SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES

VERBAL EXPLICATION OF PRAGMATIC INTERPRETATION IN LITERARY DISCOURSE

Nozliya Normurodova
Head of English philology department
PhD, associate professor
Navo'i Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature,
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
nozliyanormurodova1@gmail.com

Abstract: Linguistics of the XXI century is intensively developing the idea that language is not only an instrument of communication but also the cultural code of a nation. It happened due to the development of a new anthropocentric paradigm, which gives the human the status of being "the measure of all things" and focuses on studying the "human factor" in the language. The emergence of the anthropocentric paradigm caused the shift in linguistic views, methods of investigations and the emergence of new interdisciplinary linguistic trends such as Sociolinguistics, Cognitive Linguisticsis, Linguopersonologiey (studies of linguistic personality), Discursive studies, Cultural Linguistics (Linguoculturology), Gender Linguistics, etc., which focus on the study of linguistic personality. As many researchers note, the model of linguistic personality is not a constant, it is open for further additions, elaboration and specification. This case necessitates scientific development of this problem and determines its theoretical importance. The study of the problem of linguistic personality on the material of literary discourse in the integration of semantic-stylistic, communicative-pragmatic, cognitive, culturological characteristics makes it possible to construct the multilevel model of it that reflects mental essence of this phenomenon. The article deals with the identification of these trends, and highlights their theoretical assumptions, evolution, main problems and achievements done within each trend.

Key words: Antropothentric paradigm, linguistic personality, verbal-semantic, linguopragmatic, linguocognitive, discourse, stylistic.

Introduction

The modern linguistics is based on the principle of anthropocentric paradigm, which contains "human factor" in the study of language. The anthropocentric scientific paradigm puts forward the new approaches to the research of language which are implemented within a number of new disciplines, such as cognitive linguistics, linguopersonology, linguoculturology, text linguistics,

linguopragmatics, communicative linguistics, etc.

It is acknowledged that new perspective trends in linguistics should be investigated through anthropocentric approach. General assumptions are the following:

- the basic notion of paradigm, it's historical development and classification are key figures in penetrating deep meaning of linguistic personality;

- anthropocentric paradigm in the light of interdisciplinary approach, which includes cognitive linguistics, linguopragmatics, linguoculturology etc.

- new trends in linguistics are interconnected, interconditioned that imply extralinguistic factors of the language on the whole.

The literary review of linguistic personality from pragmatic point of view makes it inevitable to introduce the new term - "discourse". Discourse (from French "discourse" - "speech") is a coherent text with extralinguistic, pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors; it is a text used in conceptual aspect. It is the speech, which is considered as purposeful social activity, and as the component participating in interaction of people and mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes). The notions of "text" and "discourse" are correlative, but not equivalent. Text is a part of discourse; it is created in the process of discourse. Despite the differences between the notions of text and discourse, they cannot be completely separated since they are closely correlated with one another in terms of their users (addresser and addressee, i.e. author and reader), relationship (text is a part or result of discourse) etc. Although different linguists define discourse in various ways, they all back up the claim that discourse is interpreted in the context and based on specific situation. It is the belief of majority prominent linguists that in the process of discourse analysis, particularly in literary review, linguistic, social, pragmatic, cultural, psychological factors of communication should be taken into consideration.

At the present stage of development of linguistics, one of the new trends is linguopragmatics, which has the notion of "linguistic personality" (LP) as its key term. Theoretical basis of LP is based on the intersection of several disciplines, specifically, it adjoins stylistics, pragmatics, psychology, culturology, etc. This fact proves the complexity and ambiguity of approaches to revealing definition, structure, criteria and ways of the description of LP. The main task of our work is the research of complex semantic-stylistic, linguopragmatic and linguocognitive description and interpretation of LP in literary discourse. Thus, we define LP as a set of competences and characteristics of a person that determines their production and perception of speech texts which differ according to: a) the degree of semantic-stylistic language

complexity; b) the features of linguistic representation of communicative-pragmatic factors for characterization of LP; c) the profundity in of reflection of intellectual sphere of personality; d) the extent of expression of universal, national and culture-specific values.

Conceptual basis

Within the transition to anthropocentric paradigm in which the essential focus is on the "human factor", the new trends have come into existence and have been developed deeply up to present. One of the trends, which plays the predominating role in the current stage of linguistics, is linguopragmatics. Linguopragmatics is one of the directions of communicative linguistics, which is in general defined as the science that is concerned with the study of linguistic factors in the aspect of human activity. Linguopragmatics has a great number of definitions. As a result of generalizing all viewpoints, the following approaches to define this scientific field can be pointed out:

1. the relation between the sign and its users [13];

2. the science about the use of language, the science about language in context [16];

3. the speech influence, factors that provide successful use of language [25];

4. interpretative aspect of speech communication [4, 5];

5. interpretation of language as a means of implementation of a certain purposeful activity [15].

Linguopragmatics embraces a great number of key terms among of which linguistic personality is of greatest importance. It is emphasized that linguistic personality is formed and revealed in communication that gives the chance to analyze it within this or that type of discourse in which linguistic personality represents the internal link between the language consciousness - collective and individual active reflection of the experience fixed in to language semantics, on the one hand, and speech behavior - conscious and unconscious system of communicative acts that reveal character and the way of life of a human, on the other hand [23, p.100].

Pragmatic level of linguistic personality is considered to be multifaceted, multidimensional and, undoubtedly, plays the predominating role in the hierarchy of levels. At the same time, it is one of the most hard-to-reach phenomena for the researcher since motives, interests, aspirations, intentionality, aims, as well as creative potentialities of human are considerably constructed on affections and emotions; and the linguistic expression of the latter, not to mention the mental essence, has been investigated insufficiently. According to Karaulov, units of pragmatic level (see the table-1.) are designated as the needs of communicative activity, which are united in the fixed structure - communicative network [24, p.211].

Table-1.

Philosophical aspect	Psychological aspect	Levels of LP structure	Elements of levels		
			1	2	3
			units	relations	stereotypes
Language	Semantic level	Verbal-semantic	Words	Grammatical-paradigmatic, semantic-syntactic, associative - "verbal network"	Models of phrases and sentences; object contains components; object is made of components; components are allocated in the object; object is divided into components
Mind	Cognitive level	Thesaurus	Notions (ideas, concepts)	Hierarchic-coordinative, semantic field – "world picture"	Generalized statements
Substance (reality)	Pragmatic level	Motivational	Functional-communicative needs	Sphere of communication, communicative situation, communicative roles – "communicative network"	Images (symbols) of precedent texts of culture

In order to make the communication understandable to both speaker/author (addresser) and hearer/reader (addressee), there must be general principle of language use, which is called cooperative principle, i.e. communicative postulates. "According to Grice, the cooperative principle is a norm governing all cooperative interactions among humans [12]. According to Grice's cooperative principle one should make his/her contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which s/he is engaged. These communicative postulates contain four categories, which are formulated as basic rules or maxims. "Maxim is a set of norms which language users adhere to in order to uphold the effectiveness and efficiency of communication" [11]. The conversational maxims can be assumed as precisifications of the cooperative principle that deal specifically with communication. So, four maxims of conversation designated by G.Grice are the followings:

1. Maxim of quantity:

a) make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange;

b) do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

2. Maxim of quality: be truthful

a) do not say what you believe to be false;

b) do not say what you lack adequate evidence for.

3. Maxim of relation: relevance

a) be relevant

4. Maxim of manner: be perspicuous

a) avoid obscurity of expression;

b) avoid ambiguity;

c) be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity);

d) be orderly [2, p.26-27].

Grice follows his summary of the maxims by proposing that "one might need others", and states that "There are, of course, all sorts of other maxims (aesthetic, social, or moral in character), such as "Be polite", that are also normally observed by participants in exchanges, and these may also generate nonconventional implicatures" [2, p.28].

Before analyzing communicative-pragmatic features of LP, it is important to have a clear understanding of what "communicative-pragmatic situation" is. Communicative-pragmatic situation is "a complex of external conditions which the partners keep in mind at the moment of their speech communication" [2, P.34]. "According to E.S. Aznaurova the communicative-pragmatic situation can be presented by a chain of questions: who - what - where - when - why - how - to whom". D.U. Ashurova outlines the following factors as the most relevant parameters of the communicative-pragmatic situation in the literary discourse:

- The subject and aim of communication;

- The factors of the addresser (writer) and addressee (reader);

- Social, ethnic, individual characteristics of the personages, their role and personal relations;

- The linguistic personality of the author, his conceptual world picture" [1, 2, 3].

Communicative-pragmatic situation includes text as the object of research in linguopragmatics since the speech communication is reflected in it or the text itself is considered to be as the component of literary communication. The linguopragmatic analysis is based on lexica-grammatical and linguostylistic ones, and it appears to be their logical continuation in respect of linguopragmatic interpretation of the received data. It is aimed at revealing verbal signals of formation of the pragmatic meanings and their substantial and functional interpretation, defining the pragmatic effect of speech communication[1, 2, 3].

In order to identify the main aim of linguopragmatic analysis which is speech impact we will address to the study of term so-called role relations that is used as generic (родовой) and includes such notions as speech behavior, role expectations, and the factor of mutual understanding [1, 2, 3].

The speech behavior of LP can be interpreted adequately only within more general social system. In speech communication, social interaction and speech communication are distinguished. Social interaction is an activity of LPs, directed towards regulation and coordination of their

joint activity, is a way of realization of social relations. Society consists of individuals and set of their relations. The language stands up as the means of indirect acquisition of the social experience in society, and the speech communication comes forward as the main means of social interaction. It is possible to describe social interaction only in terms of the roles that are carried out by members of society which are used as LP in our analysis [1, 2, 3].

The notion of role relations is defined as the mutual relationship of LPs of communicative act, which is determined by institutional and role structure of society, on the one hand, and it is set and formed in the course of communication depending on a concrete situation, on the other hand.

The content and rules of role function/behavior are determined by the role expectations, which is the part of communicative competence. Each of LPs certainly considers expectations of another, and these expectations are, in any case, socially determined by both nation's and group's literary, ethical, cultural traditions. Everyone has a certain idea about how and what to speak in a certain situation. Thus, the role expectations is the external control over the role activity, is the general knowledge of role actions, which guarantees mutuality and coherence of speech behavior and also can be the reason for the realization of the follow-ups as well as mutual understanding. The form of realization of these or those role

expectations depends on a number of factors of communicative-pragmatic situation, the primary ones of which are: situation of speech communication and socio-psychological characteristics of LP [1, 2, 3].

As our practical material has shown, extralinguistic factors such as surrounding culture, social circle can give descriptive context to linguopragmatic aspect of linguistic personality.The dialogues and personage descriptions from Bernard Shaw's play "Pygmalion" can be nice example to illustrate the linguopragmatic features of linguistic personality. The play narrates about how two old gentlemen, Professor Higgins who is a scientist of phonetics and Colonel Pickering who is a linguist of Indian dialects meet in a rainy day and the first bets the other that within three months he can make a well-spoken lady out of uneducated, cockney speaking Covent Garden flower girl, Eliza Doolittle. In turn, Colonel Pickering offers to cover the expenses of the experiment if Higgins can pass Eliza off as a duchess at a garden party six months later .

The following fragment from Pygmalion, which gives the description of the flower girl Eliza and a few utterances produced by her, provides clear picture of her social status and educational level, which in its turn determines LP's speech behavior.

THE FLOWER GIRL [picking up her scattered flowers and

replacing them in the basket] There's menners f' yer! Te-oo banches o voylets trod into the mad. [She sits down on the plinth of the column, sorting her flowers, on the lady's right. She is not atall an attractive person. She is perhaps eighteen, perhapstwenty, hardly older. She wears a little sailor hat of blackstraw that has long been exposed to the dust and soot of London and has seldom if ever been brushed. Her hair needs washingrather badly: its mousy color can hardly be natural. She wears ashoddy black coat that reaches nearly to her knees and is shapedto her waist. She has a brown skirt with a coarse apron. Her boots are much the worse for wear. She is no doubt as clean asshe can afford to be; but compared to the ladies she is verydirty. Her features are no worse than theirs are; but their conditionleaves something to be desired; and she needs the services of a dentist].

The linguistic units such as "a little sailor hat that has been exposed to the dust and soot of London and has seldom if ever been brushed", "needs washing", "shoddy", "coarse", "the worse for wear", "very dirty", "needs the services of a dentist" indicates to her poverty and low social status. The use of the timid colors such as "mousy color", "brown" as well as the occurrence of the word "black" several times, and the word "not at all attractive" are the verbal explication of how "black" and hard her life she has been leading, as well. Moreover, it is important to state that the personage's speech is one of the powerful means of revealing implicit information about linguistic personality. Just one line of Eliza Doolittle's speech "There's menners f' yer! Te-oobanches o voylets trod into the mad" is full of mispronunciations and incorrect usage of words, dialectical words and negative stylistically colored units, which show her illiteracy and low level of education.

Next fragment is quite contrasting description to the one given above:

"Higgins's laboratory in Wimpole Street. ...In this corner stands a flat writing-table, on which are a phonograph, a laryngoscope, a row of tiny organ pipes with a bellows, several tuning-forks of different sizes, a life-size imageof half a human head, showing in section the vocal organs, and abox containing a supply of wax cylinders for the phonograph. Further down the room, on the same side, is a fireplace, with a comfortable leather-covered easy-chair at the side of the hearth nearest the door, and a coal-scuttle... The corner beyond, and most of the side wall, is occupied by a grand piano, with the keyboard at the end furthest from the door, and a bench for the player extendingthe full length of the keyboard. On the piano is a dessert dishheaped with fruit and sweets, mostly chocolates.The middle of the room is clear. Besides the easy chair, thepiano bench, and two chairs at the phonograph table, there is onestray chair. It stands near the fireplace... Higgins is standing up near him, closing two or three

filedrawers, which are hanging out. He appears in the morning light as a robust, vital, appetizing sort of man of forty or thereabouts, dressed in a professional-lookingblack frock-coat with a white linen collar and black silk tie. He is of the energetic, scientific type, heartily, even violently interested in everything that can be studied as a scientific subject..."

This is the portrait description of Professor Higgins, the scientist of phonetics. From the description of Higgins, the reader gets an impression of a wealthy gentleman and energetic scientist belonging to English upper-middle class. The linguistic units such as "phonograph", "laryngoscope", "a supply of wax cylinders", "a human head, showing in section the vocal organs", "tuning-fork", "scientific type", "scientific subject" reveal his profession to some extent and indicate that he is the person involved in science and experiments. Besides, the words describing the situational context including the look of the room and his appearance as a person such as "fireplace, with a comfortable leather-covered easy-chair", "grand piano", "light", "white", "robust", "vital", "appetizing", "silk tie", "frock coat" discloses his high social class and that he has been living independent, upscale, prosperous and carefree life.

As our practical material has shown, dialogue can represent communicative pragmatic situation intended to show social status of LP.

HIGGINS [stupent] WELL!!! [Recovering his breath with a gasp]What do you expect me to say to you?

THE FLOWER GIRL. Well, if you was a gentleman, you might ask me to sit down, I think. Don't I tell you I'm bringing you business?

HIGGINS. Pickering: shall we ask this baggage to sit down or shall we throw her out of the window?

THE FLOWER GIRL [running away in terror to the piano, where she turns at bay] Ah--ah--ah--ow--ow--ow--oo! [Wounded and whimpering] I won't be called a baggage when I've offered to pay like any lady.

The manner of the personages' speech highlight their social rank and Higgins' sarcastic statement uttered towards Liza "shall we ask this baggage to sit down or shall we throw her out of the window?" justifies how much low the professor looks down on the flower girl.Regardless of how hard the flower girl tries to look noble and ask professor to offer her to be seated, her statements that are abundant in grammatically inappropriate structures and inversions such as "you was", "Don't I tell you" and finally her self-confession "I want to be a lady in a flower shop stead of selling at the corner of Tottenham Court Road. But they won't take me unless I can talk more genteel. He said he could teach me. Well, here I am ready to pay him--not asking any favor-and he treats me as if I was dirt." reveals her real low social status,

educational and cultural level and noticeable discrepancy in way of thinking. Even the words in the utterance of Higgins' maid "foolish ignorant girl" validates the real condition of the girl and shows explicitlythat even the maid has a higher status than the flower girl.If to analyze the use of Gricean maxims in this dialogue, we can observe the case of a multiple violation. "A multiple violation occurs when the speaker violates more than one maxim simultaneously". In the aforementioned dialogue, the violation of the quantity, relevance and manner maxims can be detected in the speech of flower girl. When Higgins asks her "What do you expect me to say to you?", the girl instead of giving the relevant and direct answer, demonstrates obscurity, redundancy and irrelevance by going around the bush and avoiding the brief, direct response: "Well, if you was a gentleman, you might ask me to sit down, I think. Don't I tell you I'm bringing you business?". In addition, it is obvious that flower girl is actually implying, i.e. giving a hint to Higgins so that he would ask her to sit down. In his turn, Higgins gets the point and understands her intention but he replies with question facing towards Pickering "shall we ask this baggage to sit down or shall we throw her out of the window?" and this answer implicates that he even has no intention to invite her to take a seat. Thus, the maxim of politeness is violated in

Higgins' speech by the use of rude and disrespectful words, phrases such as "baggage", "throw her out of the window". Also, in the same utterance of Higgins we can observe the process of opting out of a maxim. "A speaker opts out of observing a maxim whenever s/he indicates unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires" [11] as it is in the case of Higgins whe he is unwilling to invite the flower girl to be seated whereas she really expects to hear the vice versa.

One of the polylogues given at the beginning of the play is also worth the analysis in terms of linguopragmatic parameters of linguistic personality.

As our practical material has shown, extralinguistic factors - social status and hierarchy, nationality of LP, - social circle and way of living can be explicated by verbal linguistic means as anthroponyms, toponyms, descriptive context of perspective and modern brand items. Further, we will analyze the verbal explication of the abovementioned factors in the following fragments from the novel The Devil wears Prada by Lauren Weisberger. This novel is about a young woman, Brown University graduate - Andrea Sachs, who is hired as a personal assistant to a powerful fashion magazine Runway's editor-in-chief - Miranda Priestly. It is about how Andrea Sach's job at the Elias-Clark company becomes hellish as she struggles to keep up with her boss's exhausting schedule and demeaning requests. It is interesting to note that the whole

plot of the novel is based on the narrated speech.

First of all, let's take a look at the portrayal description of two main personages:

Since I'd never seen so much as a picture of Miranda Priestly, I was shocked to see how skinny she was. The hand she held out was small-boned, feminine, soft. She had to turn her head upward to look me in the eye, although she did not stand to greet me. Her expertly dyed blond hair was pulled back in a chic knot, deliberately loose enough to look casual but still supremely neat, and while she did not smile, she did not appear particularly intimidating. (p.16)

My cheeks looked red and windburned in the rearview mirror, and my hair was flying wildly about. There was no makeup on my face, and my jeans were dirty around the bottom from trudging through the city slush. But at that moment, I felt beautiful. Natural and cold and clean and crisp, I threw open the front door and called out for my mother.

Aristocratic features verbalized by linguistic units such as "small-boned", "feminine", "soft", "supremely neat" reveal Miranda Priestly's high social status among various classes of society. In addition, the quality of being aware of modern fashion trends and being able to apply it in real life determines the person's positional as well as situational role in the society. Shabby look and neglected attitude towards the outfit verbalized by such linguistic units as "no makeup,

dirty", which is the case of Andrea Sachs, discloses that the personage belongs to a middle-class layer of society rather than upper class. The next fragment from "Devil wears Prada" can be a worthy example for the analysis ot role relations which appears to be one of the crucial factors of linguopragmatics used to characterize LP. The conservation takes place on the phone between the editor-in-chief and her assistant in the office of Elias Clark company:

"Ahn-dre-ah? Hello? Is anyone there? Ahn-dre-ah!" I jumped out of my seat the moment I heard her pronounce my name. It took a moment to remember and accept that she was not, in fact, in the office-or even in the country, and for the time being, at least, I was safe.

"I simply do not understand what takes you so long to speak after you pick up the phone," she stated. From any other person on earth that would have sounded whiny, but from Miranda it sounded appropriately cold and firm. Just like her. "In case you haven't been here long enough to notice, when I call, you respond. It's actually simple. See? I call. You respond. Do you think you can handle that, Ahn-dre-ah?"

I nodded like a six-year-old who'd just been reprimanded for throwing spaghetti on the ceiling, even though she couldn't see me. I concentrated on not calling her "ma'am," a mistake I'd made a week earlier that had almost gotten me fired. "Yes, Miranda. I'msorry," I said softly, head bowed. And for that

moment I was sorry, sorry that her wordshadn't registered in my brain three-tenths of a second faster than they had, sorry that my tardiness in saying "Miranda Priestly's office" had taken a fraction of a second longerthan absolutely necessary. Her time was, as I was constantly reminded, much moreimportant than my own.

"All right then. Now, after wasting all that time, may we begin? Did you confirm Mr.Tomlinson's reservation?" she asked.

"Yes, Miranda, I made a reservation for Mr. Tomlinson at the Four Seasons at oneo'clock."

"Well, I've changed my mind. The Four Seasons is not the appropriate venue for his lunch with Irv. Reserve a table for two at Le Cirque, and remember to remind the ma?tred' that they will want to sit in the back of the restaurant. Not on display in the front. The back. That's all."

"Of course, Miranda.Thank you, " I said with a smile. I could sense her pausing on the other end of the line, wondering how to respond. ... I had recently begun thanking her after every one of her sarcastic comments or nasty phone-in commands..."

This is the first conversation between Andrea Sachs being in the positional role of assistant and Miranda Priestly being in the positional role of her boss. As we can see, the boss is calm and firm in her speech whereas her junior assistant, Andrea seems to be lost in fear, intense anxiety and heart-stopping panic, and acts inadequately due to the tension and pressure. Her "soft" and "head bowed" way of manner and short utterances such as "I'm sorry" and "Thank you"and Miranda's ordering around explicates that Andrea has lower occupational status than the latter. Also, it is ridiculous how Andrea thanks her boss each and every time Miranda Priestly gives orders whereas, in fact, the one who should appreciate and thank for the hard work should be not Andrea but her boss - Miranda Priestly. It is necessary to mention that the use of represented speech throughout the entire novel plays significant role in conveying the author's message since it tends to disclose the addresser's inner thoughts and psychological state. Represented speech is a stylistic device "which conveys to the reader the unuttered or inner speech of the character, thus presenting his thoughts and feelings" [14, p.223]. In other words, it is the "form of utterance, which conveys the actual words of the speaker through the mouth of the writer but retains the peculiarities of the speaker's mode of expression" [14, p.225]. The main function of it is that it can be considered as a verbal marker of linguopragmatic level of LP.

The lexicon and manner of conversation of LP can indicate to certain age (youth, adulthood, maturity, old age) of LP. Age characteristics of LP's speech are defined as a specific system of the relations of lexical-syntactic elements, and their special

combination that reflect age features, the vision of the world and psychological traits of LPs.

We will analyze the example from D. Salinger's novel so-called "The catcher in the rhye" where age characteristics of LP are shown.

"What the hellya doing, anyway?" I said.

"Wuddaya mean what the hell am I doing? I was tryna sleep before you guys started making all that noise. What the hell was the fight about, anyhow. Wuddaya want the light for?"...

"Jesus!" he said. "What the hell happened to you?" He meant all the blood and all. "I had a little goddam tiff with Stradlater, listen, I said, do you feel like playing a little Canasta?"

"Oh, you're still bleeding, for Chrissake. You better put something on it. Ya wanna play a little Canasta or don'tcha? ... "Only around!" Ackley said. "Listen. I gotta get up and go to Mass in the morning, for Chrissake. You guys start hollering and fighting in the middle of the goddam-What the hell was the fight about, anyhow?"

"It's a long story. I don't wanna bore ya, Ackley. "Do you happen to have any cigarettes, by any chance? - Say 'no' or I'll drop dead".

"No, I don't, as a matter of fact. Listen, what the hell was the fight about?"

I didn't answer him. "About you", I said. ...I was defending your goddam honor, he made cracks about your religion.. Stradlater said you had a lousy personality. I

couldn't let him get away with that stuff"[p.8].

The early age of LP is characterized by its independence, impudence, timidness, joy and pleasure of youth. The typical feature of young people is considered to be their use of jargonisms (little Canasta), slangs (hollering, made cracks about your religion, little goddam iff, I'll drop dead), vulgarisms (the hellya, the hell, the goddam, goddam tiff), elliptic sentences (What the hellya doing, anyway, I was tryna sleep, Wuddaya want the light for?), interjections (Jesus, oh), reductions, types of informal and colloquial conversation peculiar to youth lexicon (Wuddaya mean what the hell am I doing? I was tryna sleep before you, ya wanna play a little Canasta or don'tcha, I gotta get up, I don't wanna bore ya).

The next fragment illustrates the old age of LPs.

- I remember I was very idealistic in those days, a real prig about Western decadence. On the other hand I was very patriotic and really didn't much care for foreigners. Man and boy - for the whole of his life, your good lady - a man's wife, constitutional - a walk taken to keep oneself healthy. Each according to his needs, expropriation of the expropriators. Splendid time was it, it's decent of me.

- Blair Are you in any sort of trouble? yes, excellent and nice time, I didn't' forget, the life that is pleasant to remind...

- Purvis Well, one had a bit of a crise, you know. Can you remind

me, what was the gist of it? - the moral and intellectual foundation of Western society in a nutshell (P. James "The wings of eagles" p. 148).

The given dialogue is about the meaning of life which appears to be one of the major topics in the conversation of the elders. Specific characteristic of this dialogue is addressing to the past, memories of youth. In this example it is expressed by frequent use of verbs of past tense which are emotionally colored (splendid time was it), by the use of adjectives with positive connotation (idealistic, decent, splendid, nice, excellent), stereotypic expressions of the past (each according to his needs, expropriation of the expropriators), social-historical context (□ to the moral and intellectual foundation of Western society in a nutshell). Presence/ occurrence of intrinsic system of values, principles and convictions, individual lifestyle and philosophy finds reflection in a high modality of the speech (If we are to speak we must speak as equals).

Thus, rather complete information about the social status of LP can be provided within a literary dialogue in literary discourse. The social status of LP includes factors such as profession and education, financial position, social environment belonging, social status, and cultural level.

The conducted research confirmed our conviction about the need in linguistic interpretation of these or those pragmatic factors which characterize LP's social status

(profession and education, financial position, social environment belonging, social status, and cultural level), the role relations as well as inner individual psychological state.

Conclusion

On the basis of cognitive-discursive features of LP in literary discourse it is possible to define it as a polyconceptual phenomenon that has internal structure and external signs of realization. The model of LP consists of the following levels: a) semantic-stylistic; b) linguopragmatic; c) linguocognitive. It is important to emphasize that in our model, unlike many models presented in linguistic literature, each of the specified levels has two-sided character which reflects substantial characteristics of LP (semantic-stylistic, pragmatic, cognitive, cultural) and verbal means of their realization. In other words, each level is presented in the ratio of linguistic and mental structures.

The study of linguopragmatic features of LP is aimed at revealing social and professional status, the role and personal relations between LPs, age, local, national characteristics, emotional state of LPs, traits of character and cultural belongings of LP. Besides, pragmatic aspect includes yhe study of role relations which assume the analysis of speech behavior, role expectations, factor of mutual understanding.

The conducted research confirms the suggested hypothesis that the peculiarity of LP in literary

discourse is revealed in a specific linguistic form of reflection of its semantic-stylistic, pragmatic, cognitive, national and cultural characteristics that represent a certain correlate of features of spiritual aspect of LP.

The study of LP in linguopragmatic approach effectively employs pragmatic intentions as a means of representing individual picture of LP by attracting attention, interesting the reader, exerting emotional impact, activizing knowledge structures, stimulating the addressee's creativity, representing the conceptual world picture.

Thus, the efforts put forth in the systemic description of LP makes a certain contribution to the development of anthropocentric linguistics, theories of discourse, problems of interpretation of literary discourse, and also new trends in linguistics (cognitive linguistics, pragmalinguistics, linguoper-sonology, linguoculturology). The disclosed and systematized parameters of LP in this research (semantic-stylistic, pragmatic, cognitive) and particularities of their verbalization are important for further scientific researches in this field.

In the capacity of further investigations of complex linguistic nature of LP it is possible to note/ point out the followings:

 - the study of LP on material of various types of texts;

- ethnopsycholinguistic description of LP;

- individual and psychological parametrization of LP;

- the linguodidactive principles of the analysis of LP in the process of interpretation of literary text.

REFERENCES

1. Ashurova D.U. New Trends in Stylistics//FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN UZBEKISTAN //Scientific-methodological journal. -Tashkent, 2017. -№3 (17) www.fledu.uz

2. Ashurova D.U. Main tasks of Pragmatic Stylistics//Issues on Philology. Scientific-methodological journal. -Tashkent, 2017, №2, -C.28-33

3. Ashurova D.U., Galieva M.R. Stylistics of Literary Text. - Tashkent: Turon-Iqbol, 2016. - 272 p.

4. Ashurova, Galieva M.R. Text Linguistics. - Tashkent: Turon-Iqbol, 2016. - 324 p.

5. Арнольд И.В. Стилистика декодирования. -Л.: ЛГПИ, 1974.

Arnold I.V. Decoding stylistics. - L:, LGPI, 1974.

6. Арутюнова Н. Д. Язык и мир человека, 2-е изд. испр. - М.: Языки русской культуры, 1998. ? 896 с.

Aryutunova N.D. Language and world of people, 2 nd edited version. - M.: Languages of Russian culture,1998. ? 896 с.

7. Humboldt W. von. On Language: The Diversity of Human Language. Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind (Texts in German Philosophy). - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988

8. Jackendoff R. What is a Concept?//Frames, Fields and Contrasts. New Essays in Semantics and Lexical Organization. - Hillsdale: 1992. - P. 191-209

9. Langacker R. W. Concept, Image and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar. - Berlin, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991. - 395 p.

10. Normurodova N.Z.   LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY IN THE LIGHT OF ANTROPOTHENTRIC PARADIGM: BASIC NOTION, BEST PRACTICES, CHALLENGES AND PERSPECTIVES. - LangLIT, INTERNATIONAL PEER OPEN JOURNAL, India, 2018.№2.

11. Normurodova N. (2012). Representation of linguistic personality in literary dialogue. Tashkent: Tafakkur qanoti.

12. Salkie R. (1995) Text and discourse analysis. - London, NY: Routledge, 115 p.

13. Swan M. Practical English Usage Text. - Oxford University Press, 1996. 654 p.

14. Sapir E. Selected Writings in Language, Culture, and Personality. By David G. Mandelbaum (Editor). - London: University of California Press, 2012

15. Underhill J. W. Ethnolinguistics and Cultural Concepts: Truth, Love, Hate & War. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. - 264 p.

16. Underhill J.W. Creating Worldviews: Language, Ideology & Metaphor. - Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013. - 312 p.

17. Whorf B. Language, Thought, and Reality; Selected Writings. - New York, Hardpress Publishing, 2013

18. Wierzbicka A. English: meaning and culture. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006

19. Wierzbicka A. Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction. - Berlin: Language Arts and Disciplines. 1991. - 502 p.

20. Wierzbicka A. Understanding Culture through Key Words: English, Russian, Polish and Japanese. -N.Y.-L.: Oxford University Press, 1997

21. Wierzbicka A. Semantics, Culture and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations. - NY: Oxford University Press, 1992

22.   Verdonk P. Stylistics. Oxford Introductions to Language Study Text. Series Editor H.G. Woddowson. - Oxford University Press, 2002. - 124 p.