

As you know, the theory of class inequality was first described by Karl Marx. Based on the research of economic theory, he linked the social structure with the position of people relative to the means of production. Using the example of class inequality in Great Britain in the second half of the XIX century, Marx noted the influence of the gap between capitalists and the proletariat on the linguistic personality, which manifested itself in the emergence of new urban jargons in working-class cities such as Manchester and Leeds. At the same time, there was a speech transformation in the circles of the British elite, associated with the close interaction of large landowners, representatives of the Tory aristocracy and industrial and commercial figures. Subsequently, highly paid employees and government employees began to adopt this manner of communication and speech. As a result, class inequality led to the formation of new dialects and sociolects on the territory of the United Kingdom.

Another theorist of class influence on linguistic personality features was the German sociologist Max Weber. His theory is based on the concept of the "middle" class and focuses on differences in professional and qualification characteristics. Contrasting bureaucrats and managers, workers of intellectual and physical labor, he was able to analyze their speech capabilities and identify the difference in linguistic personality within this paradigm.

Gender differences in the linguistic context are also the subject of research. In this area, the works of Robin Lakoff are interesting, who described the female language as tender and emotional, while the male language, on the contrary, is strong, domineering, capable of subjugating others. The analysis of gender differences has helped sociologists and linguists to come to the conclusion that gender is inextricably linked with race, class and manifests itself in local dialects and sociodialects.

The least studied factor of discourse affecting the linguistic personality is the age of the speaker. Age is not a static unit, so in the absence of external signs it is difficult to catch it. The influence of age on language abilities can manifest itself in the quality of the speaker's voice, but even so, not every listener is able to clearly grasp this difference.

Another factor influencing the linguistic personality is ethnicity. This is fair enough, since ethnic discourse is often determined not only by the linguistic aspect, but also by the historical, social, and regional. On the other hand, the ability to speak a particular language is

not an exhaustive condition for attributing a linguistic personality to a specific ethnic group, therefore, the ethnic factor, although objective, is not sufficient to independently influence the capabilities of a linguistic personality.

The last of the factors influencing the formation of speech discourse is belonging to the speech community. This is a set of speech characteristics of individual groups of people united by common economic, political and social ties, constantly communicating with each other. Against the background of all the factors of discourse, speech communities have a greater impact on the capabilities of linguistic personalities, intertwining age, gender, social and ethnic aspects.

In conclusion, we can draw an unambiguous conclusion about the striking differences in the capabilities of each individual linguistic personality. In addition to institutional and genre differences, each person has a personal discourse based on personal experience. This often causes people to misunderstand in everyday life. Understanding discourse as a separate unit of communication, inextricably linked with the rhetorical art, helps to bridge the gap and expand the speech capabilities of everyone who would like to develop effective communication skills.

REFERENCES

1. Fatihovich, G. E., Samadovna, A. Z., & ShukhratUgli, N. Z. (2021). Specific Features of Evtushenko's Lyrics. *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*, 2(4), 23-26.
2. Abdugafurovich, A. A., & Tavakkalovna, K. N. (2021). Intertextual signs in the scientific style. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(3), 1658-1661.
3. Usmonova, N. A. (2021). DISCOURSE AND RHETORICAL POSSIBILITIES OF A LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 1(10), 472-478.
4. Усанова, Н. А. (2022). ОБЩАЯ ТЕОРИЯ ВАЛЕНТНОСТИ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ. *Вестник науки и образования*, (6-1 (126)), 49-51.
5. Khamidova, M. (2021). FEATURES OF THE REFLECTION OF THE ETHNOLINGUISTIC PICTURE OF THE WORLD IN FOLKLORE. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 1(10), 479-488.
6. Uktamovna, K. D. (2023). On The Issue of Neologisms in Modern Linguistics. *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION*, 3(1), 17-19.
7. Темуров, Ж. Б. У. (2021). Функция дискурса в структуре художественного произведения. *Science and Education*, 2(10), 632-635.
8. Sobirov, N., & Abdullaeva, E. A. (2021). Military prisoners of the austro-hungarian and German armies in khujand.