ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

(шифр научной специальности: 10.02.19)

Victoria V. Garkusha, Marina V. Laskova, Vladimir A. Lazarev
Southern federal university
Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation
vv.garkusha@mail.ru

THE STRUCTURE
OF THE LINGUISTIC PERSONA PHENOMENON STUDY
OF POLITICAL SPEAKERS

[*В.В. Гаркуша, М.В. Ласкова, В.А. Лазарев* Структура изучения феномена языковой личности политических спикеров]

It is analyzed the significance of linguistic and non-linguistic features as structural components of the linguistic persona of political speakers. The relevance of the chosen topic arises from the lack of a unified interpretation of the categorical apparatus and the structure of the linguistic persona, which is most often represented as the sum of purely verbal characteristics. The peculiarity of political speech, reflected in the permanent manipulative function, determines the relevance of our approach, which consists in the cumulative analysis of the multi-level linguistic and non-linguistic characteristics of the linguistic persona of political speakers. Such a solution to the question of the linguistic persona will make it possible to consider the whole complex of factors influencing the opinion of the listeners and not to overestimate the importance of linguistic means.

Key words: linguistic persona, anthropocentric linguistics, nonverbal communication, non-linguistic characteristics of political speech.

Nowadays it is obviously seen that the science of language is divided into two spheres with different objects and subjects of research. If traditional linguistics continues to aim at describing and studying the language structure, then the field of science, that is called anthropocentric linguistics, is focused on the other object – the linguistic persona, i.e. a person with his or her ability to perform speech acts. With the assumption that both paradigms in the field of linguistics are not isolated from each other, each one has already considered as an independent scientific branch. Thus, the introduction of the category "linguistic persona" into linguistics stimulates the science of language to master concepts that were not previously used but are widely presented in related sciences – persona, consciousness, behavior, status, situation, etc.

Insufficient knowledge of the phenomenon of "linguistic persona" is the reason for its ambiguous assessment. For example, V.A. Chudinov considers this word combination to be terminologically inappropriate as the concept of language is already included in the concept of persona. However, the use of this term in a number of scientific research areas – language teaching methods and psycholinguistics, stylistics of artistic speech and cultural linguistics, communicative linguistics and linguistic personology – demonstrates the extreme relevance of the reference to the "human factor" in language and formation of an anthropological perspective of research.

Scientists explain that the wide use of the new term resulted from its synthesizing character reflecting the interdisciplinarity of modern human studies, the integration of the humanities, and as for linguistics itself- the integration of its various fields while studying the phenomenon. That is why linguistic reference books are just beginning to include the term "linguistic persona", and there is no universal interpretation of it in scientific research. If we turn to the origins of such word combination as a "linguistic persona", we will see that in the 1930s of the XXth century it was almost simultaneously used in the works of J.L. Weisgerber and V.V. Vinogradov for describing the language of fiction. However, the word combination, which was introduced into scientific knowledge for the first time, did not have strictly terminological characteristics: none of the scientists gave definite interpretation of the new concept.

Conceptualization of the phenomenon, expressed by the words "linguistic persona", was offered only half a century later. This phrase acquires the status of a term only in modern linguistics. Since the 80th of 20th century, a number of its definitions have already been presented. In 1980 G.I. Bogin gave the first of them in his work "Contemporary Linguodidactics" According to G.I. Bogin, a linguistic persona is considered to be "the one who assumes the language, that is the one for whom the language is speech," and its important characteristic is "not so much what this person knows about the language, but what the person can do with the language" [3]. Definitions of the lingvodidactic type go back to the works of G.I. Bogin in which the human speech abilities and their implementation play a key role.

Later on, the author of the theory of the Russian linguistic persona Y.N. Karaulov presented two definitions – narrowly and widely defined, which would later be included in the encyclopedia "The Russian Language". The first meaning defines a linguistic persona as "the name of a complex way of describing the lan-

guage ability of an individual, connecting a system representation of a language with a functional analysis of texts". The second one defines it as "... any speaker of a language characterized on the basis of an analysis of the texts produced by him from the point of view of using the system means of a given language in these texts to reflect his vision of the surrounding reality (worldview) and to achieve certain goals in this world" [9]. Speaking about the object of the research, Y.N. Karaulov means a person who absorbs the worldview by language means, and then images himself into this world with the help of the same language. This concept has had a significant impact in the field of foreign language teaching and intercultural communication in particular.

S.G. Vorkachev, in his turn, considers the linguistic persona in the context of cultural linguistics and views him as "a basic national-cultural prototype of a certain natural language speaker fixed mainly in the lexical system" [5]. Thus, the task of this concept studying is to identify the features of the national culture and mindset of a particular language community.

V.I.Karasik offered a similar definition to such a conception, but with a slight shift of emphasis towards cognitive and communicative linguistics. He considers a language persona as "a generalized image of the speaker with cultural-linguistic and communicative-active values, knowledge, attitudes and behavioral reactions" [8]. He puts the following meaning into the concept of "linguistic persona": "a generalized image of a carrier of cultural-linguistic and communicative-active values, knowledge, attitudes and behavioral reactions" [8]. The development of communicative linguistics conduced the following interpretation of the linguistic persona, proposed by G.N. Bespamyatnova "a set of distinctive features of a person, which are revealed in his communicative behavior and let this person acquire communicative personality" [2].

There are also some definitions in which the content of a linguistic persona is defined through the concept of a system or set of human features. The difference between them is established when different researchers shift the focus of their attention to a particular feature. For example, E.V. Barsukawa and M.V. Borodenko accentuate the actual linguistic components of the phenomenon - the degree of the individual language and speech competence. So, E.V. Barsukova thinks that linguistic persona is "a multidimensional, multi-level functional system that gives an idea of the language and speech skill level of an individual from

the viewpoint of active and creative understanding of reality" [1]. According to M.V. Borodenko, "it is a stable system of logical-linguistic forms that structure the individual's internal and external activity" [4].

A.R. Yeroshenko and S.Y. Godunova also follow a systematic approach. They take into account the extra-linguistic components that characterize a persona with such particularities of the national-language worldview as readiness for perception and adaptation in a different mental-linguistic environment, and other socio-psychological and cultural qualities. For example, A.R. Yeroshenko claims that a linguistic persona "can also be defined as a dynamic system characterized by a special ratio of various parameters: spiritual, mental, intuitive, rational, conscious, unconscious, habitual, creative, potential, representative, etc; and as a functional system" [7]. S.Y.Godunova believes that "a linguistic persona is a combination of a person's socio-psychological and cultural characteristics that determine his or her ability to create textual activities and reflect a specific national-language worldview, constructive interaction with the environment, readiness for perception and adaptation in different mental and linguistic environment with the aim of interacting with a foreign language culture and determining one's place in the spectrum of various cultures" [6].

Many researchers try to narrow the concept of "linguistic persona" by introducing it into the paradigmatic series of similar concepts, or replace the original term with other terms. For example, A.V. Puzyrev contrasts the linguistic persona with mental, speech and communicative personas, associating the first of terms only with the analysis of the language development competence and its features. V.V. Krasnykh distinguishes linguistic, speech, communicative personas and a person who speaks. It is also proposed to use the term "speech persona" that is filled with various contents. In some works, this term is considered as identical in meaning to the generally accepted "linguistic persona", but more accurate in its internal form. The research papers of other linguists claim that this term is associated only with one of the aspects of a linguistic persona description.

Thus, the term "linguistic persona" is gaining a foothold in contemporary linguistics. Its relevance is particularly caused by the development of the anthropological tendency of modern science of language. Varieties of definitions of this term result from different ideas about the object behind this term, the degree of abstraction in the research process, aspects of investigation of this phenomenon. Mul-

tiple interpretations demonstrate the development of ambiguity, on the one hand, and the desire to eliminate polysemy that is undesirable for the term system, on the other hand. Secondary terms (which often shows the identical sound form but different meanings) are hardly adopted, and the primary one, "linguistic persona", is still characterized by the variability of semantic content. This situation can be explained as a contradiction between the initial objects reflected in the word combination under study (unity and opposition of language and speech, sociality and individuality in a person), and the insufficient formation of the terminological apparatus of the new field of scientific knowledge.

The present situation in linguistics, when the question of the conceptual component of the term "linguistic persona" deserves to be asked it determines the absence of a generally accepted idea of its structure. The structure of a linguistic persona, proposed by researchers, largely depends on what concept they share.

Y.N.Karaulov considers three level structure of the linguistic persona:

· verbal semantic level that represents language proficiency (it includes phonetic, grammatical, lexical, syntactic means, the most important of which are lexical ones);

· linguo-cognitive (or thesaurus) level that represents the linguistic world image (it includes concepts, ideas, value systems relevant to a native speaker characterized as a linguistic persona);

· pragmatic (or motivation) level that includes goals, motives, interests, attitudes. These components are presented in the process of text generation and its perceiving. This level is realized through the ability to classify speech situations, and in accordance with the components of the situation to create a text (field of activity, positions of communicators, goal of communication).

Such structure of a linguistic persona is a hierarchical system, since the thesaurus level is a later formation, and, being built over a verbal-semantic one, the former qualitatively changes the latter including its units as construction elements. Later, on the basis of the thesaurus level, the highest level - the motivational level is developing integrating the components of the previous levels and becoming decisive for the entire speech behavior of a person [9].

The model of linguistic persona, which was proposed by G. I. Bogin, is parametric, has the shape of a cube and includes 60 components obtained by multiplying three parameters (axis A - aspects of language - substratum of linguistic persona

(phonetics, grammar, vocabulary); axis B - main types of speech activity (speaking, listening, reading, writing); axis C - value judgments (quality levels). The scientist identifies five levels of a linguistic persona reflecting the stages of the development:

- the level of correctness. It shows whether a person has mastered a sufficient vocabulary and knows how to make a statement in accordance with the rules of a given language;
- the level of interiorization showing the internal speech competence;
- the level of intensity demonstrating the frames of using phonetic, grammatical and lexical expressive means of a language;
- the level of adequate choice reflected in the ability to choose language means according to the sphere of communication, the communicative situation and the roles of communicators. In addition, the ability to review various communication failures is shown at this level;
- the level of adequate synthesis that demonstrates the "unity the communicative and aesthetic functions of a language implementation, as well as, in general, the unity of all functions of a language in speech activity" [3].

A significant role in determining the structure of the concept is also played by the fact whether researchers distinguish the meanings of the terms "linguistic persona" and "communicative persona". For example, V.P. Konetskaya believes that the concept of linguistic persona is narrower than the concept of "communicative persona". The second one includes characteristics associated with the choice of not only verbal, but also non-verbal communication code, using artificial and mixed communicative codes that ensure the interaction of a man and a machine. According to this concept, the following parameters are decisive for a communicative persona:

- motivational level (communication needs), which is top- of-mind in the structure, since "it is the need to inform something or receive necessary information that serves as a powerful incentive for communication activities and what is regarded as an obligatory characteristic of the individual as a communicative persona";
- cognitive; for this aspect, the most essential characteristics are the following: the ability to perceive information in an adequate way, the ability to influence a partner, the assessment and self-assessment of the cognitive level and knowledge of socially determined norms of verbal and non-verbal communication;

- functional; it includes three main characteristics: a) the ability to use individual fund of verbal and non-verbal means for updating the informational, expressive and pragmatic functions of communication; b) the ability to vary the communicative means in the process of communication because of changes in the situational conditions of communication; c) the ability to form statements and discourses in accordance with the norms of the chosen communicative code and the rules of speech etiquette.

V.P. Konetskaya emphasizes that overlapping of some characteristics of linguistic and communicative personas does not mean the identity of these terms because their contents coincide only partially. There is another point of view according to which the concepts of "linguistic persona" and "communicative persona" are not differentiated. For example, V.I. Karasik notes that a linguistic persona in the context of communication can be considered as a communicative persona. V.I. Karasik considers a communicative persona to have value-based, cognitive and behavioral plans:

- the value-based plan includes ethical and utilitarian norms of behavior reflected in universal statements, etiquette rules, communicative strategies of politeness, evaluative meanings of words, precedent texts that constitute the cultural context understandable to the average speaker of the language;
- the cognitive plan reveals worldview which is specific for a communicative persona;
- the behavioral plan is characterized by a specific set of paralinguistic means of communication.

Such characteristics can be analyzed from the viewpoint of sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic aspects. The former one identifies speech indexes of men and women, children and adults, educated and less educated native speakers, people who speak their native and non-native language. The latter one deals with speech, interactive and discursive activities in the natural communication of people.

V.I. Karasik also notes that the proposed aspects of the communicative persona are correlated with the three-level model of the linguistic persona, but they are not identical. The model of Y. N. Karaulov suggests a hierarchy of levels. However, the value-based, cognitive and behavioral aspects of a communicative persona are complementary. This means that cognitive and behavioral characteristics of communication can be viewed from the viewpoint of axiology; values

and communicative moves - from the viewpoint of mental presentation; ethical, utilitarian and other norms that speakers of a given culture follow, and language categorization of the world - from the viewpoint of speech interaction. At the same time, all the mentioned aspects of the communicative persona – value-based, cognitive and behavioral ones- correlate with the linguistic means of expression that can be both verbal and non-verbal [8].

From the viewpoint of analyzing a specific act of communication, that is the speech of a politician, it seems to be reasonable to follow the of V.I. Karasik's theory and consider the concepts of "linguistic" and "communicative" persona as equivalent. It also seems necessary for researchers to remain in the field of communicative linguistics, and not to shift focus to ethno-linguistics and cultural linguistics which place collectivity in the focus of their attention. It is also not a good idea to get involved into pedagogy too much because it would lead to considering the structure of a linguistic persona from the point of view of the hierarchical location of the levels and exploring the ability to develop language skills. While comparing the existing concepts of the structure of a linguistic persona, it should be noted that each of these concepts is characterized by a level system. Moreover, the analysis of the language level is a key factor in all concepts. However, the fact that the object of the study is not written texts, but public speeches does not allow researchers to neglect such an aspect as the non-verbal language level. Besides, the status of this aspect in linguistic studies of a linguistic persona is rather ambiguous, since scientists have different meanings for the concept of the non-verbal language level.

The followers of Y.N.Karaulov mention the non-linguistic aspect influencing the formation of a linguistic persona as the system of cultural and social values formed in the environment of a specific national community. This view is based on the statement of Y.N. Karaulov that the linguistic persona is a concentration of "ethno-national peculiarities, social, historical and cultural characteristics" [9]. S.G. Vorkachev uses the notion of "non-verbal idio-symbols" [5] to describe the national-cultural factors, the result of which is considered to be the linguistic persona, which is the speaker of certain ideological attitudes, value priorities and behavioral reactions. V.I. Karasik holds a slightly different point of view. He implies that the non-verbal aspect is not external factors influencing the formation of a linguistic personality, but paralinguistic means of communication as markers of a cer-

tain ethnocultural group. He introduces the concept of situational communication indexes (distance between participants of communication, loudness of voice, distinctness of pronunciation, etc.), the difference in which makes it possible to identify different cultures that linguistic personas belong to. V.P. Konetskaya avoid describing cultural and social characteristics. Highlighting the paralinguistic level in the structure of a linguistic persona, she explores non-verbal means of communication, including gestures, facial expressions, body movements, as well as voice characteristics, tone and pauses. According to V.P. Konetskaya, non-verbal means have certain advantages over verbal ones - they are perceived directly and therefore have a stronger effect despite their short duration.

If the study of the linguistic persona of a politician focuses on the individual features of the linguistic persona, rather than the national-cultural specific speech characteristics of a political representative of a particular community, then it seems appropriate to omit the analysis of the socio-cultural characteristics of the persona and consider the non-verbal linguistic level as the combination of paralinguistic means of communication.

Thus, within the framework of the works the subject of which are political figures, the most advantageous structure of a linguistic persona seems to be the two-part one which deals with linguistic features on one level and with non-linguistic features on the other one. Linguists consider verbal behavior, which implies the behavior of a person in speech and his choice of optimal language means for successful communication, as the main aspect of a linguistic persona. However, scientists do not come to a consensus about what particular linguistic factors should be analyzed in studies on linguistic persona.

Y.N. Karulov focuses on the lexical and grammatical features of the national language that shall be analyzed not by themselves as a kind of abstract system but in a certain ethnic, historical, social and psychological environment of the functioning language. Such researchers as M.V. Kitaygorodskaya and N.N. Rozanova adhere to the same point of view in their works on the Russian speech portrait. B. Y. Norman claims that the matter of particular importance shall be the analysis of grammatical linguistic level. He believes that "the process of choosing the right form for creating a phrase is rather an automated process for a common man who is not a linguist" [10], and the grammatical phenomena themselves come into his or her head as ready-made patterns that are actually widespread. In this case, it is

necessary to study deviations from widely used grammatical models since they are less strict, less regular. L.N. Churilina and E.N.Ivanova focus on lexical characteristics in their works about the linguistic persona. So, L.N. Churilina considers the vocabulary as a system serving the communicative needs of an individual, with which it is possible to reconstruct fragments of the individual image of the world. E.N. Ivanova, in turn, believes that the linguistic persona is most clearly represented and its lexical abilities can be fully realized precisely at the lexical level [18].

The founder of the speech portrait concepts, M. Panov, while describing the language features of a number of political figures, scholars and writers of the past, was guided by a combination of individual and collective phonetic speech characteristics of a person who was considered as a representative of a certain social environment. Being a follower of such a theory, E.A. Babushkina devotes her works to analyzing the systems of consonantism, vocalism and intonational characteristics of speech. She believes that the phonetic level of a language is a key level of realization of a linguistic persona. According to E.A. Babushkina, this level includes the speech tempo, its melody, the way of pausing and highlighting words of special importance from the viewpoint of expressing meaning and emotions.

Researchers of the literary text also do not come to a common opinion about the priority of a particular language aspect. E.A.Goncharova considers the character's speech from the perspective of vocabulary and syntax. She claims that the lexical composition of the phrase gives an idea of the character's image-conceptual sphere, and its syntactic organization reflects the peculiarities of the logical-expressive linking of images and concepts. G.G. Matveeva proposes to identify small syntactic groups. She thinks that the subject of the study shell be the choice of the sender of the text regarding the optimal structural and semantic variants of a statement for effective influence on the recipient of the text.

The above theoretical review suggests that there are several approaches that deal with the structure of the linguistic aspect of the linguistic persona and make it possible to describe this aspect. However, in the case when the object of the research is political speech, it is possible not to be limited to the selection of lexical and grammatical features, but to identify and analyze the peculiarity of the phonetic level of the linguistic persona. At the same time, it seems reasonable to take into account the peculiarities of the use of stylistic means which provide political speech with brightness, expressiveness and enhance its emotional impact on the

listener. In this case, the basis of the structure of the linguistic aspect of the linguistic persona shall be the results of the research of A.A. Reformatsky. The scientist presented the results of his works in monographies on general linguistics, in particular, "Introduction to linguistics".

To analyze a linguistic persona from the lexical viewpoint, it is necessary to investigate the peculiarities of using the following things:

- Borrowing and foreign language vocabulary
- Terms and words of a common language
- Connotative words
- Figures of speech

To analyze a linguistic persona from the grammatical viewpoint means to identify specific functioning of such grammatical categories as:

- the category of tense which relates verb forms to the tense characteristic of the action.
- the category of voice which distinguishes between the subject and the object of action by changing verbs' forms.
- the category of number that expresses quantitative relations that exist in reality, reflected in the minds of the speakers of a given language and having a morphological expression in the corresponding forms of the language.
- the category of definiteness/ indefiniteness that shows whether the noun refers to any member of the class of objects (indefinite article) or specifies it as the particular noun that is being considered (definite article).
- the quality category that is mainly expressed by degrees of comparison.

On the other hand, the grammatical features of the linguistic persona include syntactic and stylistic characteristics of speech, such as:

- the use of different types of sentences depending on the purpose of the statement: narrative, interrogative and imperative ones.
- the use of declarative sentences, stating facts in an affirmative or negative form.
- the ratio of different types of interrogative sentences: general, special, alternative and tag ones.
- the presence of stylistic figures of speech used to enhance the expressiveness of the statement.

To analyze the phonetic features of a linguistic persona means to investigate phonetic means that characterize rhythmic-intonational phenomena of the speech, such as:

- melody of speech represented in raising or lowering the voice.
- rhythm that demonstrates the ratio of strong and weak, long and short syllables.
- the rate of speech which refers to the speed or slowness of speech in time, including acceleration and deceleration.
- pausing, which is expressed in the presence or absence of pauses inside the phrase.

This level also analyzes such stylistic means as alliteration and assonance which are aimed to enhance the expressiveness of emotional speech. Thus, the linguistic component of the linguistic persona is of the greatest interest for analysis, since the features of verbal communication are identified at this level.

In contrast to the linguistic approach to the study of linguistic persona, where the only object of investigation is the speaker's speech, the non-linguistic aspect considers the features of non-verbal communication, which is commonly understood as the exchange of information without the help of words. This includes primary and secondary languages. In primary languages, signals directly denote meanings. In secondary languages, words are encoded into signals which, in turn, express a certain meaning. For example, body language is the primary language, since the mimic signals of our face directly indicate some state, message. Morse code is a secondary language, because the signs of Morse code mean letters and words, and the letter ones express meanings. In studies on the linguistic persona of a political speaker, primary nonverbal language is analyzed.

The simultaneous use of verbal and non-verbal means is caused by the speaker's desire to specify the information, to make it more expressive and meaningful, in order to influence the interlocutor. Despite the fact that here non-verbal means play the "secondary role" in the process of communication, they more effectively perform the function of influence. Thus, verbal communication covers only 35% of the information; the remaining 65% of the information is transferred via non-verbal messages [10].

Scientists still have not arrived at a common view concerning the question what shall be meant by non-verbal language. American scientists S.P.Moriel, B.H.Shpitzberg and D.K.Bardzh consider that this concept should be understood as "all behavior, attributes and objects - not related to words - which deliver certain messages and have common social meaning" [12].

Australian scientists R.B. Adler and R. F. Proctor offer a broader definition - everything that "is expressed by non-linguistic means" [11]. These definitions include messages transferred through voice (sighs, laughter, crying, etc.), gestures, facial expressions, the appearance of communicants and their location in space, the environment, time and other factors.

V.A. Labunskaya gives the concept of non-verbal communication in the narrow and broad sense. In the narrow sense, non-verbal communication is understood as a mean of information, a system of non-verbal symbols, signs, codes used to convey a message (secondary non-verbal languages). In a broad sense, this term is practically identified with the term of "non-verbal behavior" and means a socially determined system of interaction in the structure of which the main place is occupied by spontaneous and unconscious complexes of movements that express the personality uniqueness.

Moreover, there are many approaches to the classification of non-verbal communication, ranging from broad ones to narrow ones. For example, M. Patterson identifies a wide range of relatively stable, fixed elements and a combination of more dynamic, behavioral elements in a nonverbal system. Fixed elements include design, decor and appearance. These characteristics form the context for interaction and generate expectations. Dynamic elements include distance and location of communicants in space, visual contact, facial expression, posture and movement.

Summing up, it should be noted that the relevance of the category of "linguistic persona" arises from the development of the anthropological perspective in the works of researchers from various fields of science and linguistics, in particular. The scientific community still has not come to a single interpretation of this term and continues to offer new ones and quite different approaches to its understanding and study. However, it is necessary to consider that the peculiarity of political speech lies in the permanent manipulative function. Texts of speeches, behavioral patterns, facial expressions, voice and the politician's view are equally important. Therefore, in order to consider the linguistic persona of a politician, researchers shall take into account the full spectrum of its linguistic and non-linguistic features, which will exclude the possibility of reassessing the significance of linguistic facts and distorting the full picture of the phenomenon.

R E F E R E N C E S

1. *Barsukova E.V.* The linguistic persona as a category of historical cultural studies (on the material of the "Archive of Prince Vorontsov"). Thesis abstract. M., 2007.

2. *Bespamyatnova G.N.* The linguistic persona of the television presenter. Thesis abstract. Voronezh, 1994.

3. *Bogin G.I.* The model of linguistic persona in its relation to the varieties of texts. Thesis abstract. L., 1984.

4. *Borodenko M.V.* Linguistic persona // Cultural-historical developmental psychology. M., 2001.

5. *Vorkachev S. G.* Linguoculturology, linguistic persona, concept: the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics // Philological Sciences. M., 2001. No 1.

6. *Godunova S.Yu.* Pedagogical conditions for the development of the linguistic persona of a technical university student. Thesis abstract. M., 2008.

7. *Yeroshenko A.R.* The concept of "Man" in anthropological linguistics: interpretation features // Anthropocentric paradigm in philology. Stavropol, 2003. No. 2

8. *Karasik V.I.* Language circle: persona, concepts, discourse. M., 2004.

9. *Karaulov Yu.N.* The Russian language and language persona. M., 2007.

10. *Norman B.Yu.* Linguistic pragmatics (on the material of the Russian and other Slavic languages): lecture course. Minsk, 2009.

11. *Adler, R. B., Proctor, R. F.* Looking out, Looking in. Australia, Boston. 2010.

12. *Morreale S.P., Spitzberg B.H., Barge J.K.* Human communication: motivation, knowledge, and skills. Belmont, CA. 2007.

Л И Т Е Р А Т У Р А

1. *Барсукова Е.В.* Языковая личность как категория исторической культурологии (на материале «Архива князя Воронцова»). Автореф. дисс. канд. филол. наук. М., 2007.

2. *Беспамятнова Г.Н.* Языковая личность телевизионного ведущего. Автореф. дисс. канд. филол. наук. Воронеж, 1994.

3. *Богин Г.И.* Модель языковой личности в ее отношении к разновидностям текстов. Автореф. дисс. канд. филол. наук. Л., 1984.

4. *Бороденко М.В.* Языковая личность // Культурно-историческая психология развития. М., 2001.

5. *Воркачев С. Г.* Лингвокультурология, языковая личность, концепт: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании // Филологические науки. М., 2001. № 1.

6. *Годунова С.Ю.* Педагогические условия развития языковой личности студента технического вуза. Автореф. дисс. канд. филол. наук. М., 2008.

7. *Ерошенко А.Р.* Концепт «Человек» в антропологической лингвистике: особенности интерпретации // Антропоцентрическая парадигма в филологии. Ставрополь, 2003. №. 2.

8. *Карасик В.И.* Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. М., 2004.

9. *Караулов Ю.Н.* Русский язык и языковая личность. М., 2007.

10. *Норман Б.Ю.* Лингвистическая прагматика (на материале русского и других славянских языков): курс лекций. Минск, 2009.

11. *Adler, R. B., Proctor, R. F.* Looking out, Looking in. Australia, Boston. 2010.

12. *Morreale S.P., Spitzberg B.H., Barge J.K.* Human communication: motivation, knowledge, and skills. Belmont, CA. 2007.

16 ноября 2018 г.