ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

THE RHETORICAL POTENTIAL OF LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY IN CONTEMPORARY DISCOURSE

Nilufar Adkhamovna Usmonova
Instructor at Fergana State University, Fergana, Uzbekistan
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23478791

Abstract: The article examines the rhetorical potential of linguistic personality as a dynamic discursive capacity that becomes visible in the selection, organization and strategic deployment of linguistic resources under specific communicative conditions. Rather than treating rhetorical competence as a fixed inventory of expressive devices, the study conceptualizes it as an interaction among verbal-semantic mastery, conceptual framing, pragmatic intention, audience orientation, self-presentation and genre flexibility. The theoretical basis combines the linguistic-personality model developed in Russian linguistics with discourse analysis, argumentation theory, ethos studies and research on computer-mediated communication. The analysis identifies five interrelated dimensions of rhetorical potential: verbal-semantic, cognitive-framing, pragmatic-strategic, ethotic-interactional and digital-modal. Particular attention is paid to contemporary discourse environments in which speakers and writers must simultaneously construct credibility, anticipate heterogeneous audiences, adapt to compressed and multimodal formats, and manage the circulation of utterances beyond their original context. The article argues that rhetorical effectiveness is produced not by linguistic richness alone, but by the ability to coordinate linguistic choice with social role, communicative purpose, discursive norms and expected perlocutionary effect. The proposed model offers a framework for analysing public, media, academic and digital discourse and clarifies why the modern linguistic personality should be studied as an adaptive, reflexive and ethically responsible subject of communication.

Keywords: linguistic personality, discourse, rhetoric, ethos, communicative strategy, audience design, digital discourse, perlocutionary effect.

РИТОРИЧЕСКИЙ ПОТЕНЦИАЛ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ ЛИЧНОСТИ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

Аннотация: В статье риторический потенциал языковой личности рассматривается как динамическая дискурсивная способность, проявляющаяся в выборе, организации и стратегическом использовании языковых ресурсов в конкретных коммуникативных условиях. Риторическая компетенция трактуется не как фиксированный набор выразительных средств, а как взаимодействие вербально-семантического владения языком, концептуального фреймирования, прагматической интенции, ориентации на адресата, самопрезентации и жанровой гибкости. Теоретическую основу исследования составляют концепция языковой личности, дискурс-анализ, теория аргументации, исследования ethos и компьютерно-опосредованной коммуникации. В результате выделены пять взаимосвязанных измерений риторического потенциала: вербально-семантическое, когнитивно-фреймовое, прагматико-стратегическое, этосно-интеракциональное и цифровое-модальное. Особое внимание уделяется современным дискурсивным средам, в которых коммуникант одновременно конструирует доверие, прогнозирует реакцию неоднородной аудитории, адаптируется к сжатым и мультимодальным форматам и учитывает возможность выхода высказывания за пределы исходного контекста. Обосновывается, что риторическая эффективность определяется не только богатством

языковых средств, но прежде всего способностью согласовывать языковой выбор с социальной ролью, коммуникативной целью, нормами дискурса и предполагаемым перлокутивным эффектом.

Ключевые слова: языковая личность, дискурс, риторика, ethos, коммуникативная стратегия, адресат, цифровой дискурс, перлокутивный эффект.

Introduction

The anthropocentric turn in linguistics changed the status of the speaking subject from an external producer of linguistic forms into one of the central objects of linguistic description. Within this perspective, the concept of linguistic personality has become especially productive because it connects the structure of language with knowledge, values, communicative intentions and socially conditioned patterns of speech behaviour. In the model associated with Yu. N. Karaulov, linguistic personality is not reducible to vocabulary or grammatical competence: it includes the verbal-semantic level, the cognitive or thesaurus level and the pragmatic level of motives, goals and communicative needs [1]. Such a model is particularly important for rhetorical analysis because persuasive and influential speech necessarily activates all three levels at once.

Contemporary discourse, however, places the linguistic personality in communicative conditions that are more complex than those assumed by classical models of public speaking. A speaker may address a physically present audience, an institutionally defined group, an anonymous mass audience and an algorithmically assembled digital public almost simultaneously. A statement can be produced in one genre and redistributed in another; a lecture fragment may become a short video, an interview sentence may circulate as a headline, and a social-media post may be quoted in journalistic or political discourse. Consequently, rhetorical potential must be understood not only as the ability to formulate a persuasive utterance, but also as the ability to anticipate recontextualization, audience heterogeneity and the transformation of meaning across platforms.

Discourse analysis provides the theoretical tools for such an expansion. In T. A. van Dijk's sociocognitive approach, discourse is inseparable from context models through which participants interpret communicative situations, social roles and relevant knowledge [2]. N. Fairclough likewise emphasizes the relation between discourse, social practice and institutional structures [3]. From the rhetorical perspective, argumentation is not confined to formal proof; it involves the organization of what an audience can accept as reasonable, plausible and relevant [4, 6]. Therefore, rhetorical potential emerges at the intersection of linguistic form, cognitive representation, social positioning and interactional expectation.

An additional conceptual bridge is provided by the notion of ethos. In contemporary discourse studies, ethos refers to the image of the speaker constructed through discourse and interpreted in relation to prior social knowledge about that speaker. R. Amossy demonstrates that self-presentation is an integral dimension of verbal interaction and that ethos connects linguistic choices with social identity, authority and audience expectations [5]. Her later work stresses the continuing relevance of ethos for discourse analysis, argumentation, impression management and other contemporary forms of self-presentation [7]. This perspective is especially useful for the study of linguistic personality because rhetorical influence depends not only on what is said, but also on who the speaker appears to be while saying it.

The problem has already been addressed in earlier studies by N. A. Usmonova, where discourse was examined as a sphere in which the rhetorical possibilities of linguistic personality are realized, and where models of linguistic personality were subsequently discussed from linguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives [13, 14]. The present study develops this line of inquiry in a new

direction. Its focus is not the general correlation between discourse and linguistic personality, but the internal structure of rhetorical potential under contemporary communicative conditions, including digital mediation, genre hybridity, accelerated circulation and intensified demands on public self-presentation.

The aim of the article is to conceptualize the rhetorical potential of linguistic personality as a multidimensional discursive capacity and to identify the mechanisms through which it is realized in contemporary discourse. The objectives are: (1) to distinguish rhetorical potential from general language competence; (2) to identify its principal structural dimensions; (3) to describe the role of ethos, audience orientation and strategic framing; (4) to determine how digital communication modifies traditional rhetorical resources; and (5) to propose an analytical model applicable to public, media, academic and online discourse.

Materials and Methods

The study is theoretical-analytical and interpretative. Its material consists of major works on linguistic personality, discourse analysis, rhetoric, argumentation, self-presentation and computer-mediated communication, supplemented by recurrent communicative patterns characteristic of contemporary public, media, academic and digital discourse. The purpose is not to establish statistical frequency, but to construct a functional model that explains how rhetorical resources are coordinated by a linguistic personality in different discourse environments. For this reason, illustrative formulations used in the discussion are treated as analytical examples rather than as a quantified corpus.

The methodological design combines several approaches. First, the structural model of linguistic personality is used to differentiate verbal-semantic, cognitive and pragmatic resources [1]. Second, discourse analysis makes it possible to interpret utterances in relation to social roles, institutional expectations and context models [2, 3]. Third, rhetorical and argumentation theory is employed to examine audience orientation, persuasive organization, acceptability and the distribution of ethos, logos and pathos [4, 6]. Fourth, the concept of self-presentation is used to analyse credibility and the discursive construction of speaker identity [5, 7, 8]. Fifth, research on metadiscourse and computer-mediated communication helps describe the interactional signals and platform-sensitive practices through which writers and speakers guide interpretation in academic and digital environments [9, 11, 12].

The central analytical procedure is functional decomposition: rhetorical potential is divided into dimensions according to the type of communicative work performed by linguistic resources. This is followed by relational analysis, which examines how the dimensions support or constrain one another. For example, lexical sophistication may strengthen conceptual precision but weaken accessibility; categorical certainty may project authority but reduce dialogic openness; emotional intensity may increase visibility but undermine credibility if it exceeds genre expectations. Thus, rhetorical potential is evaluated as a coordinated system rather than as a sum of isolated techniques.

To avoid equating rhetorical effectiveness with manipulation, the analysis also incorporates an ethical criterion. Contemporary rhetorical competence includes the capacity to preserve proportionality between persuasive intention and epistemic responsibility. The linguistic personality is therefore assessed not only by the force of influence but also by the transparency of framing, the adequacy of evidence, the treatment of alternative positions and the degree to which the audience retains interpretive agency. This distinction is essential in digital environments, where emotional amplification and decontextualized circulation can reward rhetorically effective but epistemically weak messages.

Results and Discussion

1. Rhetorical potential as a dynamic configuration of resources

The analysis suggests that rhetorical potential should be defined as the ability of a linguistic personality to mobilize linguistic, cognitive, pragmatic and interactional resources in a manner appropriate to a communicative purpose, a particular audience and a specific discourse situation. This definition is intentionally dynamic. A person may possess broad vocabulary, grammatical accuracy and substantial subject knowledge yet still fail rhetorically if these resources are not adapted to the audience or if the chosen discourse strategy contradicts the expected social role.

The distinction between competence and potential is important. Competence refers to resources that a communicator possesses; potential refers to the range of effective discursive actions that can be realized through those resources under changing conditions. The same lexical choice can therefore have different rhetorical value in different contexts. Specialized terminology may function as a marker of precision and professional ethos in an academic article, but the same terminology may create distance in public communication. Conversely, deliberate simplification can signal clarity and solidarity in one context while suggesting superficiality in another. Rhetorical potential lies in recognizing such differences and managing them deliberately.

This interpretation also explains why rhetorical personality cannot be described through a stable list of preferred devices. Repetition, metaphor, rhetorical questions, direct address, mitigation, intensification and narrative exemplification are not inherently persuasive. Their value depends on timing, genre, audience knowledge and the speaker's projected identity. A rhetorical question may invite cognitive participation, dramatize certainty or suppress dialogue; a first-person plural pronoun may construct solidarity, institutional authority or artificial consensus. The linguistic personality becomes rhetorically effective when it can select not only the device itself but also the function that the device is expected to perform in context.

2. The verbal-semantic dimension: precision, salience and stylistic calibration

The verbal-semantic dimension is the most visible layer of rhetorical potential. It includes lexical choice, syntactic organization, rhythm, repetition, contrast, figurative language, evaluative vocabulary and cohesive patterning. Yet its rhetorical function is not ornamentation. Verbal form determines which elements of a message become salient, memorable, emotionally marked or cognitively easy to process.

One of the key mechanisms is lexical calibration. The linguistic personality continuously chooses between neutral and evaluative nomination, general and specialized vocabulary, explicit and implicit judgment, direct and mitigated formulation. Compare the analytical difference between the neutral statement "the proposal may create additional costs" and the evaluatively framed "the proposal will impose another burden." The propositional core concerns negative consequences in both cases, but the second formulation pre-structures the audience's evaluation through the noun burden and the verb impose. Contemporary rhetorical competence requires awareness of this framing effect because evaluative nomination often precedes overt argumentation.

Syntactic design performs a similar function. Short parallel clauses increase rhythm and memorability; extended hypotactic sentences can project analytical complexity; parenthetical structures allow qualification; passive constructions can background agency; imperatives intensify directiveness. In academic discourse, the effective linguistic personality often combines cautious claims with explicit logical transitions, thereby balancing epistemic modesty and argumentative control. Hyland's work on metadiscourse is relevant here because stance and engagement markers show how writers organize not only information but also the relationship with readers [9].

Expressions such as “the results suggest,” “it should be noted,” or “we can therefore infer” regulate certainty, guide attention and position the reader inside the argumentative process.

Verbal-semantic potential also includes stylistic switching. Contemporary speakers move between formal, semi-formal and conversational registers more frequently than in many traditional institutional genres. A university lecturer, for example, may present a technical definition, paraphrase it in everyday language, add an analogy and then return to disciplinary terminology. This sequence is rhetorically stronger than either constant simplification or constant specialization because it preserves precision while supporting accessibility. Thus, register flexibility is not merely sociolinguistic accommodation; it is a rhetorical instrument.

3. The cognitive-framing dimension: conceptual organization and interpretive control

The second dimension concerns the conceptual sphere of linguistic personality. Rhetorical influence is possible because discourse does not merely transmit facts; it organizes them through categories, contrasts, causal relations, analogies and narrative schemas. The same event can be represented as a problem of risk, responsibility, fairness, efficiency, tradition or innovation. Each frame foregrounds certain questions and makes certain conclusions more probable.

At this level, rhetorical potential depends on the ability to select a frame that is both cognitively accessible and normatively meaningful for the audience. An academic discussion of language change, for instance, may frame innovation as evidence of systemic adaptability rather than as linguistic decline. A public-health message may frame preventive behaviour in terms of collective responsibility rather than individual restriction. Neither framing is neutral, but neither is necessarily manipulative: framing is unavoidable because discourse always selects relations among facts. The ethical issue is whether the selected frame suppresses relevant alternatives or distorts the evidential basis of the claim.

The cognitive dimension also includes metaphorical modelling. Metaphor can condense complex relations into accessible images, but its rhetorical force arises from the inferences it invites. If a social process is described as a “battle,” participants are implicitly divided into sides, compromise may appear as weakness, and success is conceptualized as victory. If the same process is described as a “journey,” delay, stages and course correction become conceptually available. A rhetorically mature linguistic personality recognizes that metaphor is not simply decorative language but an instrument of conceptual orientation.

Another important mechanism is contrastive structuring. Binary oppositions such as old/new, open/closed, responsible/irresponsible, evidence/emotion or local/global create rapid cognitive organization. Their effectiveness explains their frequency in political, media and digital discourse, but their simplicity can also conceal intermediate positions. The rhetorical potential of linguistic personality therefore includes not only the ability to create contrasts, but also the ability to control their degree of simplification. In expert communication, excessive binarization reduces analytical credibility; in short public formats, carefully limited contrast may improve comprehensibility.

4. The pragmatic-strategic dimension: intention, speech action and perlocutionary design

The pragmatic dimension concerns what the linguistic personality intends to accomplish by speaking. Contemporary discourse rarely serves a single function. A message may simultaneously inform, evaluate, defend a position, construct solidarity, pre-empt criticism and invite action. Rhetorical potential is therefore closely connected with strategic sequencing of speech acts.

A useful distinction can be made between local and global strategy. Local strategy concerns the function of individual formulations: mitigation, emphasis, concession, challenge, compliment,

warning, invitation or rebuttal. Global strategy concerns the overall trajectory by which the discourse moves the audience from an initial position toward a preferred interpretation or action. For example, a speaker may begin by establishing common ground, acknowledge a counterargument, redefine the issue through a new frame, introduce evidence and conclude with a low-cost call to action. None of these moves is unusual in isolation; rhetorical skill lies in their order and proportionality.

Concession is particularly revealing. Expressions such as "this concern is understandable, but…" or "the approach has limitations; nevertheless…" can strengthen credibility because they signal awareness of complexity. Yet concession is rhetorically effective only when the acknowledged alternative is represented fairly. A pseudo-concession that trivializes the opposing position may produce the appearance of dialogism without genuine engagement. This distinction illustrates the ethical dimension of pragmatic competence.

The perlocutionary orientation of discourse must also be considered. The effect of an utterance may be cognitive (to change interpretation), affective (to evoke concern, trust or indignation), behavioural (to encourage action), relational (to establish solidarity or distance) or reputational (to strengthen the speaker's credibility). A rhetorically developed linguistic personality anticipates several possible effects at once. It also anticipates unintended effects: a categorical message intended to project confidence may be interpreted as arrogance; emotional intensity intended to signal commitment may be read as aggression; excessive hedging intended to show caution may be interpreted as uncertainty.

5. The ethotic-interactional dimension: credibility, self-presentation and audience design

Ethos constitutes a central bridge between linguistic personality and rhetoric. Every sustained discourse constructs some image of the speaker: competent or inexperienced, open or dogmatic, careful or impulsive, close to the audience or institutionally distant. This image is partly based on prior knowledge and social status and partly produced by the discourse itself [5, 7]. Goffman's account of self-presentation likewise demonstrates that interaction involves the management of impressions and expectations [8].

The important point is that ethos is not created by self-praise. In many discourse types, direct claims to authority are weaker than linguistic signals from which authority can be inferred. Precise terminology, transparent organization, proportionate certainty, accurate reference to evidence, fair treatment of objections and controlled emotional expression collectively create an ethos of competence. Similarly, inclusive pronouns, acknowledgement of audience concerns, accessible paraphrase and respectful disagreement contribute to an ethos of solidarity.

Audience design is therefore inseparable from ethos. The speaker's identity is not projected in a vacuum; it is calibrated in relation to an imagined addressee. Contemporary discourse complicates this process because the imagined audience is frequently multiple. A public post by a scholar may be read by colleagues, students, journalists, critics and unknown users. A statement addressed to one group may be screenshot, quoted or redistributed to another. The rhetorical personality must therefore balance local intimacy with broader interpretability.

This condition produces what may be called layered addressivity. A message can have a primary addressee and several secondary audiences. Effective contemporary discourse often contains markers that serve both levels: it remains specific enough for the immediate audience but explicit enough to withstand circulation outside the original interaction. This is one reason why context-setting has become a rhetorical resource. Briefly identifying the issue, defining key terms or

specifying the scope of a claim may appear redundant in the original context, but it protects the message against later decontextualization.

Dialogicity is another component of the interactional dimension. Even monologic genres contain anticipated voices of others through quotation, concession, negation, rhetorical questions and references to common objections. Argumentation in discourse is therefore fundamentally relational [6]. A linguistically strong but dialogically closed personality may achieve short-term assertiveness while weakening long-term credibility. Conversely, unlimited accommodation can blur the speaker's position. Rhetorical potential involves maintaining a recognizable stance while demonstrating the capacity to represent alternative positions accurately.

6. The digital-modal dimension: compression, multimodality and recontextualization

Digital communication does not simply provide a new channel for existing rhetorical behaviour; it modifies the conditions under which linguistic personality is perceived. Computer-mediated discourse has long required researchers to consider medium-specific patterns of interaction, participation and textual trace [11]. Social media further intensifies recency, interpersonal visibility and the redistribution of discourse across networks [12]. Under these conditions, rhetorical potential includes competencies that are only partly captured by traditional models of speech production.

The first is compression. Platform formats encourage short units, strong openings, visually segmented information and rapid recognizability of stance. Compression can improve rhetorical clarity, but it can also remove qualifications that are essential for accuracy. The contemporary linguistic personality must therefore distinguish between compression of form and simplification of thought. A successful short message preserves the argumentative skeleton of the longer position: the central claim, its scope, its basis and its limits.

The second is multimodality. Meaning is increasingly distributed across words, typography, image, gesture, audio, layout, hyperlinks and interface conventions. Even when analysis focuses on language, these elements affect the interpretation of verbal discourse. Capitalization may intensify stance; paragraph breaks may create rhythm; emojis can modify interpersonal force; visual evidence can reinforce or contradict verbal claims. The rhetorically competent communicator coordinates verbal and non-verbal resources rather than treating them as independent additions.

The third is accelerated recontextualization. Digital utterances are highly detachable. A sentence can be separated from its preceding qualification; a screenshot can freeze an informal formulation; a headline can condense an interview into a stronger claim than the original speaker intended. This increases the rhetorical value of scope markers, explicit attribution and careful lexical commitment. Expressions such as "in this dataset," "at the current stage," or "this does not imply that…" may function not only as academic caution but as protection against decontextualized reinterpretation.

The fourth is metric visibility. Likes, shares, views and comments can make audience response publicly measurable. This creates a new pressure on linguistic personality: discourse is not only interpreted but continuously evaluated through visible signals. The risk is that rhetorical effectiveness becomes confused with engagement maximization. Highly polarizing, emotionally charged or oversimplified formulations may receive greater circulation without providing stronger arguments. A mature rhetorical personality therefore needs reflexive distance from platform metrics and must distinguish reach from communicative quality.

A further contemporary challenge is AI-assisted communication. Drafting tools, automated translation, summarization and generative systems can improve lexical range, organization and

speed, but they also complicate the relation between linguistic form and personal authorship. In such contexts, rhetorical personality is expressed increasingly through selection, verification, revision and responsibility for the final utterance rather than through unaided production alone. The decisive question becomes not whether a tool participated in formulation, but whether the communicator preserves conceptual ownership, factual accountability and a coherent individual stance.

The proposed multidimensional model can be summarized as follows:

Dimension	**Core resource**	**Primary rhetorical function**	**Typical risk**
Verbal-semantic	Lexis, syntax, rhythm, cohesion, register	Salience, clarity, memorability, stylistic fit	Ornamentation, jargon, overstatement
Cognitive-framing	Concepts, categories, metaphors, causal models	Interpretive orientation and conceptual coherence	Oversimplification, hidden framing bias
Pragmatic-strategic	Speech acts, sequencing, mitigation, intensification	Managing intention and perlocutionary effect	Manipulation, pseudo-dialogue
Ethotic-interactional	Self-presentation, stance, addressivity, engagement	Credibility, solidarity, authority	Artificial authenticity, reputational inconsistency
Digital-modal	Compression, multimodality, platform awareness	Adaptation to networked circulation	Decontextualization, metric-driven polarization

These dimensions should not be interpreted as independent layers. Rhetorical success emerges from their coordination. Consider a public expert explaining a controversial issue. The verbal-semantic dimension determines accessible wording; the cognitive dimension determines the frame; the pragmatic dimension structures concession and claim; the ethotic dimension constructs competence without arrogance; the digital dimension determines how the message can survive compression and circulation. Weakness in one dimension can undermine the others. A carefully reasoned message may fail if its style is inaccessible; an engaging message may fail if its ethos appears inconsistent; a credible message may be distorted if its key qualification disappears in redistribution.

7. Genre flexibility and the contemporary rhetorical personality

Genre is one of the principal constraints on rhetorical behaviour. Academic articles, lectures, interviews, institutional statements, opinion columns, social-media posts and comment threads differ in permissible explicitness, emotionality, evidence structure and relationship with the audience. Contemporary rhetorical potential therefore includes genre competence and, increasingly, the ability to move between genres without losing conceptual continuity.

This ability can be described as rhetorical recoding. The same position may need to be expressed as a research claim, a classroom explanation, a public summary and a short digital post. Effective recoding preserves the semantic core while modifying terminology, evidence density, explicitness and interpersonal tone. Failure can take two opposite forms: excessive conservation, when academic complexity is transferred unchanged into a public format, and excessive reduction, when adaptation removes the qualifications that made the original claim valid.

Genre hybridity also creates new possibilities. Contemporary public discourse frequently combines explanation, narration, evaluation and personal testimony. A specialist may use a brief personal anecdote to humanize technical information; an institutional statement may include conversational elements to reduce distance; an educational video may combine definition, demonstration and direct address. These combinations expand rhetorical resources, but they require control. If the personal voice dominates expert evidence, ethos may shift from competence toward mere relatability; if institutional formality dominates completely, communicative distance may increase.

8. Rhetorical potential, power and ethical responsibility

Rhetorical potential is inseparable from power because discourse influences what is considered relevant, normal, credible and worthy of attention. Critical discourse studies have repeatedly shown that linguistic choices participate in the reproduction or contestation of social relations [3, 10]. For this reason, a model of rhetorical personality should not celebrate persuasive effectiveness independently of ethical evaluation.

The most important ethical criterion is proportionality between rhetorical force and evidential support. Strong affective language, categorical modality and simplified oppositions can be legitimate when evidence is clear and urgency is real; the same resources become problematic when they compensate for weak evidence. A second criterion is representational fairness: opposing views should not be reduced to obviously weaker versions merely to facilitate rebuttal. A third criterion is transparency of role. Institutional, commercial, political and expert positions shape prior ethos, and the audience's interpretation may change when these roles are concealed.

A fourth criterion concerns emotional influence. Pathos is not inherently irrational. Emotion can signal relevance, human consequence and moral seriousness. However, rhetorically responsible discourse connects emotion with reasons rather than replacing reasons with emotional pressure. A fifth criterion is reversibility: a communicator should be prepared for the same standards of evidence, quotation accuracy and contextualization to be applied to their own position. These criteria transform rhetorical potential from a technique of influence into a broader communicative competence.

Taken together, the results support a view of linguistic personality as an adaptive rhetorical subject. Its effectiveness depends not on maximal expressiveness but on calibrated expressiveness; not on constant certainty but on appropriate certainty; not on permanent informality or formality but on controlled register movement; not on the elimination of alternative voices but on their strategic and fair integration. This model also explains why the contemporary communicative environment increases the value of reflexivity. The linguistic personality must monitor not only what is being said, but how the utterance constructs the speaker, frames the issue, positions the audience and may be reinterpreted after circulation.

Conclusion

The rhetorical potential of linguistic personality in contemporary discourse is a multidimensional and context-sensitive phenomenon. It cannot be reduced to eloquence, stylistic richness or the possession of persuasive devices. It is better understood as the capacity to coordinate verbal-

semantic resources, conceptual framing, pragmatic strategy, ethos construction and digital-modal adaptation in accordance with communicative purpose and audience expectations.

The analysis has identified five principal dimensions of this potential. The verbal-semantic dimension regulates clarity, salience and stylistic fit; the cognitive-framing dimension organizes interpretation; the pragmatic-strategic dimension connects speech actions with intended perlocutionary effects; the ethotic-interactional dimension constructs credibility and manages relations with audiences; and the digital-modal dimension adapts the utterance to compressed, multimodal and highly recontextualizable environments. These dimensions interact continuously, which means that rhetorical effectiveness is systemic rather than additive.

Contemporary discourse also expands the traditional model of linguistic personality by increasing the importance of layered addressivity, genre recoding, public self-presentation and reflexive control over circulation. The communicant must increasingly anticipate not only the immediate interlocutor but also secondary audiences, platform transformations and the possibility that fragments of discourse will be interpreted outside their original context. This makes explicit qualification, coherent ethos and ethical framing more important rather than less important.

The proposed model can be used in further research on political, pedagogical, academic, media and digital discourse. It may also support comparative studies of rhetorical personality across languages and cultures, where the same dimensions can be realized through different norms of authority, politeness, emotionality, collectivism, individual agency and public self-presentation. A productive continuation would therefore combine the present functional model with corpus-based analysis of concrete speakers or discourse communities. Such work would make it possible to determine which rhetorical configurations are recurrent, genre-specific or culturally marked and how they change under the influence of digital communication.

References

1. Karaulov, Yu. N. Russkiy yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost [The Russian Language and Linguistic Personality]. Moscow: Nauka, 1987.
2. van Dijk, T. A. Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
3. Fairclough, N. Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.
4. Perelman, Ch., Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
5. Amossy, R. La présentation de soi: Ethos et identité verbale. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2010.
6. Amossy, R. Argumentation in Discourse: A Socio-discursive Approach to Arguments. Informal Logic. 2009. Vol. 29, No. 3. P. 252–267. DOI: 10.22329/il.v29i3.2843.
7. Amossy, R. Ethos Today: The Re-Appropriation of a Key Rhetorical Notion. Topoi. 2026. Vol. 45, No. 3. P. 859–867. DOI: 10.1007/s11245-025-10303-3.
8. Goffman, E. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday, 1959.
9. Hyland, K. Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. London: Continuum, 2005.
10. Wodak, R., Meyer, M. (eds.). Methods of Critical Discourse Studies. 3rd ed. London: SAGE, 2016.
11. Herring, S. C. Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis: An Approach to Researching Online Behavior. In: Barab, S. A., Kling, R., Gray, J. H. (eds.). Designing for Virtual Communities in the Service of Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. P. 338–376. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511805080.016.
12. Page, R. E. Stories and Social Media: Identities and Interaction. New York: Routledge, 2012.

13. Usmonova, N. A. Discourse and Rhetorical Possibilities of a Linguistic Personality. Society and Innovations. 2021. Vol. 2, No. 10/S. P. 385–390. DOI: 10.47689/2181-1415-vol2-iss10/S-pp385-390.
14. Usmonova, N. A. Models of Discourse of a Language Personality: Theories, Methods and Challenges. Best Intellectual Research. 2023. Vol. 7, No. 2. P. 105–107.
15. Burov, A. A. K voprosu ob idiostile sovremennogo oratora kak yazykovoy lichnosti [On the Idiostyle of the Contemporary Speaker as a Linguistic Personality]. Zapiski Gornogo instituta. 2005.