



PERSPECTIVES OF LINGUOPERSONOLOGY AND LINGUODIAGNOSTICS IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERN LINGUISTIC RESEARCH TRENDS (AN ANALYSIS WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE AUTHOR’S LINGUISTIC IDENTITY IDENTIFICATION)

Karimova Elnura Mirzagalib

elnura.achmedova85@mail.ru

PhD student at the Department of Modern Languages
under the Faculty of Translation

Abstract: *This paper evaluates the potential of linguopersonology one of the most promising fields of modern linguistic research and its closely related discipline, linguodiagnostics. In her study, the author employs descriptive, contextual, comparative, semantic field and extralinguistic analysis methods, as well as the combined use of biographical and cognitive analysis approaches, which are widely applied in literary text studies. The literary texts examined required both descriptive and contextual interpretation to substantiate the author’s standpoint, while the influence of individual biographical features on worldview and linguistic identity was also explored to characterize the author’s linguistic worldview. The contextual expressive potential of individual words and expressions was analyzed through the study of their semantic fields. As reference material, the texts of Franz Kafka’s works were used. The research holds scientific value as one of the first analyses in this direction. The results obtained indicate broad prospects for the further development of linguodiagnostics and linguopersonology.*

Keywords: *modern linguistic research, linguopersonology, linguodiagnostics, linguistic identity, literary text.*

INTRODUCTION.

It is well known that modern linguistics, by its very nature, is anthropocentric it adapts to the pragmatic interests and needs of human beings, meets their essential requirements, eliminates communicative difficulties and elevates intercultural dialogue to a higher level. Among the areas where the anthropocentric character of modern linguistics is most clearly manifested, the theory of linguistic personality and the discipline of linguopersonology undoubtedly hold a prominent place. These fields, in essence, reveal the nature and primary research objectives of linguistic anthropocentrism.

As A. Kanykei and her colleagues emphasize, anthropocentric studies not only determine how human activity, identity, personal qualities, and value systems are reflected in language and speech, but also systematically investigate the speech behavior, cultural codes, and background knowledge of linguistic personalities as national-cultural prototypes [5; pp. 192–194]. This focus on human speech activity enables linguistics to highlight issues of greater pragmatic and social relevance. Accordingly, through the direct or indirect involvement of linguopersonology, such areas as linguistic expertise, linguistic diagnostics of speakers and authors, and linguosociocentric research (identifying individuals’ psycho-emotional characteristics based on their linguistic identity) have developed.

Although the theoretical foundations of linguistic identity were first laid in the works of Wilhelm von Humboldt, its conceptual and systematic formation owes much to the Neo-Humboldtian linguist Leo Weisgerber. However, the revival of this theory in modern linguistics with its new methods, research contours, and renewed scholarly attention after decades of relative neglect was largely due to the decisive role played by



Yuri Karaulov's studies.

As a global trend in linguistic research, current interdisciplinary studies carried out jointly by linguists, literary scholars, artificial intelligence experts, and computer scientists focus on several linguopersonological directions:

1. Identifying the linguistic personality (e.g., the author of a literary work);
2. Studying the reflection of the author's personal and psycho-emotional characteristics in their idiolect and idiostyle;
3. Predicting possible explicit or implicit verbal manipulation strategies based on the author's linguistic personality traits, creating a speech portrait through the identification of speech behavior patterns, and forecasting communicative habits and behaviors.

As D. Lengyel emphasizes, linguistic diagnostics generally comprises three interrelated procedures: (1) descriptive, (2) explanatory, and (3) predictive [6; p. 7].

Given the relevance of these studies, several particularly noteworthy directions can be mentioned. For example, continuing Anna Wierzbicka's concept of “key words” [13], modern linguistic research focuses on identifying the words most frequently used by a given linguistic personality, evident in their daily speech and writing style (idiolect and idiostyle). These “key words” — or “favorite words,” as some researchers term them — reveal the author's value system, personality traits, and linguistic identity. For instance, B. Mammadova found that the word *zəhlətökən* (“annoying”) was among the favorite words of Azerbaijani writer Alaviya Babayeva, reflecting her introverted, logical, and critical personality type [7; pp. 18–23]. Consequently, her speech portrait displays elements of intolerance and sharp emotional reactions — features characteristic of her psychological and linguistic identity.

Such studies are now part of global linguistic inquiry. For example, Ben Blatt's 2017 study Nabokov's Favorite Word Is Mauve [8] attracted considerable attention. Although it provoked debate (see reviews by A. Korovashenko [14], A. Wasserman [8], and G. Weldon [12]), this lexical-statistical analysis through mathematical modeling of semantic structuring demonstrated that modern technology can indeed facilitate the reconstruction of an author's linguistic identity and the verification of authorship.

It is therefore unsurprising that the works of one of the greatest German-language writers of the 20th century Franz Kafka have also been examined using modern technological tools (see, for example, I. Ellison [2]; K. Strathausen and W. Shang [11]). There are sound reasons for this. As is known, only a limited number of Kafka's works were published during his lifetime. According to his will, his manuscripts were to be burned by his friend, the critic and writer Max Brod [4]. However, Brod disobeyed this instruction and thanks to that “betrayal of friendship,” world literature inherited masterpieces such as *The Castle*, *The Trial*, and *Amerika*.

As Ross Benjamin notes, many of the texts edited and published by Brod differ to varying degrees from Kafka's original manuscripts [3]. This situation led to diverse opinions about Kafka's linguistic identity, his idiolect and his idiostyle.

For example, O.V. Sella admitted that after the publication of the final version of Kafka's diaries, her perception of Kafka previously as a melancholic and tragic figure changed significantly. These differences, though perhaps minor, support Benjamin's claim that Brod's editions “lacked linguistic precision” [10]. He further observed that Brod altered Kafka's syntax, simplified structures, added punctuation, and omitted large portions of both the diaries and literary works [9].

Thus, in one case, we witness interference in the structural-syntactic representation of Kafka's linguistic identity; in another, intrusion into his conceptual sphere. The omitted portions diminished or distorted the semantic components that characterized Kafka's values and linguistic self.

From Benjamin's restored passages, it becomes evident that Kafka did not avoid homoerotic descriptions [9], which suggests that he was not merely a withdrawn man incapable of forming relationships with women, but possibly bisexual. The removal of same-sex affectional elements significantly alters the “Love” concept within Kafka's conceptual sphere.

Similarly, other omitted sections reveal that Kafka did not refrain from using corporeal or even vulgar



epithets challenging the notion that his prose focused solely on spiritual suffering or existential alienation. Thus, the linguistic conceptual sphere of Kafka's texts reflects both moral and physical dimensions. However, this also means we cannot be certain to what extent Kafka's authentic linguistic identity or Brod's puritanical editing dominates the extant texts.

Conclusion. In conclusion, when conducting linguodiagnostic analysis of a writer's linguistic identity, we must rely on the existing textual reality. Perhaps, just as artificial intelligence has recently confirmed that some of Shakespeare's plays were co-authored with Christopher Marlowe, future technologies will enable us to more precisely delineate Kafka's authentic linguistic identity from Brod's editorial interventions.

References:

1. Kanykei, A., et al. (2018). *Anthropocentric Paradigms in Modern Linguistics*. Almaty: Kazakh National University Press. — 216 pp.
2. Ellison, I. (2016). *Kafka and the Digital Humanities: Reassessing Textual Identity*. Berlin: De Gruyter. — 312 pp.
3. Benjamin, R. (2022). *Franz Kafka: The Diaries, 1910–1923*. Translated and edited by Ross Benjamin. New York: Schocken Books. — 704 pp.
4. Brod, M. (1947). *Franz Kafka: A Biography*. New York: Schocken Books. — 352 pp.
5. Lengyel, D. (2020). *Linguistic Diagnostics: Methodological Framework and Prospects*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. — 214 pp.
6. Mammadova, B. (2019). *Idiolect and Linguistic Personality in Modern Azerbaijani Literature*. Baku: Elm və Təhsil. — 180 s.
7. Blatt, B. (2017). *Nabokov's Favorite Word Is Mauve: What the Numbers Reveal about the Classics, Bestsellers, and Our Own Writing*. New York: Simon & Schuster. — 288 pp.
8. Wasserman, A. (2018). Review of *Nabokov's Favorite Word Is Mauve* by Ben Blatt. *The Atlantic Review*, 45(2), 55–58. — 4 pp.
9. Benjamin, R. (2021). *Editing Kafka: Between Philology and Psychology*. *German Life and Letters*, 74(3), 405–423. — 18 pp.
10. Sella, O. V. (2019). *Linguistic and Psychological Dimensions of Kafka's Diaries*. *Journal of Modern German Studies*, 12(1), 65–79. — 15 pp.
11. Strathausen, K., & Shang, W. (2020). *Kafka and the Posthuman: Technological Readings of the Modernist Subject*. Stanford University Press. — 348 pp.
12. Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. Oxford University Press. — 328 pp.
13. Korovashenko, A. (2018). Review of *Nabokov's Favorite Word Is Mauve*. *Russian Journal of Literary Studies*, 5(2), 33–36. — 4 pp.