LINGUOPERSONOLOGY AND THE TYPOLOGY OF CHARACTER SPEECH IN LITERARY DISCOURSE

Berdiyarova Shoira Shaniyazovna
Turon University in Karshi

Abstract. *This paper investigates linguopersonology as an anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics and examines how typological patterns of character speech operate in literary discourse. It argues that fictional dialogue and monologue represent systematically constructed linguistic personalities that encode social identity, psychological disposition, cultural affiliation, and communicative intent. By integrating insights from cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, stylistics, and discourse studies, the study outlines a multidimensional typology of individual speech in fiction. The analysis demonstrates that character-specific linguistic choices function as semiotic indicators of worldview and identity, thereby enhancing interpretative depth in literary analysis.*

Keywords: *linguopersonology, linguistic identity, character speech, literary discourse, typology, pragmatics, stylistic analysis*

Introduction. Recent developments in linguistics emphasize the role of the speaker as a central category of analysis. Within this anthropocentric shift, linguopersonology focuses on how language embodies individual identity and experience. In literary texts, the representation of speech is not a direct transcription of real communication but an artistically mediated construct shaped by authorial strategy. Character speech, therefore, serves as a key site where linguistic form intersects with psychological and social meaning. The scholarly relevance of this topic stems from the need to integrate linguistic and literary methodologies in the analysis of fictional discourse. Studies of linguistic personality provide a theoretical framework for examining how characters are linguistically profiled and how their speech patterns index identity, ideology, and communicative behavior (Karaulov, 1987; Karasik, 2002).

The concept of linguistic personality conceptualizes speakers as carriers of lexical, conceptual, and pragmatic resources. Karaulov's (1987) tripartite model distinguishes between linguistic competence (vocabulary and grammar), cognitive structures (conceptual organization of knowledge), and pragmatic orientation (goals and strategies of communication). Applied to literary studies, this model allows fictional characters to be interpreted as constructed linguistic identities rather than merely narrative figures. Vinogradov (1980) notes that character speech in fiction is shaped by stylistic conventions and authorial intent. Consequently, individual speech in literature reflects a balance between naturalistic representation and aesthetic design. Character speech is embedded in discourse types and cultural frameworks. Karasik

(2002) conceptualizes linguistic identity as discourse-bound, while linguocultural approaches emphasize the role of cultural meanings in shaping linguistic choices (Maslova, 2001). Thus, the analysis of character speech requires attention to both situational context and cultural symbolism.

Social differentiation in literary discourse is manifested through register, lexicon, and syntactic complexity. Characters occupying institutional or elite positions often employ standardized language and abstract vocabulary, whereas socially marginalized characters tend to use colloquial or non-standard forms. Such variation constructs social stratification within the narrative world and contributes to realism (Fairclough, 1995).

Personality traits influence communicative style. Reflective or introverted characters frequently engage in internal monologue and implicit expression, while emotionally expressive or dominant figures favor direct speech acts, imperatives, and evaluative lexis. Politeness strategies and face-management practices further index interpersonal orientation (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Cultural identity is encoded in idiomatic expressions, metaphorical patterns, and references to culturally salient practices. Such linguistic markers function as semiotic cues that position characters within particular cultural traditions and value systems (Maslova, 2001). Through these markers, literary discourse reproduces culturally specific modes of conceptualization. Variation in character speech also depends on discourse contexts. In confrontational situations, speech becomes condensed, emotionally charged, and fragmentary; in narrative or pedagogical contexts, it tends to be elaborated and coherent. These discursive shifts correspond to pragmatic aims and situational roles (van Dijk, 2008).

A fundamental feature of literary discourse is the coexistence of multiple voices. The narrator's discourse and the characters' voices interact to produce polyphonic structures in which diverse ideological and social positions are articulated. Bakhtin's (1981) concept of dialogism elucidates how characters' speech contributes to the plurality of perspectives within a text. Linguopersonological analysis highlights how this plurality is linguistically encoded through differentiated speech patterns.

The investigation of character speech within linguopersonology employs a combination of methodological tools:

1. Cognitive analysis to reconstruct conceptual structures and worldview;
2. Pragmatic analysis to identify communicative intentions and strategies;
3. Stylistic analysis to examine expressive resources;
4. Discourse analysis to contextualize speech within interactional frames;
5. Linguocultural analysis to interpret culturally marked meanings.

This multi-level approach enables systematic interpretation of character speech as a manifestation of linguistic identity.

Conclusion. The typological examination of individual speech in literary discourse demonstrates that fictional characters are constructed as linguistically differentiated personalities. Their speech patterns reflect the interplay of social positioning, psychological disposition, cultural affiliation, and discursive context. Linguopersonology, therefore, offers a coherent theoretical and methodological framework for integrating linguistic analysis into literary interpretation. By foregrounding the linguistic modeling of character identity, this approach contributes to a deeper understanding of how literature represents human subjectivity through language.

References

1. Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The dialogic imagination: Four essays. Austin: University of Texas Press.

2. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

3. Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis. London: Longman.

4. Karaulov, Y. N. (1987). Russian language and linguistic personality. Moscow: Nauka.

5. Karasik, V. I. (2002). Language circle: Personality, concepts, discourse. Moscow: Gnosis.

6. Maslova, V. A. (2001). Linguoculturology. Moscow: Akademiya.

7. van Dijk, T. A. (2008). Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

8. Vinogradov, V. V. (1980). On the language of fiction. Moscow: Nauka.