IDIOLECT AND IDIOSTYLE. LINGUISTIC OUTLINES OF LEARNING

Xuramova Dildora Rahkmonkulovna[1], Akhmedova Firuza Asrorovna[2]
(SamSIFL,teachers)
Tel:90 270 31 34Tel:99 576 41 59
www.dilshod.rahmonov1401@gmail.com
dildorakhuramova1987@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The paper covers the issue of «idiostyle» definition formation, singling out «idiostyle» and «idiolect» concerning their definitions functions. The author outlines the problems in the sphere of studying the phenomenon of idiostyle and idiolect that need to be solved such as differentiatio between conventional and individual, the use of idiostyle outside creative writing, quantitative features of idiostyle, etc. The author offers a classification of idiostyle aspects such as cultural historical, genre, psycholinguistic, cognitive, axiological, systems structural, linguopoetical, semantic stylistical, etc.

The speech activity of a linguistic personality is characterized by idiolect or idiostyle. These concepts, which exist in linguistic, speech studies, stylistic scientific works, are very close, since they have a common semantic core - "individual, belonging to an individual".

The objectives of our study, carried out on the material of the creative heritage of the Russian publicist of the XVIII century. N. I. Novikov, was the analysis of the concepts of idiolect and individual style (idiostyle). To distinguish between these concepts, the terminological line "linguistic personality - speech personality - communicative personality" is used. Within the framework of this article, we will present the theoretical conclusions related to the quantitative characteristics of the idiostyle, with the issues of distinguishing between the conventional and the individual, etc.

Despite the difference in approaches and the fact that there is still no single position both in determining the essential features of the idiostyle category and in the use of the term (idiostyle, idiolect, individual style, speech manner), which is easily explained by the relative "youth" of the problem itself, the researchers in general, they describe / see her being quite similarly. "Individual style is ... a structurally unified and internally connected system of means and forms of verbal expression" [1, p. 105], i.e. idiostyle components, according to V.V. Vinogradov, are not adequate to the elements of the language system; "the result of selection at the level of verbal expression, i.e. at the final stage of creativity" [4, p. 189]; an integral system that "arises as a result of the application of peculiar principles of selection, combination and motivated use of language elements" [13, p. 20 - 21]. It is also

noted that the establishment of a system of meanings inherent in the author and distinguishing him from others reveals his predilection for reflecting certain realities.

Objective reality and the nature of their relationship, i.e. picture of the world of this author. On the other hand, it is very important to note that, although, apparently, there are no unique ways of representing personal meanings, their predominant use is easily detected [13, p. 28]. This means that it is possible to associate the idiostyle not only with the selection of language means, but also with the frequency of their use (which gives us the opportunity to use the dominant-functional approach). In a narrow sense, idiolects are only specific speech features of a given native speaker. In a broad sense, an idiolect is generally the realization of a given language in the mouth of an individual, i.e. a set of texts generated by the speaker and studied by a linguist in order to study the language system.

An idiolect is always, according to the author of the article, a "point" representative of a certain idiom (literary language, territorial or social dialect), combining the general and specific features of its structure, norm and usage [10, p. 234].

We also find the definition of an idiolect in the work of V.M. Mikhailov, where the idiolect is understood as "an individual language of a personality, formed on the basis of social standards and norms refracted through the prism of personal cognitive and communicative experience" [12, p. 85]. Here, the idiolect is a set of proper structural and linguistic features (stable characteristics) that take place in the speech of an individual native speaker, and the idiostyle, respectively, is a set of speech-text characteristics of a separate linguistic

personality (the individuality of a writer, scientist, a specific speaker), nevertheless less formed under the influence of the entire extralinguistic basis - as a functional-style, genre-style, as well as individual style.

Thus, one of the authors of the monograph, Lev Alekseevich Novikov, based on the concept of Jan Mukarzhovsky (one of the ideologists of the Prague Linguistic Circle) about the hierarchical structure of aesthetic norms [11, p. 162 - 171], believes that idiolects are formed on the basis of: a) unconditional norms (codified), b) culturally tested, stable (usual) norms. Idiostyles are formed on the basis of: a) usual and b) norms that are actually perceived as a proper expressive variant, as one of the possibilities on a given synchronous cut [14, p. 58].

Thus, the differentiation of the terms "idiostyle" and "idiolect" can be carried out on different grounds. In the first case (LES, V.M. Mikhailov, SES), the delimitation of definitions occurs on the axis of oral - written speech: the concept of an idiolect characterizes the linguistic features of a native speaker in different areas and forms of its use in oral and written speech, while the idiostyle is correlated with textual characteristics, with written communication.

"Essays on History ..." suggest linking the terminological division of idiostyle and idiolect with the normalization, conventionality of the language. The basis for division is codified norms, usage and "expressive variant". Crossing of fields of definitions occurs in the zone of usage, it is here that both one and the other field are realized. Ya. Mukarzhovsky notes that the application of the language norm sometimes fluctuates between denial and violation of the norm.

At the same time, the researcher calls usus norms "spontaneously observed by language communities" [11, p. 162 - 171], against this background, the "expressive variant" looks like a violation of the norm, which, according to J. Mukarzhovsky, is not the main and normal form of the language. Thus, the desire comes to the fore not for an absolutely adequate "reading" of the text by the addressee in accordance with existing norms, but for efficiency based on expressiveness.

Among the variety of points of view on the relationship between such concepts as poetic idio-style and idiolect, two main approaches can be distinguished: (1) the relationship between surface and deep structures and (2) dominant-functional. The first is that idiolect and idiostyle are considered to be related to each other as surface and deep structures in descriptions of the type "Meaning Text" or forming a triad "Theme Methods of expressiveness Text" [6, p. 161 - 167], [7]. The set of interconnected linguistic factors that make up the idiolect, presented on the surface, has functional roots in the "language memory" and "genetics of linguistic thinking" of the author and, as a result, turns out to be reducible to a hierarchical system of invariants organizing the so-called "poetic world" of the author.

According to V.P. Grigoriev, "the description of the idiostyle should be aimed at revealing the deep semantic and categorical connection of its elements, embodying the poet's creative path in the language, towards the essence of his explicit and implicit reflection on the language" [3, p. 134].

Thus, the idiostyle is not just a "set" of repetitive individual elements, methods of expressing thoughts (such as underlining, expanding, balancing, combining, for example) [7] chosen by the author from a whole series, but also the conditionality of this choice by a conscious desire for the most adequate reflection of their thoughts and feelings and, moreover, representing a hierarchical structure, i.e. "dependency chain" of elements.

These reflections fix the necessary for further reasoning the idea of the possibility of building an idiostyle as a hierarchical structure based on idiolectal features.

The defining characteristics are thus:

1) the most general, singled out by the absolute majority of researchers who turn to the study of the phenomenon of individual style:

- selection of language means by an individual;

- the frequency of use of certain language means;

2) related to the possibility of modeling an individual style:

- speech-text characteristics of a separate linguistic personality, formed under the influence of the entire extralinguistic basis - both functional-stylistic, genre-stylistic, and individual-stylistic [15];

- the possibility of constructing a hierarchical structure based on the features of the selection of language means and the motivation for their use [6], [7];

- connection of mental phenomena and ways of their verbalization (cognitive poetics);

- a system of interconnected dominants and their functional areas [8];

3) defining specific features of an individual style as existing within the framework of a particular discourse:

-chronological sequence of texts (to a greater extent characteristic of artistic discourse);

- a natural tendency for the existence of several styles in one text - a specific refraction of different styles in one text, often associated with the intersection of discourses within the text [2], [5].

The selected aspects make it possible to describe the phenomenon of idiostyle within the framework of the axial model (see diagram), where the coordinate axes are the characteristics presented above The third coordinate (2) correlates with the concept of discourse, in our case, a newspaper-journalistic discourse, which is characterized as written, distant, with an individual-collective subject and a dispersed mass addressee and intersecting with other institutional discourses [9]. Thus, the third coordinate shows the specific features of the idiostyle to a greater extent.

Motivated selection and frequency of use of linguistic means by an individual makes it possible to identify patterns of appeal to certain means and thereby present the structure of an idiostyle.

Nevertheless, these characteristics of the idiostyle are quite "typical", because the selection by the individual is made from a common series of elements (even if we mean neologisms, they are built according to public models), and the dominant-functional structuring of the idiostyle will still lead to the presence of at least the most general typical scheme.

Therefore, the coordinate 2-specific features occupies a special place, since it is precisely here that the "deviation" from the most general, but still normalized, of the first two coordinates takes place.

The axial model provides a wide field of possibilities, since it is the most general in terms of scheme of wearing to the object of study (idio-style in its dominant-functional incarnation). In particular, the model defines a limiting, conventional framework:

discourse, genre, functional style. On the other hand, each frame component can also be represented as an axial model. In this way, the models "overlay" each other and allow analysis based on the overall simulation.

That is, each of these objects determines the general principles for the use of language material, and also determines the alignment of features in a certain structure (strategies for discourse, compositional features for a genre, a communicative program for a functional style).

REFERENCES:

1. Виноградов, В.В. Стилистика. Теория поэтической речи. Поэтика / В.В. Виноградов. - М., 1963.

2. Гиндин, С.И. Опыт статистической реконструкции семантики поэтического идиолекта по корпусу связных текстов / С.И. Гиндин // Автоматическая обработка текста методами прикладной лингвистики: материалы Всесоюзной конф. 6-8 декабря 1971 г. - Кишинев, 1971.

3. Григорьев, В.П. Грамматика идиостиля: В. Хлебников / В.П. Григорьев. - М., 1983.

4. Долинин, К. А. Интерпретация текста / К.А. Долинин. -М.: Проев., 1985.

5. Дымарский, М.Я. Речевая культура и речевая манера / М.Я. Дымарский // Русская языковая ситуация в синхронии и диахронии: сб. науч. статей / отв. ред. К.П. Сидоренко. - СПб.: Изд-во РГПУ им. А.И. Герцена, 2006.

6. Жолковский, А. К. К описанию связи между глубинными и поверхностными уровнями художественного текста / А.К. Жолковский // Материалы Всесоюзного симпозиума по вторичным моделирующим системам. - Тарту: ТГУ, 1973.-Т. 1. -№ 5.

7. Жолковский, А. К. К описанию смысла связного текста. Приемы выразительности / А. К. Жолковский, Ю. К. Щеглов. - М., 1973. - Ч. 1.

8. Золян, С.Т. От описания идиолекта - к грамматике идиостиля / С. Т. Золян // Язык русской поэзии XX века: сб. науч. тр. - М.: Язык русской поэзии XX века, 1989.

9. Карасик, В.И. О типах дискурса / В.И. Карасик // Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс: сб. науч. тр. - Волгоград: Перемена, 2000.

10. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / под ред. В.Н. Ярцева. - М„ 1990.

11. Мукаржовский, Я. Исследования по эстетике и тео-

рии искусства / Я. Мукаржовский. - М.: Изд-во «Искусство», 1994.

12. Овчинникова, И.Г. Ассоциация и высказывания: структура и семантика / И.Г. Овчинникова. - Пермь, 1992.

13. Пищальникова, В.А. Проблема идиостиля. Психолингвистический аспект / В.А. Пищальникова. - Барнаул, 1992.

14. Поэтический язык и идиостиль // Очерки истории языка русской поэзии XX века. - М., 1990.

15. Стилистический энциклопедический словарь / под ред. М.Н. Кожиной. - М., 2003.

16. Щукин, В.Г. Лингвистические аспекты проблемы идиолекта: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук / В.Г. Щукин.-Л., 1978.