

## Representation of the Language Personality in LSP

In my paper I would like to talk about the influence of linguistic personality on Terminology and scientific Text creation. First of all, I would like to start with the definition of linguistic personality as a separate concept. Secondly, I'd like to point out some cases of terminological creations by some scholars and domination of linguistic personality in professional communication.

From the point of view of linguistics linguistic personality can be described as a complicated system consisting of many components, which are represented at linguo-cognitive, semantic and pragmatic levels. This concept can be regarded a clear-cut category including either the concept of a language user in general or the concept of a concrete individual.

The "worldview" of each linguistic personality is treated as a structured set of knowledge and representations, which are verbalized in language. Characterizing linguistic personality it is necessary to admit that his/her "model of the world" depends on features of the certain linguo-cultural community.

The process of socialization of linguistic personality goes through different stages which are reflected in the levels of language competence. The level of language competence is manifested via the "portrait" of a language-user; he speaks or writes via choices of what to say about things and how to say about them, so he can make use of the wide range of potential alternatives skillfully to operate those types of knowledge he possesses.

Professor Yu. Karaulov introduced a new term – a person's "lifeability" By this he meant "person's abilities for the creation of his/her own literary text" (Karaulov 2002: 3). This "lifeability" of a linguistic personality consists of several types of knowledge – social, cultural, linguistic and terminological one. The structure of terminological knowledge as a cognitive activity of a specialist in its turn represents the integration of various types of knowledge: knowledge about some definite fragment of the world (which also includes encyclopedic, general scientific and specific scientific domain of human activity), knowledge about conceptual forms of their representation in human cognition, and knowledge about language forms. Each type of knowledge is based on certain kinds of person's experience of interaction with the outer world. What is of most importance for the specialist is professional experience and specialized knowledge developed in some particular field of science.

Certain individuals take part in creating new terms, because they need to give a new name to some new object, concept or phenomenon. They build a new lexical item by analogy with words of the literary language and units of international terminological corpus, trying to find the most essential features of these words fitting the new notions. "Any novelty irrespective of its quality or real necessity can appear only in a particular person's mind... The role of the collective linguistic personality is to approve and spread the innovation or reject it" (Arkhipov 2008: 39).

It's quite difficult to record the exact moment of a words birth in common language; - when this or that neologism comes into existence, in Terminology, it is easier to find out the concrete dates

---

\* Valentina F. Novodranova  
Moscow Medico-Stomatological University  
Russia  
novodranova@mail.ru

of its appearance. Terminology is secondary to the literary language and is formed on its basis. Thus, modern medicine borrowed a lot of terms from the conception by Hippocrates (who lived in the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C.), e.g.: *bronchi*, *herpes*, *carcinoma*, *coma*, *nephrite*, *polypus*, *cholera*, *typhus*, *epidemic* and many other words.

Information about authors of different terms is found in encyclopedic dictionaries. We know that the term *therapy* was introduced by the French writer and scholar Francois Rabbie (1494–1553), *leucocytosis* was invented by professor from Russia Virkhov in 1865, *phagocyte* was given by Ilya Metchnikov in 1884, *phytoncide* was created by one more Russian scholar Boris Tokin, while the American scientist Thomas Kooli gave the name to *Kooli's disease* or *talassemia* in 1925. The scholar gave his surname to the discovered disease, phenomenon or object to the term. This happened with the term *Parkinsonism* or *Parkinson's disease* introduced by the English surgeon J. Parkinson, *nicotine* got the name by J. Niko, who was the ambassador in Portugal. The Bekhterev's Symptom, Botkin's disease are created in the same way.

In trying to find the most adequate (exact, suitable and economic) unit for the term many synonyms appear. In the course of time some variants are rejected, others are adopted, but the cognitive process continues when the system of scientific notions is developed, and Terminology is enriched by a number of innovations, author's terms initiated by specialists.

Author's terms reflect the primary and subjective character of scientific language, which fully depends on professional and linguistic competence of the creator. "A specialist models a scientific concept in language in accordance with his own conceptual system. The evaluation of a scientific concept by an individual in the process of naming is not absolute and sometimes not quite objective. It is based not only on qualities and properties of naming objects, but also on the degree of professional skill, level of intellect, linguistic competence, emotional state, and his/her social and ethno-cultural background" (Bekisheva 2003: 16).

Author's terms being the result of intellectual labour may generalize the process of reasoning and language activity of people, their collective experience. For example, the term *interpheron* was introduced by the English scholar Alick Isaacs and by the Swiss scientist Lindenmann in 1957. The term *physiotherapy* was adopted on the 1<sup>st</sup> International Congress in physiotherapy in Liege in 1905.

Eponymic terms representing a very interesting layer of term-formation depict linguistic personality, author's name or the name of that scientist who discovered some phenomenon, research procedure, introduced the invention and so on. Eponyms are widely disseminated in different scientific and technological disciplines though they do not follow the principles of term formation in all cases. Eponyms mark the scientific concept, but do not reveal its conceptual features; they just refer to some sign as a way to concept reconstruction in specialist's mind. They fulfill the accumulating (historical and cultural) function, because the scholar's name immortalized to future generations, reveal the authority of scientists living in different countries and belonging to various scientific schools.

Medical Terminology abounds in different types of eponymic terms:

- 1) the author's name is a part of the term like in *палочка Коха* (*Koh's probe*), *болезнь Альцгеймера* (*Alzheimer's disease*), *синдром Мюнхаузена* (*Munchausen's syndrome*),
- 2) the author's name undergoes derivational changes, e.g. in Russian *гайморова пазуха*, *Кесарево сечение*, *Евстахиева труба*, etc.
- 3) the author's name is used as a derived stem in affixational terminological units e.g. in Russian *лейшманиоз*, *дальтонизм*, *гайморит*, *гаймороскопия*, etc.

Examples of medical terms show that the category of a linguistic personality starting with Hypocrates still remains the key aspect in terminological mechanisms.

The representation of linguistic personality in professional communication is even more interesting and complicated, because it describes participants of communication (e.g. one scientist

– the other scientist, scientific adviser – post-doctoral student, scholar – non-professional and so on). Terminological saturation of a text and the relationship between terminological and non-terminological vocabulary in the text depends on the role of each participant of interaction. In oral dialogue between a «professional in medicine – a non-professional», that is between the doctor and his patient, the specialist is dominating, because the effect of communication depends on his/her professional and linguistic competence, psychological state, and erudition. In the doctoral thesis of V. Zhura called «Discursive competence of doctor in oral medical interaction» (defended in 2008) the structure of doctor's and patient's competences is developed, they are distinguished in content and volume of information. Doctor's framework is based on medical scientific world view, it includes information about every disease structurally organized in the form of the clinical picture of disease development, which is demonstrated with the help of such categories (slots of frame): etiology, pathogenesis, symptoms, diagnostics, treatment, prophylactics. Patient's frames are based on the naïve understanding of the medical picture of world, including separate images, comprising slots of reasons causing the disease, treatment and possible complications.

Professional communication does not only depend on participants of interaction, but also on different situations in communication. These situations may be both official and unofficial. In oral communication there exist many possibilities – for manifestation of linguistic personality, that is of the speaker. If in official situations neutral terminological units are used, in unofficial situations not only terms, but also professional words appear in parallel to them. In comparison with terms professional words are lexemes belonging to the literary language of general currency, they are usually native and colloquial. «They reflect that part of professional information which is actualized in everyday repeated actions and operations, through all the experiences such words are closer to a personal space of a human being, comprising a range of the closest and daily concepts» (Golovanova 2007: 32). In professional words altogether with the scientific worldview, everyday knowledge of objective reality is shaped by our everyday sensual perception. Professionalisms depend on pragmatic characteristics of communicative interaction and purpose-evaluative intentions of participants in a speech act.

Pragmatic peculiarities of professionalisms are marked by various language means. For example, the process of metaphorization is a widely spread means of formation in medical terminology. The zoo-morphic metaphoric model is the most frequent one, animal parts of a body, their image and behaviour are used as a source to structure another conceptual domain, you can compare such examples as *бычье сердце, заячья губа, лягушачий живот, гусиная кожа, кошачье мурлыканье*. Visual methods of patient's examination by the doctor are based on visual perception, that is reflected in colourful metaphoric names of diseases and their features, e.g.: in Russian *краснуха, желтуха, желтая лихорадка, мокрота ржавая, синяк, синюшное пятно, черные угри* and many others.

I would like to note that the representation of everyday knowledge on the derivational level is very interesting, because we can stress the usage of the most characteristic derivational suffixes

To denote signs of diseases:

- ёк/ок: *отёк, кровоподтек, припадок,*
- ка: *одышка, лихорадка,*
- ота/ота: *тошнота, глухота, слепота, немота/ мокрота, икота,*

To define the disease:

- ица: *молочница, бессонница,*
- ка: *бугорчатка, пузырьчатка,*
- отка: *сухотка, чахотка, чесотка,*
- уха: *желтуха, краснуха, почесуха,*

To determine the patient with the disease:

- ик/ник: *аллергик, астматик, туберкулезник, лёгочник.*

Linguistic personality is vividly revealed in scientific text. A scientific text can never be impersonal. Linguistic personality and author's "ego" is represented in the structure of text and special linguistic means. The parts of the egocentric conception of language are the speaker as an author of the text and the discourse as author's speech creation. Egocentrism is defined as the relationship of discourse to the author. The speaker represents the discursive category, defining cognitive and evaluative space of discourse, its communicative and structural organization. In the doctoral thesis «Egocentrism of linguistic discourse» by D. Gergokajeva (defended in 2008) it was defined that the core of linguistic representations of a speaker in linguistic discourse serves the pronoun «I», which marks its social, psychological and individual characteristics and preferences, the desire to point at the importance of research results, the relevance of his personal achievements. The nearest and far peripheries of the author's «ego» are represented by case forms of the personal pronoun «We», possessive pronoun «Our», means of author's modality, and constructions with indefinite pronouns or pronouns with general semantics, etc. The pronoun «We» as a mean of representation of the speaker is of great pragmasemantic potential and is represented by some models, among which the most regular is the model «We = I», where «We» is a way of shadowing the author's «ego» which serves the cooperative principle, speech politeness, and scientific modesty.

I'll try to show the sense structure of the linguistic discourse on the basis of the monographic paper, titled «Socio-linguistic typology: West Africa» (by V. A. Vinogradov, A. I. Koval, V. Ya. Parkhomovskiy 1984). The linguistic discourse contains the nuclear communicative block which bears the main information and some optional communicative blocks that support the consequent description, expressing estimation and relationship towards theoretical sources and a new typological model introduced by authors. *The communicative environment* is the main notion of this typological model. In the structural organization of a text the authors use such discursive markers as: *насколько нам известно; отметим, что при сравнении этнических общностей; но, скажем, архитектурные черты ... могут служить типологическими признаками; как они нами понимаются, etc.*

The analysis of the material showed that the frequently used form expressing the author's "ego" is the pronoun "We", which reveals the general image of the speaker (We = I + I + I): *мы не хотим сказать; мы делаем упор на ее коммуникативной спаянности; проблематика, которой мы намерены заниматься...; по мере дробления исходного КС мы можем получать микроединицы...; во всех случаях, однако, мы употребляем термин «этнос»...; точных диалектных границ мы при этом не получим...; мы учитываем некоторые конкретные значения внешних параметров...; мы получаем более гибкую трехступенчатую градацию; мы говорим здесь о трех ярусах типологии, etc.*

In the text case forms of the personal pronoun "We" are used: *сужение ракурса исследования приводит нас в область микросоциолингвистики...; в предлагаемой нами типологии...; как они нами понимаются...; конструируемая нами типология..., etc.*

In the analyzed monograph the polemics with predecessors is observed. The authors persist on the priority of their conception and dispute with opponents or agree with them in some aspects. All these peculiarities are reflected in language means: *но если понятие СЛС (социолингвистическое состояние) никак не пересекается с понятием языкового состояния Г.В. Степанова, то в понимании ситуации имеются общие моменты. В частности, с его определением языковой ситуации как «отношения языка к другим языкам, проявляющегося в различных формах пространственных и социальных взаимодействий», сходно наше понимание коммуникативной ситуации.*

Thus, the author's «ego» in linguistic discourse is represented by language means belonging to different levels: lexical, morphological and syntactic. Scientific discourse including a linguistic

one is a product of linguo-creative activity of a speaker and it bears a mark of the author's individuality as linguistic personality.

So, in language for specific purposes, in terminology and scientific text the category of linguistic personality is shown as a person expressed in language and by the means of language.

## Literature

- Arkhipov, I. K. 2008: *The Language and the Linguistic Personality: textbook*. St. Petersburg: Publishing House "Knizhny Dom Ltd."
- Bekisheva, E. V. 2003: *The Author's Terms in the Medical Terminology: the Generativity Problem. Scientific and Methodological Issues in the Medical and Pharmaceutical Terminology*. Moscow: Moscow State Medical Stomatological University.
- Dyachenko, A. P. 2002: *The Author's Terms, Notions and Names Dictionary in the Medicine*. Moscow "The TRIADA-X Ltd."
- Golovanova, E. I. 2007: *The Professional Communication Theory in the Cognitive and Discourse Linguistic Paradigm: Scientific Publications of the III-rd International Conference*. Vol. 1. Chelyabinsk: "The Encyclopedia Ltd."
- Karasik, V. I. 2002: *The Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse*. Volgograd: "The Peremena Ltd."
- Karaulov, Yu. N. 1989: *The Russian Linguistic Personality and its Investigation Issues. The Language and the Personality*. Moscow: "The Nauka Inc."
- Kubryakova, E. C. 2004: *The Language and the Knowledge*. Moscow: "The Languages of the Slavic Culture Inc."
- Novodranova, V. F. 2007: *The Scientific and the Common Knowledge Representation in the Terminology: the Representation Issues in the Language. The Knowledge Types and Formats*. Moscow-Kaluga.
- Novodranova, V. F. 2008: *The Linguistic Personality Function in the Terminology Formation: Lingua-Philosophical Portrait of Modern Linguistic Personality*. Vladimir.