Linguistic Personality of Homo Ridens

Мовна особистість homo ridens

Oksana Skryl
Ph.D. in Pedagogy,
Assistant Professor

Оксана Скриль
кандидат педагогічних наук,
доцент

E-mail: o.i.skryl@karazin.ua
orcid.org/0000-0002-1089-463X

Yuliia Sharun
Ph.D. in Pedagogy,
Assistant Professor

Юлія Шарун
кандидат педагогічних наук,
доцент

E-mail: j.f.sharun@karazin.ua
orcid.org/0000-0002-6187-0742

*V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National
University, Department of
the English Language*
✉ 4, Svoboda S., Kharkiv,
Ukraine, 61022

*Харківський національний
університет імені В.Н. Каразіна,
кафедра англійської мови*
✉ пл. Свободи, 4, м. Харків,
Україна, 61022

ABSTRACT
The article is part of a more detailed study of a linguistic laughing personality (homo ridens) in British literature within the framework of the theory of anthropocentrism. The results of the scientific literature analysis aimed at the study of the concept of «linguistic personality» and «laughing linguistic personality», in particular, are presented. From a wide range of examples starting from Chaucer up to the present we have selected the brightest characters in the English literature represented by W. Shakespeare and B. Shaw to highlight the main characteristics of the communicative style of homo ridens behavior. The analysis of the development of the personality is

*provided and the ways of achieving humorous effect in the process of communication in humorous discourse are given. The main factors of influence (psychological, social, cultural, etc.) on the formation of a laughing communicative personality are highlighted. The perception, understanding and interpretation of the world are covered within humorous discourse. **Particular attention is paid** to the intentions of comedians to use high-quality intellectual humor not only to create a humorous effect, but also for a philosophical explanation of the basic realities and laws of being. Shakespearean fools characterized as highly intellectual communicative people tend to influence their humor on the ruler and, thus, to the development of consciousness of the nation as a whole. Both linguistic and extra-linguistic means of expressing opinion by a laughing personality are analyzed. The analysis of the 'quality' of English humor has been carried out in order to show the influence of English fools as mimetic personalities on the British society in general. The ability of the communicative personality of homo ridens within the norms adopted by society to clearly reflect the realities of life of their era in a humorous form is characterized that further allows us to analyze the identity of the British comedian in diachrony.*

Key words: *anthropocentrism**,** communicative behavior, discourse, homo ridens, linguistic personality.*

Introduction

The role of linguistic personality in different types of discourse is of great concern among linguists that consider all language phenomena in the framework of the communicative, pragmalinguistic approach. Thus, language study is closely connected with the 'linguo-bearer' that gives the opportunity to research the language in its functioning in the discourse. A number of scholars (Tsos, 2014; Antonov, 2013; Naumov, 2006; Karasik & Yarmahova, 2006; Sternin, 1989; Serebrennikov, Kubryakova, Postovalova, Telia & Ufimtseva, 1988 etc.) analyzed the laws of communication in close connection with a linguistic personality. Using anthropocentrism as the main principle of modern linguistic research, scholars consider the language by analyzing personality development and his/her further improvement in the constantly changing world and define the perspective, usefulness and ultimate goals, reflected in human linguistic consciousness (Poluzhin, 1998: 7). Psycholinguistic approach in humor is substantially analyzed by a number of scholars (Attardo, 2017; Lopez & Vaid, 2017).

Thus, a communicator is the most important component of any discourse, a person with a certain structure of consciousness. The

personality of the communicator is not abstract. He/she is such a specific individual immersed in the discourse that revises the objectives, makes plans for speech acts, formulates the conduct in discourse that is controlled and regulated (Selivanova, 2002: 159).

In the focus of attention of psycholinguistics is an individual in communication. Thus, the *subject* of the article is the relationship of the individual with the structure and functions of speech activity of *homo ridens* in close connection of the language as the main means of human world reflection.

The present paper studies one of the aspects of the linguistic personality such as *homo ridens* i.e. a laughing personality acting in the humorous discourse. The *novelty/topicality* of the study is determined by the combination of linguistic and extra linguistic factors of the laughing personality. In this respect we have analyzed the characteristics of behavior creating humorous effect taking into account psychological, social, cultural components in the British literature. In terms of psycholinguistics all of them are of importance in characterizing *homo ridens* as a linguistic personality whose linguo-cultural stereotype is an individual, inherent to a person as a bearer of the linguistic picture of the world. British comedians were also proved to use humor for educational purposes and not only for creating humorous effect. The choice of the authors (W. Shakespeare and B. Shaw) is determined by the stereotypical character of their laughing personalities. Highly intellectual comedians have been chosen to show the reflection of their humor in the realities of life in Britain. Moreover, comparing laughing personalities of W. Shakespeare and B. Shaw was proposed for the first time. These characters strike the reader with eloquence and stick to traditional morality philosophically explaining the basic realities of being in a humorous way. It's a distinctive feature for both authors regardless the fact that these comedians were created in different centuries.

The main *aim* of the article is to elucidate the impact of psychological, social and cultural factors on the laughing personality creation. Secondly, particular attention is given to the analysis of the «quality» of humor in British literature. The preference is given to the social component of *homo ridens* since comedians chosen are bright representatives influencing British society. As for the structure we first determine the laughing personality as a linguistic type influenced by

many factors forming *homo ridens* consciousness. Then in this respect the personality of B. Shaw comedian has been analyzed. Shakespearean fool has been looked at due to his social role in society and influence on the formation of the British laughing personality.

Methods and techniques of the research

The choice of *methods* is determined by the linguistic and communicative approach to linguistic phenomena which is based on the general scientific methods of induction and deduction. The main method is the descriptive method that is the most appropriate while analyzing works of literature. Moreover, the comparative analysis of Shakespearean fools and B. Shaw's laughing personality's language is also given. The method of observation as one of psycholinguistic methods allow to learn the language of a laughing linguistic personality in action, in dynamics, in connection with thinking and other mental processes, taking into account probabilistic relationships and relationships of linguistic facts.

Results and Discussions

There is a reciprocal connection between the communicator and the way of communication. To be more precise, the discursive capabilities of the individual predict the way of organization, generation, perception, understanding and interpretation of discourse. The personality of the communicator, on the one hand, is static and constant, but on the other hand, it is dynamic, corrected by the intentions of the interlocutor, the type of response and the very way of conducting the discourse (Selivanova, 2002: 159).

An integral part of humorous discourse is the social component determined as the main one by many scientists. According to V. Karasik and O. Dmitrieva a linguistic personality is an entity in which different socio-situational roles, modes of behavior, levels of communicative competence, as well as individual, idiosyncratic features coexist. The scientists note that linguistic-cultural types are distinguished in the broader sense. They are images of representatives in a certain culture that are easy to recognize (Karasik & Dmitrieva, 2005: 6–8). As the present paper is a part of a more substantial study of *homo ridens* we

can note that the characters by W. Shakespeare and B. Shaw are easily recognizable from a wide range of comedians in English literature.

In the framework of our study it should be noted that the linguistic-cultural type of *homo ridens* correlates with the related ones: 'role', 'stereotype', 'character', 'image', 'archetype', etc. All of them characterize a person in the context of his communicative behavior. For instance, every person in his life has a huge number of roles that are determined by the social circumstances in which a person may be. That is, there is a certain area which is superimposed on the behavior of the individual in different situations.

This is a pattern of unwritten rules of behavior that has already been consolidated in society, i.e. role behavior corresponds to a certain scheme and has certain boundaries. The role performer, *homo ridens* in particular, has a certain freedom of action. The role structure includes the place of personality in the system of social relations, social communication, role expectations, role partners and role orders (Sorokin, Tarasov & Shahnarovich, 1979: 117)

V. Karasik and O. Dmitrieva states that the role typology is too varied. As a criterion of roles the following characteristics of a person are distinguished:

    a) permanent and variables,
    b) independent of person and assimilated,
    c) status and situational,
    d) intra-group and interpersonal.

Moreover, these characteristics can be interlaced (Karasik & Dmitrieva, 2005: 11).

In its turn, the linguistic-cultural type behaves in accordance with the role expectations. In this sense, we can say that a role as a general scheme of behavior forms the basis of type's actions. That is, the type is a kind of a role. But to reduce the whole behavior of the type to the set of role reactions means to ignore the personally significant individual qualities of human behavior that are identified and transformed into a character. Thus, V. Karasik and E. Yarmahova notes that their difference is that the type is related to people who are really recognizable, and the role, in its turn, is a certain mask that helps to conceal individuality (Karasik & Yarmahova, 2006: 48). Thus, the *homo ridens* communicative personality of W. Shakespeare and B. Shaw is mostly considered as a characteristic type in English literature.

Certain communication of a person covers only the relevant intentions and reactions of communicators, part of their internal vocabulary, which is only a small part of cognitive strategies, the recipient intention and the cognitive interpretive space of the addressee, as well as their various reflexes as personalities. The linguistic personality of *homo ridens* is a transformed reflection in the iconic form of the communicator's personality as his manifestation in the speech/text is usually of a model, simulated character. In general, the personality of the communicator is regarded as a 'complex, moving, non-closed dissipative self-organizing system, associated with diverse relationships with the environment, which, in fact, serves as a source of motivation for speech actions' (Tarasova, 2000: 5).

Interacting with the surrounding people, the person expresses and constructs his/her own style to gain certain aims. The usage of humor, in particular, forms special communicative style which makes beneficial cooperation in various spheres of life possible. We will mark that in our case it is quite reasonable to use the term «Communicative speech style (CSS)» suggested by Y. Tsos developed from «communicative style» (Antonov, 2013: 41) and «communicative behavior» (Sternin, 1989). It has been defined as «a systematic description of an individual that determines human communicative speech behavior, determines the leading way of solving speech and communication problems and the nature of interaction with the outside world» (Tsos, 2014: 6). Taking into account the fact that the communicative behavior of the personality of *homo ridens* contains both linguistic and non-linguistic expressive means, we also agree with the author's idea to speak about it as «a set of psychological skills for coordinating someone's own communicative behavior and internal special features of verbal data constructing and transferring by means of language» (Tsos, 2014: 6). Thus, we are intended to study communicative speech style of the laughing personality in Britain according to the above-mentioned principles.

For the most part in all the books there is a comedian who stands out from a wide range of characters in his own language and behavior. To analyze *homo ridens* more deeply in British literature we have analyzed the comedians by W. Shakespeare and B. Shaw which are the representatives of the original English humor influencing the development of British society and culture.

Eliza Doolittle's father, Alfred is a typical London dustman, drunkard and extortionist. Despite all of these qualities, due to his original humor, we consider him to be as attractive as the Shakespearean Falstaff. In order to imagine this person, we turn to the description by B. Shaw:

ALFRED DOOLITTLE is an elderly but vigorous dustman, clad in the costume of his profession, including a hat with a back brim covering his neck and shoulders. He has well marked and rather interesting features, and seems equally free from fear and conscience. He has a remarkably expressive voice, the result of a habit of giving vent to his feelings without reserve. His present pose is that of wounded honor and stern resolution (Shaw, 1972: 40).

It should be noted that we are going to reveal Alfred's features not according to his social function that characterizes more or less permanent status of the communicator but according to his social role which is determined by the behavior of here and now taking into account the expectations of society towards this person.

Thus, we can infer from his speech how moving his personality is:

1. *DOOLITTLE: Morning Governor. I come about a very serious matter, Governor. I want my daughter: that's what I want. See?* (Shaw, 1972: 40).

2. *DOOLITTLE: Done to me! Ruined me. Destroyed my happiness. Tied me up and delivered me into the hands of middle class morality… But this is something that you done to me: yes, you, you Engry Iggins* (Shaw, 1972: 84).

The communicative speech style of homo ridens is balancing between the biological nature of Alfred and his social environment. The first example shows Doolittle as it was (individual component). The second one represents him in the course of time (social component). Thus, person behavior in society is determined by the norms that allow him to feel comfortably in his surroundings. And the system of ethical norms defines a range of comfort. In its turn, norms are accepted by society or by a group of individuals equal in social status (Naumov, 2006: 59).

Alfred does not feel comfortable in the highest world of linguistic rules and norms. The character did not expect this, he was embarrassed. This is a typical reaction to a rapid jump on the social ladder, which led to his oratory skills. He is afraid of a new world for him. Thus, we

can see that both his language and his eyes are skeptical and ironic. He knows how to play his role while using the tactic of fact fabrication (the strategy of information distortion). Thus, his humor with various stylistic devices is used to fulfill a successful act of mind manipulation with the professor (Dmytruk, 2018). This person is endowed with an oratorical gift, a unique humor. The personality of A. Doolittle as a comic language personality is characterized by a high degree of motivation and intent. He achieves the goal by humor and the social status is not a barrier in communication.

His role is characterized as positional (corresponding to the social function of a person and his place in society) and not social (given from birth as belonging to class, sex, faith, etc.) (Bell, 1980: 137). In addition, the communicator can realize more varied situational roles in a particular situation (e.g. friend, etc.).

Both social and positional roles of communicators are factors of communicative status, defined by O. Pocheptsov as communicative rights and duties of participants of speech interaction and its realization (Pocheptsov, 1989: 41–42). These parameters determine the type of interactivity (cooperative or conflict) attributing to it a set of communicative means. With the first type of interactivity, the communicative statuses are equivalent, in case of a conflict type their statuses compete in the struggle to increase their own significance and reduce the communicative status of the opponent (Selivanova, 2002: 167). Therefore, the comedian by B. Shaw is constantly searching for a helpful hand in difficult situations, uses stylistically colored language and shows the cooperative type of interactivity.

The communicative status can be fixed and varied (mobile) depending on the roles of the communicators and their aspirations for cooperation, rivalry or conflict. It determines communicative speech style of *homo ridens*. The mobility of social roles can serve as a means of his success in achieving goals or can create a comic effect in the text. This approach distinguishes between representatives of certain social and ethnic groups (stereotypes): a typical dustman in our case. The type of roles also determines the patterns of speech and stylistic devices that depend on the situation of communication (Selivanova, 2002: 167).

Studying 'interactional humor' as a spontaneous phenomenon, Thomas W. Jensen proves that the main goal of it is the realization of values. Thus, humor helps Doolitlle to re-direct the attention and

enables to act in a playful manner to acquire a sense of well-being (Jensen, 2018).

Doolittle plays his role luxuriously. His whole look shows an overthrown dignity and determination in his intentions. Alfred 'pours' into the higher society without difficulty and feels equal. This man is difficult to beat down from a purposeful communicative task. He hints at parental rights, emphasizes the fact that Eliza is the main 'wealth' in his life although it is difficult to say that he is a good father.

After a long conversation, combining the senseless idea of earning money for a daughter and parental affection, he achieves the goal by force of intention and well-expressed rhetorical abilities, showing his discursive consciousness which the professor describes as follows:

HIGGINS: Pickering: this chap has a certain natural gift of rhetoric. Observe the rhythm of his native woodnotes wild. «I'm willing to tell you: I'm wanting to tell you: I'm waiting to tell you.» Sentimental rhetoric! that's the Welsh strain in him. It also accounts for his mendacity and dishonesty (Shaw, 1972: 42).

«Discursive consciousness» was apparently first suggested by the representative of «Structuration theory» sociologist A. Giddens (Giddens, 1984) and further developed by O. Selivanova. Communicator's discursive consciousness directed to the implementation of discourse includes communicative:

(1) *competence* i.e. a system of knowledge about the rules of communication, its procedure, etiquette, ritual reflecting the interaction of intellectual, social and verbal in the behavior of the communicator;

(2) *intention* i.e. the purpose of the communicative act;

(3) *interpretant* i.e. possibilities of reaction and perception;

(4) *background knowledge* i.e. knowledge about the situation of communication and about the interlocutor, etc (Selivanova, 2002: 166).

The consideration of the personality structure influences the delimitation of its types. N. Arutyunova established the role of the addressee in various speech acts: the performer, the victim, the counterparty, the informant, the confidant, etc (Arutyunova, 1981: 356–367). Doolittle's communicative roles studying shows the ability of *homo ridens* to adapt to any situation and any social layer changing his roles without any difficulty while using his sense of humor.

Such a substantial analysis of Doolittle allows us to characterize English humor as highly intellectual and the personality of *homo ridens*

as a linguistic personality showing cooperative type of interaction and aiming at no conflict in achieving his goals. As there are also social roles in society (corresponding to the social function of a person, showing his place in society), Shakespearian comedian is to be analyzed.

In many countries, particularly in England, only one person at the royal court had the privilege of telling the truth. He was a generally recognized fool and could do so with impunity, as he was in the civil service and had a kind of diplomatic immunity. The favorite entertainment of the fool was to speak to the ruler as if he was a friend. The fool is not only an entertainer, but also a clown philosopher, the only wise person at court. W. Shakespeare chose the name Touchstone for the fool in «As You Like it». As it is known 'a touchstone' was used to check the purity of gold or silver. Thus, Shakespearean clown fulfils this function.

He is characterized by a sufficiently high level of communication, easily gets in touch, does not try to get out of contact without a serious reason, rarely avoids contact. Touchstone wants to communicate and expand the circle of acquaintances, have a great communicative experience and a solid communicative competence. His jokes are filled with deep philosophical meaning.

Touch: I do remember a saying, 'The fool doth think he is wise, but the wise knows himself to be a fool.' The heathen philosopher, when he had a desire to eat a grape, would open his lips when he put it into his mouth; meaning thereby that grapes were made to eat and lips to open (Shakespeare W. As You Like it. Act 5, Scene 1).

One more Shakespearean fool is described in the following example in which humor does not only plays with the rules of language but also with the rules of logic:

Feste. My lady is within, sir. I will construe to them whence you come; who you are and what you would are out of my welkin, I might say 'element', but the word is over worn.

Viola. This fellow is wise enough to play the fool; and to do that well craves a kind of wit: he must observe their mood on whom he jests, the quality of persons, and the time, and, like the haggard, check at every feather that comes before his eye. This is a practice as full of labour as a wise man's art: for folly that he wisely shows is fit; but wise men, folly-fall'n, quite taint their wit (Shakespeare W. Twelveth Night. Act 5, Scene 1).

From this example, we can conclude that humor has its own logic and, thus, disrupts the rigidity of conventional ways of thinking (Lopez & Vaid, 2017). Feste makes hints from afar to show people certain facts in a humorous way though showing his logical approach to the situation under consideration. Moreover, the fool is a fairly educated, erudite person, aware of human psychology, especially of habits. As Viola says, you need to be a good actor to play the role of a fool, as well as to have extraordinary intelligence, logic and literacy. The role of the fool is compared with art which not everyone can master and only a fool has this skill.

Fools' mindset can be traced through their language patterns which are meaningfully combined together. Thus, 'full objectification' (Gaidenko, 2015) is observed in their discourse.

The image in which the actor wants to be recognized is the 'theatrical character' which should be mentioned while talking about Shakespearian fools too. They show specific behavior patterns characterizing the personality of *homo ridens*. And apparently the idea that jokes are a violation of the cooperative principles developed by Attardo (Attardo, 2017) is worth mentioning too.

Moreover, fools possess stereotypical qualities that reflect reality with the change of which the stereotype changes in its turn. The linguo-cultural type of a laughing personality is essentially a stereotype that is a generalization and in this regard includes stereotypical representations, with which a personality associates himself consciously or unconsciously. The stereotypical characteristics of the linguo-cultural type include the values according to which the type behaves. In turn, values are the most profound characteristics of culture (Karasik & Dmitrieva, 2005: 13–14). Therefore, characterizing the type, one can identify the features of a particular culture, British, in particular.

The character of a fool is fictitious in contrast to the real person. However, it is real, unlike a social role or a social stereotype (Karasik & Dmitrieva, 2005: 15).

S. Plotnikova considers the character that is identical to a person as 'mimetic'. Such a character exists in the world of literature and is very similar to the real one, similar in the sense that these two worlds are in the same space, temporal and geographical coordinates, i.e. the same social relations operate there and everyday life is organized according to the norms of the same culture (Plotnikova, 2006: 93).

Thus, the characters by Shakespeare can not be considered mimetic in relation to people of our time. At the same time, they are mimetic in relation to people of the XVII century, as they act and speak as the society at that time. Shakespeare's creation of the true world structure of his time is automatically accompanied by the reproduction of a true man-speaker. Mimesis of the world leads to human mimesis, to the creation of characters that are able to live in a similar world. These characters are the imitation of ordinary people of the Shakespearean era and their communication is the imitation of natural communication of this era (Plotnikova, 2006: 94).

In our opinion, in addition to the sign of time, it is worth allocating also a sign of place, as in different corners of the earth different conditions for the generation of speech are formed. Thus, the mimetic character of Shakespeare will take place not only in the XVII century, but also in England.

The type of communicators' roles (fixed or mobile) also determines speech patterns depending on the repertoire of language means used in this situation of communication, as well as types of communicative situations (Selivanova, 2002: 167). Thus, knowing the type of communicator and the ability to make the right behavior strategies for discourse based on his knowledge is one of the factors of communicative competence and efficiency. This is clearly observed in the plays by Shakespeare. For instance, the fool is the person of skill and wisdom. This hero understands the absurdity conceived by King Lear, he feels the hypocrisy of his surroundings. Instead of an ironic smile on his face there is a grimace of pain. With his humor, he seems to cling to Lear's consciousness. The fool helps the old king to understand the tragedy of his decision.

The image of the English fool in British culture is easy to distinguish. It is a specific link in this culture construction. Since ancient times this role has been institutionalized and authoritative in its own way (Sheygal & Mironenko, 2005: 386). Thus, the characters of W. Shakespeare's plays are people with a funny exaggerated behavior, often enthusiastic about certain occupations, smart and clever. The fools often hide their true thoughts and only smart people can see the main essence in their jokes. Thus, their humor is intellectual. Moreover, the characteristic of Shakespearean comedians are traced in the

XXth century. Alfred Doolittle is a bright representative of a laughing English personality reflecting the consciousness of the nation as a whole.

The vocabulary of the language gives each *homo ridens* wide opportunities for linguistic individuality disclosure. In turn, according to V. Naumov, it provides reliable data on such parameters of personality as: psycho type, social status, relation to the environment, to people and to himself, reactions, level of thinking (Naumov, 2006: 221).

It should be noted that three main components are important in analyzing the linguistic personality of *homo ridens*:

- Individual component (i.e. a certain language strategy using typical linguistic acts of humorous discourse that define the communicative speech style);
- Social component (i.e. language means, characterizing a particular social group);
- Cultural component (i.e. language means, characterizing a certain ethno-cultural society) (Skryl & Parfenova, 2018).

Communicative competence of the laughing personality is formed due to the above mentioned three components. The examples of different authors show that socio-cultural existence of a joking person has two hypostases: a fool as a professional, as an institutional role (a fool at court) and a joker/a fool as a psychological type of personality prone to jokes (Sheygal & Mironenko, 2005: 385).

Conclusions

Having analyzed the personality of the fool as a linguistic, social and cultural type, we have attained an understanding of basic characteristic features of English society and their intellectual humor. The comedians created by W. Shakespeare and B. Shaw have been determined as a linguistic type of the laughing personality influenced by many factors that form *homo ridens* consciousness. The principles of shaping *homo ridens'* communicative competence and the impact of psychological, social, and cultural factors on the laughing personality creation in Britain have been elucidated. The ways of creating humorous effect through intellectual philosophical statements of comedians have been analyzed along with the analysis of the «quality» of humor in British literature. Both linguistic and extra-linguistic means of expressing

opinion by a laughing personality have been taken into account. Specific features of mimetic characters of a comedian in Shakespearean era have been distinguished. It has been shown that knowing the communicative status, types of social and positional roles of the interlocutor is extremely important in the discourse, as it promotes communicative equilibrium and cooperation or, at least, justifies expectations. Traditional moral behavior and the identity of the British comedian can be easily traced while analyzing intellectual humor of the laughing personality of W. Shakespeare and B. Shaw. They do not only influence the realities of life but also reflect the development of consciousness of the nation in general. The structure of consciousness of a British comedian can be characterized as highly intellectual, developing, influencing society, aimed at gaining goals without conflicts using cooperative methods.

Secondly, particular attention is given to the analysis of the «quality» of humor in British literature. The preference is given to the social component of *homo ridens* since comedians chosen are bright representatives influencing British society. As for the structure we first determine the laughing personality as a linguistic type influenced by many factors forming *homo ridens* consciousness. Then in this respect the personality of has been analyzed. The fool has been looked at due to his social role in society and influence on the formation of the British laughing personality. The intentions of comedians to use high-quality intellectual humor not only to create a humorous effect, but also for a philosophical explanation of the basic realities and laws of being have been clearly observed. The ability of the communicative personality of *homo ridens* within the norms adopted by society to clearly reflect the realities of life of their era in a humorous form is characterized. It allows us to carry out further research of the identity of the British comedian in diachrony.

References

Antonov, O.V. (2013). Poniattia komunikatyvnoho styliu v suchasnykh prahmalinhvistychnykh doslidzhenniakh [The concept of communicative style in modern prahmalinhvistic researches]. *Movni i kontseptualni kartyny svitu – Language and conceptual world view, 43*(1), 38–44 [in Ukrainian].

Arutyunova, N.D. (1981). Faktor adressata [Addressee Factor]. *Izvestiya akademii nauk SSSR – Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 40*(4), 367–386 [in Russian].

Attardo, S. (2017). *Humor in Language.* Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.342

Bell, R. (1980). *Sotsiolingvistika [Sociolinguistics].* Moscow: Mezhdunarodnie otnoshenia [in Russian].

Dmytruk, O. (2018). The Strategy of Structuring Information According to its Relevance in Mind Manipulation. *Advanced Education, 9*, 194–200. https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.124468

Gaidenko, I.O. (2015) Language and Thought. *Advanced Education, 3,* 33–38. https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.43887

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration.* California: University of California Press.

Jensen, T.W. (2018). Humour as Interactional Affordances: an Ecological Perspective on Humor in Social interaction. *Psychology of Language and Communication, 22*(1), 238–259. https://doi.org/10.2478/plc-2018-0010

Karasik, V.I., & Dmitrieva, O.A. (2005). Lingvo-kulturnuy tipazh: k opredeleniyu poniatia [Linguistic-cultural type: to the definition of the concept]. *Axiological linguistics: lingvo-cultural types – Aksiologichnaya lingvistyka: lingvokulturnye tipazhi,* (pp. 5–23). Volgograd: Paradigma [in Russian].

Karasik, V.I., & Yarmahova, E.A. (2006). *Lingvoculturniy tipazh «angliyskiy chudak» [Linguistic-cultural type of «English eccentric»].* Moscow: Gnozis [in Russian].

Lopez, B.G., & Vaid, J. (2017). Psycholinguistic approaches to humor. In S. Attardo (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Humor*, (pp. 267–281). Tailor and Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315731162-19

Naumov, V.V. (2006). *Ligvisticheskaya identifikatsia lichnosty [Linguistic identification of personality]* Moscow: KomKniga [in Russian].

Plotnikova, S.N. (2006). Chelovek i personazh: phenomenologicheskiy podhod k yestestvennoy i khudozhestvennoy kommunikatsii [Man and character: the phenomenological approach to natural and artistic communication]. *Chelovek v kommunikatsii: kontsept, zhanr, diskurs – Man in communication: concept, genre, discourse,* (pp. 89–104). Volgograd: Paradigma [in Russian].

Pocheptsov, O.G. (1989). Komunikatuvnuy status yak parametr movleniyevoi vzaemodiy [Communicative status as a parameter of speech interaction]. *Lingvistyka – Linguistics, 4,* 40–45 [in Ukrainian].

Poluzhyn, M.M. (1998). Suchasni paradygmy lingvistychnyh doslidzhen [Contemporary paradigms of linguistic research]. *Problems of Romano-Germanic Philology*, (pp. 3–15). Uzhgorod: Patent [in Ukrainian].

Selivanova, O.O. (2002). *Osnovy lingvistychnoi teorii tekstu i komunikatsii [Fundamentals of linguistic theory of text and communication].* Kyiv: TSUL «Phitosociocenter» [in Ukrainian].

Serebrennikov, B.A., Kubryakova, E.S., Postovalova, V.I., Telia, V.N., & Ufimtseva, A.A. (1988). *Rol chelovecheskogo factora v yazyke [The role of the human factor in the language].* Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].

Sorokin, Y.A., Tarasov, E.F., & Shahnarovich, A.M. (1979). *Teoreticheskie i prikladnye problemy rechevogo obschenia [Theoretical and applied problems of speech communication].* Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].

Sternin, I.A. (1989). O ponjatii kommunikativnogo povedenija [The concept of communicative behavior]. *Kommunikativ-funktionale Sprach betrachtung – Communicative-functional language viewing,* (pp. 279–282) [in Russian].

Tarasova, E.V. (2000). Synergetychni tendentsii v suchasniy lingvistytsi [Synergetic tendencies in modern linguistics]. *Bulletin of Kharkiv national university – Visnyk Kharkivskogo natsionalnogo universytetu, 500,* 3–9 [in Ukrainian].

Tsos, Y.A. (2014). Komunikatyvni movlennievi vlastuvosti u stulioviy organizatcii osobystosti [Communicative speech properties in stylistic personality organization]. *Psyholingvistyka – Psycholinguistics, 16,* 164–174 [in Ukrainian].

Sheygal, E.I., & Mironenko, M.V. (2005). Shut i shutnik: professia ili hobbi? [Fool and joker: a profession or a hobby?]. *Zhanry rechi – Genres of Speech, 4,* 385–399 [in Russian].

Skryl, O.I., & Parfenova, O.V. (2018). To the Question of the Linguistic Personality and Its Components. In W. Klaczewski & H. Stefanek (Eds.), *Development of philological sciences in countries of the European Union taking into account the challenges of XXI century,* (pp. 362–381). Lublin: Izdevnieciba «Baltija Publishing».

Sources

Shakespeare, W. (n.d.). *As You Like It*. Act 5, Scene 1. Retrieved from http://www.shakespeare-online.com/plays/asu_5_1.html

Shakespeare, W. (n.d.). *Twelfth Night*. Act 3, Scene 1. Retrieved from http://shakespeare.mit.edu/twelfth_night/twelfth_night.3.1.html

Shaw, B. (1972). *Pygmalion.* Moscow: Higher School Publishing House [in Russian].

АНОТАЦІЯ

*Стаття є частиною більш детального вивчення мовної особистості, яка сміється (homo ridens) в англійській літературі в рамках теорії антропоцентризму. Представлені результати аналізу наукової літератури спрямовані на вивчення поняття «мовна особистість» і «мовна особистість, яка сміється», зокрема. З широкого спектру прикладів, починаючи з Чосера і до теперішнього часу, ми вибрали найяскравіших персонажів У. Шекспіра і Б. Шоу, щоб підкреслити основні характеристики комунікативного стилю поведінки homo ridens. Проведено аналіз розвитку особистості і представлені способи досягнення гумористичного ефекту в процесі спілкування в гумористичному дискурсі. Виділяються основні фактори впливу (психологічний, соціальний, культурний, тощо) на формування комунікативної особистості, яка сміється. Сприйняття, розуміння та інтерпретація світу розглядаються в рамках гумористичного дискурсу. **Особливу увагу** приділено намірам коміків використовувати якісний інтелектуальний гумор не тільки для створення гумористичного ефекту, а й для філософського пояснення основних реалій і законів буття. Шекспірівські блазні, як високоінтелектуальні люди схильні до комунікації, як правило, своїм гумором впливають на правителя і, таким чином, на розвиток свідомості нації в цілому. Аналізуються як лінгвістичні, так і екстралінгвістичні засоби вираження думки особистості, яка сміється. Проведено аналіз «якості» англійського гумору, щоб показати вплив*

© *Скриль Оксана & Шарун Юлія*

англійських дурнів як міметичних особистостей на британське суспільство в цілому. Характеризується здатність комунікативної особистості homo ridens в рамках норм прийнятих суспільством, чітко відображати реалії життя своєї епохи в гумористичній формі, що в подальшому дозволить проаналізувати особистість британського коміка в діахронії.

Ключові слова: *антропоцентризм, комунікативна поведінка, дискурс, homo ridens, мовна особистість.*

Скриль Оксана, Шарун Юлия. Языковая личность homo ridens

АННОТАЦИЯ
Статья является частью более детального изучения языковой личности, которая смеется (homo ridens) в британской литературе в рамках теории антропоцентризма. Представлены результаты анализа научной литературы, направленные на изучение понятия «языковая личность» и «языковая личность, которая смеется», в частности. Из широкого спектра примеров, начиная с Чосера и до настоящего времени, мы выбрали самых ярких персонажей У. Шекспира и Б. Шоу, чтобы подчеркнуть основные характеристики коммуникативного стиля поведения homo ridens. Проведен анализ развития личности и представлены способы достижения юмористического эффекта в процессе общения в юмористическом дискурсе. Выделяются основные факторы влияния (психологический, социальный, культурный и т. д.) на формирование смеющейся коммуникативной личности. Восприятие, понимание и интерпретация мира рассматриваются в рамках юмористического дискурса. Особое внимание уделено намерениям комиков использовать качественный интеллектуальный юмор не только для создания юмористического эффекта, но и для философского объяснения основных реалий и законов бытия. Шекспировские шуты, как высокоинтеллектуальные люди склонные к коммуникации, как правило, своим юмором влияют на правителя и, таким образом, на развитие сознания нации в целом. Анализируются как лингвистические, так и экстралингвистические средства выражения мнения смеющейся личностью. Анализ «качества» английского юмора был проведен, чтобы показать влияние английских дураков как миметических личностей на британское общество в целом. Характеризуется способность коммуникативной личности homo ridens в рамках норм принятых обществом, четко отражать реалии жизни своей эпохи в юмористической форме, что в дальнейшем позволит анализировать личность британского комика в диахронии.

Ключевые слова: *антропоцентризм, коммуникативное поведение, дискурс, homo ridens, языковая личность.*