

ARTISTIC CHARACTER AS A PERSONALITY MODEL: METHODS OF LINGUISTIC REPRESENTATION OF THE HUMAN IMAGE

ULLIEVA SANOBAR KHAYDAROVNA ¹, UMAROVA DILFUZA MAMATKULOVNA ²
and ALLAYAROVA DILFUZA KLICHEVNA ³

^{1,2,3} Samarkand State University Veterinary Medicine of Livestock and Biotechnologies.

Email: ¹ullievasanobar@gmail.com, ²umarovadilfuza750@gmail.com, ³dilyaopa494@gmail.com

Abstract

Whatever text is created, the image of the author - its creator - determines all the elements of the structure (theme, idea, composition, selection and organization of linguistic means, etc.). The problem of studying the author's linguistic personality has been studied by many domestic and foreign linguists, philologists, and literary scholars. Of course, the image of the author in a literary text differs from his textual embodiment in other areas of communication, but its general integrating principle remains unchanged. The means, methods and forms of its implementation are changing. The choice of different types of narrators, which is far from random, is indicative. The author and his point of view on the subject of the image manifests itself in different forms. The article considers the main provisions of some of the presented theories.

Keywords: Individual Creator, Situations, Collective Creativity, Anonymity, Pseudonym, Hoax, Independence, Inner Freedom, Incompleteness, Creator.

INTRODUCTION

First of all, we should turn to the term itself, the concept of “author”. What is an author in modern literary criticism? Author (from Latin au(c)tor - subject of action, founder, organizer, founder, teacher, writer and, in particular, creator of a work), according to V.E. Halizev, has several meanings in the field of art history:

- a) Biographical author - a creative person existing in a non-artistic, primary empirical reality, i.e. the creator of a work of art as a real person with a certain fate, biography, and a set of individual traits;
- b) The image of the author, localized in the literary text, i.e. the writer, painter, sculptor, director's image of himself;
- c) The artist is a creator present in his creation as a whole, immanent in the work. The author (in this meaning of the word) presents and illuminates reality (being and its phenomena) in a certain way, comprehends and evaluates them, and also demonstrates his creative energy. With all this he manifests himself as a subject of artistic activity. The author's subjectivity organizes the work and generates its artistic integrity. It constitutes an integral, universal, most important facet of art (along with its own aesthetic and cognitive principles). The “spirit of authorship” is not only present, but dominates in any form of artistic activity: both when a work has an individual creator, and in situations of group, collective creativity, and in cases where the author is named, and when his name is hidden (anonymity, pseudonym, hoax) [1].

METHODS

Let us dwell in more detail on the problem of the linguistic personality of the author, the image of the author in a literary work. The image of the author as a semantic-style category of an epic and lyric-epic work is purposefully comprehended by V.V. Vinogradov as part of the theory of functional styles he developed. The image of the author was understood by V.V. Vinogradov as the main and multi-valued stylistic characteristic of a single work and of all fiction as a distinctive whole, as a synthesizing basis of an artistic text, as a concentrated embodiment of the "essence of the work", uniting "the entire system of speech structures of characters in their relationship with the narrator - the storyteller or storytellers and through them being the ideological and stylistic focus, the focus of the whole" [2].

Moreover, the image of the author was conceived primarily in his stylistic individualization, in his artistic and speech expression, in the selection and implementation of the corresponding lexical and syntactic units in the text, in the general compositional embodiment; The image of the author, according to Vinogradov, is the center of the artistic and speech world, revealing the author's aesthetic relationship to the content of his own text. Developed by V.V. Vinogradov, in relation to the aesthetic sphere, the concept of the image of the author remains relevant for the theory of the text as a whole. The relevance of this theory is due to the fact that it is the author, with his inherent system of value guidelines and information thesarium, goals and motives, that is the driving force that creates the system of any text: "in the image of the author, as in a focal point, all the structural qualities of the verbal and artistic whole converge" [3].

A fundamentally new concept of the author as a participant in an artistic event belongs to M.M. Bakhtin. Emphasizing the deep value role of the dialogue between self and other in our existence, Bakhtin believed that the author in his text "must be on the border of the world he creates as an active creator of it, because his intervention in this world destroys its aesthetic stability." The image of the author is considered by M.M. Bakhtin as the image of a creator, artist, creator of his own world, adjacent to his creative vision of this world: "The author is not a bearer of mental experience, and his reaction is not a passive feeling and not a receptive perception, the author is the only active formative energy, given not in a psychologically conceptualized consciousness, but in a persistently significant cultural product, and his active reaction is given in the structure determined by it active vision of the hero as a whole, in the structure of his image, the rhythm of his discovery, in the intonational structure and in the choice of semantic moments" [4]. The author's internal aspiration to create a sovereign, different reality, capable of meaningful self-development, was emphasized in every possible way. The logic of verbal and artistic creativity is such that the author is not engaged in self-directed processing, but in overcoming language: "The poet does not create in the world of language, he only uses language"; "The creative consciousness of the author-artist never coincides with linguistic consciousness; linguistic consciousness is only a moment, a material entirely controlled by a purely artistic task." According to Bakhtin, the author, using language as matter and overcoming it as material (just as in the hands of a sculptor marble ceases to "persist like marble" and, obedient to the will of the master, expresses plastically the forms of

the body), in accordance with his internal task expresses a certain content [6].

The narrator's choice depends on the following. As is known, in the artistic sphere, a distinction is made between speech (direct speech, internal, improperly direct) and compositional forms of subjectification, or subjectivization of the author's narrative (according to V.V. Vinogradov, "the image of the author can be hidden in the depths of composition and style"). In his study of the image of the author V.V. Vinogradov gives three main approaches to the concept of subjectivation based on the article by Kveta Kozhevnikova, "Subjectivization and its relation to the style of modern epic prose":

1. Subjectivized epic prose is usually considered to be works with a narrator who narrates in the first person and is also the protagonist, i.e. the main character of the action or one of its main characters. For this theoretical approach, the subjective coloring of the work is given primarily by the highly active role of the narrator in the action itself, and, consequently, by the duality of the nature of this role, since the narrator is simultaneously both the narrating subject and the object of the narration;
2. Other researchers talk about subjectivization only in connection with works in which the main place is given to the self-expression and introspection of the narrator. In this case, we are talking about works whose object of epic knowledge is equal to the subjective inner world of the protagonist. Under subjectivization, i.e., this implies not only the active role of the narrator in the action, not only the perception of fictitious ethical events through the eyes of the narrator, but also the nature of the epic matter itself;
3. Finally, subjectivized epic prose also includes works that are distinguished by the frequent inclusion of personal points of view of individual characters directly into the narration of the anonymous narrator, into his "abstract". In this case, the role is played by the multiplication of points of view occupied in relation to the unfolding action, and the degree of subjectivization here directly depends on the increase in the number of these points of view [7].

The subjective author's will, expressed in the entire artistic integrity of the work, commands a heterogeneous interpretation of the author behind the text, recognizing in it the inseparability and non-fusion of empirical-everyday and artistic-creative principles. More specific authorial intratextual manifestations provide compelling reasons to detect various forms of the author's presence in the text. According to V.E. Khalizev, these forms depend on the generic affiliation of the work, on its genre, but there are also general trends. As a rule, the author's subjectivity is clearly manifested in the frame components of the text: the title, epigraph, beginning and ending of the main text, as well as in the preface and afterword, which together form a kind of metatext that is integral to the main text [8].

Consequently, the image of the author is not identical to the real personality of the writer, although it is correlated with it. According to the theory of N.S. Bolotnova, behind the "image of the author" there is an author's personality with its inherent lexicon, grammaron, pragmaton (cf. three levels in the model of linguistic personality by Y.N. Karaulov: verbal-semantic, cognitive, motivational). At the same time, "the image of the author is one of the

forms of manifestation of the writer's literary artistry, his knowledge about the world, a system of assessments, unique associations; all this is embodied in the text system and interpreted by the addressee" [9].

RESULTS

As already noted, the "image of the author" in the aesthetic sphere is only one of the forms of manifestation of the real personality of the author, moreover, it remains an artistic image. Among the various forms of manifestation of the author's image, we can name the types of narrators known in scientific literature (in particular, those identified by B.O. Korman): objective narrator (in the 3rd person); personal narrator (1st person); unspecified; the narrator is a speaker of speech, openly organizing the entire text with his personality (he is characterized by bright characteristic elements, including non-normative ones, spontaneity, etc.) [10]. The success of textual activity is determined both by the author's linguistic ability, her individual worldview, and his orientation towards the addressee, taking into account the established norms of perception and rules of verbal communication.

The author's problem becomes particularly acute in connection with the always relevant and controversial tasks of interpreting a literary work, analytical and emotional penetration into a literary text, in connection with the reader's direct perception of literary literature. In the modern culture of communication with literary text, two main trends have emerged that have a long and complex pedigree. One of them recognizes in a dialogue with a literary text the complete or almost complete omnipotence of the reader, his unconditional and natural right to freedom of perception of a poetic work, freedom from the author, from obediently following the author's concept embodied in the text, independence from the author's will and the author's position.

Going back to the works of W. Humboldt, A.A. Potebni, this point of view was embodied in the works of representatives of the psychological school of the 20th century. The extreme expression of this position is that the author's text becomes only a pretext for subsequent active reader receptions, literary adaptations, willful translations into the languages of other arts, etc. Consciously or unintentionally, this justifies the reader's arrogant categorism and peremptory judgments.

In the second half of the 20th century. The "reader-centric" point of view has been taken to its extreme limit. Roland Barthes, focusing on the so-called poststructuralism in artistic literature and philological science and declaring the text a zone of exclusively linguistic interests that can bring the reader mainly playful pleasure and satisfaction, argued that in literary and artistic creativity "traces of our subjectivity are lost", "all self-identity and, first of all, the bodily identity of the writer," "the voice is torn away from its source, death occurs for the author" [9].

A literary text, according to R. Barthes, is an extra-subjective structure, and the owner-manager, co-natural with the text itself, is the reader: "... the birth of the reader has to be paid for by the death of the Author" [7]. Despite its proud shockingness and extravagance, the concept of the death of the author, developed by R. Barth, helped to focus philological research attention on

the deep semantic-associative roots that precede the observed text and make up its genealogy, which is not fixed by the author's consciousness ("texts in the text", dense layers of involuntary literary reminiscences and connections, archetypal images, etc.).

A.P. Skaftymov, in his article "On the question of the relationship between theoretical and historical consideration in the history of literature," noted: "No matter how much we talk about the reader's creativity in the perception of a work of art, we still know that the reader's creativity is secondary, it is in its own direction and facets is determined by the object of perception. The reader is still led by the author, and he demands obedience in following his creative path. And a good reader is one who knows how to find in himself a breadth of understanding and give himself to the author" [4].

The connection between the writer and the reader is mutual, inverse. And if the reader likes/dislikes this or that author, then, therefore, first of all, the reader himself liked/did not like the author, as they say, to his taste, and did not become an interesting interlocutor/empathizer for the author. The author has already truly said his last word in the work. A literary text, with all its complex polysemy, has an objective artistic and semantic core, and the author chooses his reader through the work itself, through its entire multi-level structure. "The composition of the work," wrote A.P. Skaftymov, "in itself carries the norms of its interpretation" [6].

According to M.M. Bakhtin, the author enters into a relationship with the reader not as a specific biographical person, not as another person, not as a literary hero, but primarily as a "principle to be followed." In the artistic world, the author, according to Bakhtin, is the "authoritative leader" of the reader [9].

These are the main theoretical justifications for the linguistic personality of the author in a literary work. The problem of the author continues to be one of the most controversial in literary studies of the late 20th and early 21st centuries. In literary works, images of people, and in some cases, their likenesses: humanized animals, plants and things, are invariably present and, as a rule, fall into the spotlight of readers' attention. There are different forms of human presence in literary works. This is a narrator-storyteller, a lyrical hero and a character capable of portraying a person with the utmost completeness and breadth. The term "character" is taken from the French language and is of Latin origin. The ancient Romans used the word "persona" to designate the mask worn by an actor, and later the person depicted in a work of art. The phrases "literary hero" and "character" are now used as synonyms for this term. However, these expressions also carry additional meanings: the word "hero" emphasizes the positive role, brightness, unusualness, and exclusivity of the person portrayed, and the phrase "actor" - the fact that the character manifests himself primarily in the commission of actions.

The character, according to V.E. Khalizev, is "either the fruit of the writer's pure invention; or the result of conjecturing the appearance of a really existing person (be it historical figures or people biographically close to the writer, or even himself); or, finally, the result of processing and completing already known literary heroes". V.V. Tomashevsky, in turn, argues that the character has a dual nature: he, firstly, "is the subject of the depicted action, the stimulus for the unfolding of events that make up the plot," and, secondly, "the character has independent

significance within the composition of the work.”, independent of the plot (event series): it acts as a bearer of stable and sustainable properties, traits, qualities" [5].

The linguistic personality of a character is characterized by the actions he performs, as well as forms of behavior and communication, appearance and close surroundings, thoughts, feelings, and intentions. And all these manifestations of man in a literary work have a certain resultant - a kind of center, which M.M. Bakhtin called the core of personality, A.A. Ukhtomsky - a dominant determined by a person's initial intuitions. All of the above components form the semantic whole of the hero as an integral component of a work of art.

Each literary work is a system of interacting linguistic personalities: the linguistic personality of the author and the linguistic personalities of the characters presented in this work. The author invariably expresses his attitude towards the position, attitudes, and value orientation of his character (hero - in the terminology of M.M. Bakhtin). At the same time, the image of the character appears as the embodiment of the writer's concept, idea, i.e. as something whole, located, however, within the framework of a different, broader, strictly artistic integrity of the work as such. The correlation between the value orientations of the author and the hero constitutes a kind of fundamental basis of literary works. So, V.V. Vinogradov believed that the images of characters in their content are determined by those cultural, every day and socio-characterological categories to which real life, which provides material for a literary work, is subordinated. Thus, a peculiar synthesis of "history" and "poetry" occurs, and the subject of the narrative itself fits into the sphere of this depicted reality - the image of the author, which is "a form of complex and contradictory relationships between the author's intention, between the fantasized personality of the writer and the personalities of the characters" [5]. In understanding all the shades of this multi-valued and multi-faceted structure of the image of the author V.V. Vinogradov saw the key to the composition of the whole, to the unity of the artistic and narrative system of a literary work.

DISCUSSION

In literary works, one way or another, there is a distance between the character and the author. It occurs even in the autobiographical genre, where the writer, from a certain temporary distance, comprehends his own life experience. The author can look at his hero as if from the bottom up, or, on the contrary, from the top down (the so-called "omniscient author"). But the most deeply rooted in literature (especially of recent centuries) is the situation of essential equality between the writer and the character.

With such internal equality, a kind of dialogical relationship of the writer to the fictional person and the person he portrays can arise. M.M. drew attention to this. Bakhtin: the author's dialogical position, according to the scientist, "affirms the independence, inner freedom, incompleteness and unresolvedness of the hero," whose consciousness is "equal" to his own. At the same time, Bakhtin recognized that "in every literary work there is the final semantic authority of the creator," i.e. the author's creative will embraces the world of characters she created. According to the scientist, "the hero is not the expresser, but the expressed"; he is "passive in his interaction with the author." And one more thing: "the most important facet of

the work” is the “unified reaction” of the author “to the whole of the hero” [3]. According to T.L. Vlasenko, the author’s intonations are clearly distinguishable in the “author’s digressions (most often - lyrical, literary-critical, historical-philosophical, journalistic), which organically fit into the structure of essentially epic works. These digressions enrich the emotional-expressive limits of the narrative, expand the sphere of the ideal, significantly clarify the author's intentions and at the same time the reader's orientation of the work" [4].

Most often, as many researchers claim (B.O. Korman, A.Y. Bolshakova, etc.), the author acts as a narrator, leading the story from a third person, in an extra-subjective, impersonal form. In literary criticism, the figure of an omniscient author is distinguished, knowing everything and everyone about his heroes, freely moving from one time plane to another, from one space to another. This method of narration, the most conventional (the narrator’s omniscience is not motivated), is usually combined with subjective forms, with the introduction of narrators, with the transmission in speech, which formally belongs to the narrator, of the point of view of one or another character. The author can entrust his stories to someone he has composed, a dummy Narrator (participant in events, chronicler, eyewitness, etc.) or narrators, who can thus be characters in their own narrative. The narrator narrates in the first person; depending on his closeness/alienity to the author’s outlook, the use of this or that vocabulary, some researchers distinguish a personal narrator and the narrator himself, with his characteristic, patterned tale. Thus, in various literary works, the author’s beginning appears in different ways: as the author’s point of view on the recreated poetic reality, as the author’s commentary on the course of the plot, as a direct, indirect or improperly direct characterization of the characters, as the author’s description of the natural and material world, and etc.

As for the author and the characters of a literary work as interacting linguistic personalities, M.M. Bakhtin considers three cases of interaction between the author and his characters:

1. The hero takes possession of the author. In this case, according to M.M. Bakhtin, “the hero’s emotional-volitional objective attitude, his cognitive-ethical position in the world are so authoritative for the author that he cannot help but see the objective world only through the eyes of the hero and cannot help but experience the events of his life only from within; the author cannot find convincing and a stable value fulcrum outside the hero." This position of the author in relation to his character is especially characteristic of a lyrical work, where the statement belongs to one lyrical subject, where his experiences, attitude to the “inexpressible”, to “the external world and the world of his soul in the infinity of their transitions into each other” are depicted [6].
2. A lyrical hero, according to B.O. Corman, is “the unity of personality, not only standing behind the text, but also embodied in the very poetic plot that has become the subject of the image - and its image does not exist, as a rule, in a separate, isolated poem: the lyrical hero is usually the unity if not the entire lyrical work of the poet, then a period, a cycle, a thematic complex" [10]. With varying degrees of completeness, the author's lyrical self can be entrusted to different heroes or characters (the so-called role-playing lyrics), expressed in the dialogue of the heroes, etc.

CONCLUSION

The author takes possession of the hero, “brings the final moments inside him,” thus, the author’s attitude towards the hero becomes partly the hero’s attitude towards himself. In the figurative expression of M.M. Bakhtin, “the hero begins to define himself, the author’s reflex is put into the soul or into the mouth of the hero.” In this case, two options for the development of the hero can be distinguished: firstly, “the hero is not autobiographical, and the author’s reflex introduced into him really completes him”; and, as a result, the hero, being in every manifestation, in every action, in facial expressions, in the expression of feelings, emotions, judgments, remains true to his aesthetic principles and soon becomes obsolete, exhausted.

Secondly, “the hero is autobiographical; having mastered the author’s final reflex, his total formative reaction, the hero makes it a moment of self-experience and overcomes it; such a hero is incomplete, he internally outgrows every total definition as inadequate to him, he experiences completed integrity as a limitation and opposes it some inner secret that cannot be expressed.” Such a hero will always remain endless, incomplete for the author, since there will always be certain features and details that the author did not take into account when creating his hero.

3. The hero himself is his own author; he comprehends his life aesthetically, while seeming to play a role. This hero, according to M.M. Bakhtin, also completed [9].

V.V. Vinogradov, in turn, highlighted the role of the author in which he “does not empathize with the actions of the characters, does not participate in them, but only observes them” [10]. Thus, the image of the narrator is immersed in the atmosphere of the life depicted as the image of an observer and “whistleblower” involved in the heroes.

Consequently, the author and his characters reflect the same reality in different ways in the process of its development. However, it is not only the intersection of these subjective spheres and the forms of their semantic relationships that organize the unity of the plot movement, but also the opposition of characters to the author.

According to Vinogradov, the author approaches the sphere of consciousness of the characters, but does not take upon himself their speeches and actions; while the characters, acting and speaking for themselves, are at the same time drawn to the sphere of the author’s consciousness: “In the images of the characters, two elements of reality are dialectically fused: their subjective understanding of the world and this world itself, of which they themselves are a part. Emerging in the sphere author's narrative, they remain within its boundaries as objects of artistic reality and as subjective forms of its possible interpretations”. These are the main forms of interaction between the author and his characters in a literary text.

References

- 1) Bart R. Death of the Author // Selected Works. Semiotics. Poetics. - M.: Progress, 1994. -p.325.
- 2) Bakhtin M.M. Author and hero: Towards the philosophical foundations of the humanities. - St. Petersburg: Azbuka, 2000. -p.54.
- 3) Bolotnova N.S. About the basic concepts and categories of communicative stylistics of the text. - Bulletin of the Russian Humanitarian Science Foundation. - 2001. - No. 3. -p.91.
- 4) Bolshakova A.Y. Theories of the author in modern literary criticism. - News of the Russian Academy of Sciences, ser. Literature and language. - 1998. - No. 5. - Volume 57. -p.163.
- 5) Vinogradov V.V. From the history of the word. Personality in the Russian language of the mid-16th century. / Reports and communications of the Philological Faculty of Moscow State University. Issue 1. - M., 1946.
- 6) Ullieva S. Kh. Functions of linguistic units in creating an artistic image. Eurasian Journal of Academic Research. Volume 2, Issue 12, 2022, -p.1069. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5584563>
- 7) Ullieva S. Kh. Specific Aspects of Linguistic Study of Literary Characters. Zien Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities. Volume 16, 2023, -p.38. <https://zienjournals.com/>
- 8) Ullieva S. Kh. Character image as an object of linguistic characteristics. International Conference on Developments in Education. Toronto, Canada. 2023. -p. 24. <https://conferencea.org>
- 9) Ullieva S. Kh. Speech portrait of a hero from the point of view of linguistics. 12th- International Conference on Research in Humanities, Applied Sciences and Education. Berlin, Germany. 2023. -p. 64. <https://conferencea.org>
- 10) Umarova D.M., Allayarova D.K. Psychological and pedagogical bases for monitoring and evaluating the activities of students in the lessons of the Russian language. Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching. Volume 14, 2022. -p.34. www.geniusjournals.org