

Artículo de investigación

**Discourse of Communism and Socialist linguistic personality:
Rhetorical perspective**Дискурс коммунизма и социалистическая языковая личность:
риторический аспектDiscurso del comunismo y la personalidad lingüística socialista:
Perspectiva retórica

Recibido: 12 de agosto del 2019

Aceptado: 23 de septiembre del 2019

Written by:

Aleksandra A. Vorozhbitova²⁸⁵

SPIN-код: 5160-2150

Serhiy I. Potapenko²⁸⁶**Larisa G. Berezovskaya**²⁸⁷

SPIN-код: 4029-8458

Elena I. Lebedeva²⁸⁸**Nadezhda V. Kushko**²⁸⁹**Abstract**

Within the conception of the Sochi Linguistic & Rhetorical School the paper argues for the idea of discourse of Communism as a cover term for the «officialese» in the Soviet Union and former Socialist countries singling out four periods of its development: origin, formation, official existence, dismantling. The article pays special attention to the heterogeneity of the longest period of the discourse's official existence, which consists of the alternating stages: rise in the revolutionary and post-revolutionary years, during war and past-war time with the expansion of the discourse of Communism to other countries; and fall with the massive reprisals of 1930s and the “stagnation” epoch. During the period of its official existence three of its facets – official, public and real – reflect contradictions between the Communist ideas imposed by the authorities and the state of the Socialist linguistic personality confronting the meanness of daily life. The paper reveals those contrasts drawing on the diaries of Olga Berggolts and Alexander

Аннотация

В русле концепции Сочинской лингвориторической школы статья обосновывает идею дискурса коммунизма, обобщающую интерпретации «официолекта» в Советском Союзе и в бывших странах социализма, и выделяет четыре периода его развития: зарождение, формирование, расцвет и угасание. Отмечена неоднородность наиболее длительного и значимого периода расцвета, который состоит из чередующихся этапов: вознесения в революционные и послереволюционные годы, в военное и послевоенное время, сопровождавшееся расширением границ дискурса коммунизма на другие страны; и упадка, с которым соотносятся массовые репрессии конца 30-х годов и эпоха «застоя». На всех этапах расцвета дискурса коммунизма его три ипостаси – официальная, публичная и реальная – отражали противоречие между коммунистическими идеями, навязываемыми властями, и

²⁸⁵ Doctor of Pedagogy, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Honorary Worker of Higher Professional Education of the Russian Federation, Professor of the Department of Roman-German and Russian Philology, Sochi State University, Sochi, Russia

²⁸⁶ Doctor of Philology, Professor, Professor of the Department of English Philology, Translation and Language Philosophy named after Professor O.M. Morokhovskiy, Kyiv National Linguistic University, Kyiv, Ukraine

²⁸⁷ Ph. D. of Philology, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Roman-Germanic and Russian Philology, Sochi State University, Sochi, Russia

²⁸⁸ Ph. D. of Philology, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Russian and foreign literature, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University), Moscow, Russia

²⁸⁹ Ph. D. of Philology, Associate Professor of the Department of Roman-Germanic and Russian Philology, Sochi State University, Sochi, Russia

Dovzhenko as well as the destinies of Mikhail Prishvin, Alexey Tolstoy and Alexander Fadeyev.

Keywords: Discourse of Communism, Socialist linguistic personality, Sochi Linguistic & Rhetorical School.

состоянием социалистической языковой личности, сталкивающейся с превратностями повседневной реальности. Указанные контрасты раскрываются в статье на материале дневников Ольги Берггольц и Александра Довженко, а также на примере литературных судеб Михаила Пришвина, Алексея Толстого и Александра Фадеева.

Ключевые слова: дискурс коммунизма, социалистическая языковая личность, Сочинская лингвориторическая школа.

Resumen

Dentro de la concepción de la Escuela Lingüística y Retórica de Sochi, el artículo argumenta a favor de la idea del discurso del comunismo como un término de cobertura para los «*officiales*» en la Unión Soviética y los ex países socialistas que señalan cuatro períodos de su desarrollo: origen, formación, oficial existencia, desmantelamiento. El artículo presta especial atención a la heterogeneidad del período más largo de la existencia oficial del discurso, que consiste en las etapas alternas: ascenso en los años revolucionario y posrevolucionario, durante la guerra y el tiempo de la guerra pasada con la expansión del discurso del comunismo. a otros países; y caer con las represalias masivas de 1930 y la época de "estancamiento". Durante el período de su existencia oficial, tres de sus facetas, oficial, pública y real, reflejan contradicciones entre las ideas comunistas impuestas por las autoridades y el estado de la personalidad lingüística socialista que confronta la mezquindad de la vida cotidiana. El documento revela esos contrastes basados en los diarios de Olga Berggolts y Alexander Dovzhenko, así como los destinos de Mikhail Prishvin, Alexey Tolstoy y Alexander Fadeyev.

Palabras clave: Discurso del comunismo, personalidad lingüística socialista, escuela lingüística y retórica de Sochi.

Introduction

The study of Communist discourse representing a utopian worldview of desired social relations has been developing in several directions: Russian *officiales* as a language of Soviet power (Seriot, 1992: 202), *Lingua Sovietica* both remaking and renaming the world (Ryazanova-Clarke, Petrov, 2014); language of Soviet Communism (Thom 1989); Socialist / Communist and Totalitarian discourse (Wierzbicka, 1990: 1; Parra, 2010). The outlined interpretations of *officiales* face the problem of a limit since at a certain stage of generalisation they come to a point when the discourse of Communism loses its distinctive features becoming indistinguishable from other totalitarian variants, for example, the language of the Nazis (Young, 1992).

With that in mind our preference for distinguishing discourse of Communism is explained by two reasons: on the one hand, the contradiction between the representation of idealistic, non-existent, worldview encoded in

the name of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Socialist reality the speakers were immersed in; on the other hand, its two-levels functioning: the Soviet multinational state and the global scale involving the countries of the former Socialist bloc which emerged after World War II.

However, the scholarly understanding of the Communist discourse turns out to be removed from its users, or in more general terms, from the linguistic personality whose text production is subordinated to three main levels of human consciousness: motivational, concerning an individual's intentions; cognitive, representing the speaker's worldview; verbal semantic, concerning the use of linguistic units (Karaulov 1987: 42). Initially introduced to reconstruct Russian linguistic personality, this concept suits the description of two other types: Soviet, representing USSR citizens speaking a number of languages, and Socialist, covering the

population of the former Socialist states, e.g. Socialist personality in Germany (Watts 1994).

At the motivational level the Socialist linguistic personality as a generalization of its Russian and Soviet types is characterized by a clash between the utopian Communist ideology and the Socialist reality which directly affects the worldview and the language of the peoples within the multinational Soviet Union and Socialist states (Ebzeeva, Karabulatova, Nakisbaev, 2018). At the cognitive level the Socialist linguistic personality turns out to possess two worldviews – official and straight (Seriot 1992) with each of them implemented at the verbal semantic level with respect to a particular situation which is reflected by the specific rhetoric of the times. The resulting discourse is an ideocratic cognitive construct matured in the languages spoken by the population of the Soviet Union and Socialist countries (Wierzbicka, 1990). The Communist discourse nurtures the Socialist linguistic personality: both individual and collective encompassing a nation and developing within the Communist system on the platform of the Bolshevik discourse fitted into the Procrustean bed of the Communist official discourse.

The relations between the Communist discourse and the Socialist linguistic personality have been discussed in the works of the Sochi Linguistic & Rhetorical School (Vorozhbitova, Potapenko, 2013) treating the discourse under study as a special sociocultural phenomenon of cognitive nature. Within the collective linguistic personality's consciousness of the producer and recipient of diglossia two types of discourse co-exist: official and personal. This idea is further developed in this paper in the context of Western studies of the discourses of the former Socialist states.

From the standpoint of the Sochi Linguistic & Rhetorical School the relations of Communist discourse and Socialist linguistic personality contradict the canons of invention, disposition, elocution, memory and delivery under the influence of the Polyethnic-Sociocultural and Educational Spaces which dominated in the former Soviet republics and Socialist states (Luchinskaya et al, 2018).

The natural subjectivity in the selection of concepts at the level of rhetorical invention gives way in the Communist discourse to the artificial subordination to the "politics a priori". The violations of the inventive mechanism triggered by the ideological pressure discredit the

inventive-elocutionary component of the Socialist linguistic personality's competence. As a result, despite several qualities of exemplary speech – correctness and purity, accuracy and consistency, expressiveness, etc – the outlined contradictions introduce a "negative reference" into the text (Khachmafova et al, 2017). All this compels the Socialist linguistic personality to draw a few maps in the public discourse: official which is false since it does not correspond to any real territory and several maps for the same territory, embodied in dual language.

With this in mind first the paper discusses the periods of the Communist discourse and then focuses on the contradictions tearing the Socialist linguistic personality apart during the most poignant of those periods, when the scream of the real discourse froze in Soviet writers' diaries and note-books as well as in unpublished texts.

Materials and methods

The material of the study was the texts of V. I. Lenin, I. V. Stalin; "the ABC of communism" by N. Bukharin and E. Preobrazhensky, the diaries of Olga Berggolts and Alexander Dovzhenko as well as the destinies of Mikhail Prishvin, Alexey Tolstoy and Alexander Fadeyev.

Specific research methods were descriptive, stylistic, LR, quantitative analysis; methods of observation, comparison, language and speech distribution, extra-linguistic correlation were used.

The desire to integrate scientific approaches and research methods, caused by the need to synthesize the achievements of neo-rhetoric as a "functional language of culture" (R. Lakhman, V. N. Toporov) and anthropocentric linguistics led to the formation of a linguistic paradigm (A. A. Vorobieva). As an integrative research approach, it synthesizes the theoretical and methodological setup is not only (primarily) anthropocentric linguistics and classical rhetoric / *paritarie*, but also in other areas of the Humanities, which brings the researcher handling outline levels of a language personality, the phases of the universal videorecipe cycle "from idea to word" ideological (in the broad sense) aspects of the discursive process. Accordingly, the linguistic-rhetorical approach establishes three groups of parameters of speech-creating phenomena to be studied in order to identify the principles and patterns of communicative interaction. Logos-tesaurus-inventory parameters of the analysis of speech phenomena are based on the mental basis,

including key concepts, ideological stereotypes, ideological attitudes of the producer of discourse as the basis of its content field. Ethos-motivational-dispositive parameters of discourse are expressed in the organization of the speech-making process, determined by the set pragmatic tasks and the existing moral and philosophical attitudes and limitations. Pathos-verbal-eloquent parameters include emotional manifestations presented at the linguistic level (vocabulary, syntax), as well as in metabolites (D. Dubois et al.) as rhetorical transformations of language units of different types – tropes, figures.

Discussion

Periods of the Communist Discourse

The communist discourse perceived as a representation of a desired worldview is a heterogeneous phenomenon influencing the activities of the Socialist linguistic personality at different stages of its evolution. The latest classification divides the discourse under discussion into two periods: post-revolutionary with the language of Bolshevism establishing itself in the culture of polyphonic revolutionary avant-garde; the ascendancy of Stalinism, or the new Soviet doxa (Ryazanova-Clarke, Petrov 2014). However, this periodization seems to have a number of gaps which are to be filled in. Taking into account the Communist discourse's reference to the utopian, or desired, worldview we tend to distinguish four stages in its evolution: origin; underground formation; official existence; dismantling.

The origin of the discourse under discussion falls on the second half of the 19th century when the underground ideological activity of Russian intelligentsia gradually transforms into the Bolshevik discourse underlying the future Soviet official variant which is discussed in Nikolai Berdyaev's 1918 article "Spirits of the Russian Revolution" (see: Berdyaev 1990).

The second period involving the underground formation of the discourse lasts from the beginning of the 20th century until the 1917 revolution. It includes socialist, democratic, Marxist and other varieties of oppositional, revolutionary discourse, the Bolshevik discourse that inspired the October Revolution and the Civil War. During that period the national discourses transformed into two varieties which accumulated some partly rejected spiritual values within the framework of the ideology of an irreconcilable opposition to Bolshevism: Communist and anti-communist.

The third period of official existence which spans the time from 1917 till 1985 is far from homogeneous and can be subdivided into the alternating phases of Communism ascending and descending: the post-revolutionary time; the 1920-30s phase ending with reprisals; World War II time; post-war years witnessing the spread of Communist discourse to the newly established Socialist states; the phases of Khrushchov's "thaw" and Brezhnev's "stagnation".

The heyday of the Soviet official discourse coincides with World War II, a situation of military-ideological conflict with the Nazis. Having mobilized all its reserves the Communist discourse withstood a mortal battle against the fascist ideology and gained the global ground. It was this ideological variety of the Russian national macro-discourse that embodied "linguistic resistance" (Kupina 1996), or linguistic rhetorical resistance, to be exact, to the discourse and ideology of national socialism in Germany. At that time the resistance was raised by the collective Soviet linguistic personality, a representative of the Polyethnic-Sociocultural and Educational Space of the USSR as a superpower. The struggle for a just cause in a holy liberation war against the fascist invaders triggered all the powerful potential of the rhetoric of the Soviet era, its heavy and monumental official discourse. During World War II Soviet journalism portrayed itself as a special medium of representing Communist worldview. Facing the threat of total annihilation of a huge empire the Communist discourse most dramatically demonstrated its linguistic and extralinguistic powers potent in the Bolsheviks' rhetorical worldview and Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist ideology. The war became a test for the Soviets which could not but determine the specificity of the global discursive text-forming process of the collective linguistic personality of an ethnic social group and reflected the nature of individual cognitive communicative activity.

The study of a significant bulk of the World War II journalistic texts reveals three distinct features of the Communist discourse of the time: official press with editorials of the newspaper *Pravda*, other media, official speeches, etc.; war writers' personal diaries, notebooks, other forms of private statements, reflecting a painful gap between the official "truth" and the real state of souls; journalistic articles by the masters of words which produced a tremendous influence on the population, inspired ordinary people's exploits, helped defeat the enemy: Leonid Leonov, Mikhail Sholokhov, Leonid Sobolev, Ilya Erenburg and other Soviet writers of fame.

The Communist discourse of the Khrushchev and Brezhnev times presents a special case of a "sublanguage", linguistically marked by a loss of agent, expansion of nominalized constructions, genitive chains, etc (Seriot 1986).

In the framework of the Communist discourse of the period of official existence a special place belongs to its publicistic, i.e. journalistic, variety which appears to be a dominant paradigm in its functional-stylistic realizations, the "strongest position" of its ideological self-disclosure. As textual analyses suggest, the Communist journalistic discourse displays referential aggression at two levels: first, the annihilation of the existing anti-Soviet referent, i.e. "absence of a map for a real territory" in Seriot's terms, second, hostile, pejorative interpretation of ideologically alien – bourgeois, capitalist – referents.

Generally speaking, the Communist discourse constitutes a powerful ensemble consisting of three components: official, represented by the newspaper *Pravda* and other periodicals under the Communist Party's supervision; real, encompassing personal texts by genuine Socialist linguistic personalities, believing in the ideas of communism and blaming all troubles on the "degenerated government", "the NKVD anti-people institution" (Olga Berggolts); public, covering a mental subspace of the Communist discourse in terms of the "specific importance of the truth" in a quite realistic way, sometimes unpleasant for the system, but approved by censorship and presented in state periodicals.

The perestroika of 1985 "marks the beginning of the end of the communist language of the Soviet era" (Kupina 1996: 16). It witnessed the dismantling of the Communist official discourse in general and of the belletristic ideological discourse of the "Socialist realism literature", in particular.

The existence of the Communist discourse was accompanied by the anti-Communist and anti-Socialist counterparts, which being alternative to the Communist mindset rejected the Marxist-Leninist ideology in principle.

The large mental-discursive structures of Communist parlance – discourse ensembles – are formed by discourse practitioners, or linguistic personalities who come into the focus of our attention.

Results

Socialist linguistic personality

Within the linguistic-hermeneutical circle which comprises Communist discourse the ethos, pathos and logos of the Socialist collective linguistic personality are embodied in a number of products of linguistic cognitive activity of a collective producer and recipient of opposing discursive processes: official, real and public, on the one hand, and anti-Communist, or nationalistic, on the other.

The range of the Socialist linguistic personality is wide: first, separate cases of highest spiritual embodiment of a person inspired by social utopian ideas that fell on the fertile soil of individual human decency encompassing Pavka Korchagin, Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya etc; second, the caricatured attempts at their mass replication in the "moral code of the builder of Communism"; third, there are a number of ordinary, kind and honest "Soviet people" building Communism.

Within the orientational mechanism of linguistic competence an individual linguistic personality has to select between ethos and anti-ethos. In totalitarian society this choice takes on a form of analyzing all the pros and cons of making up with the "referential reality" at the linguistic personality's motivational level. In the testimonies of their contemporary "pen-brothers", some Soviet writers are regarded as "cynics", the label Alexander Solzhenitsyn attached to Alexey Tolstoy, "conformists", "disobedient", "ideological", "marginalized" etc. The opposite variants of creative behavior are represented either by submission to the tastes and requirements of the masses (Dmitry Furmanov, Alexander Fadeyev), or explicit / implicit opposition to them (Alexander Green, Vladimir Zamyatin, Mikhail Bulgakov). An intermediate group of writers, or linguistic literary personalities, includes Mikhail Zoshchenko and Andrei Platonov, who as representatives of the masses in the literature tried to aesthetically use the most tragic aspects of the new sociocultural situation.

Different types of literary linguistic personality, functioning within the framework of the Communist discourse, are directly related to the ethos responsibility of their speech behavior, while the typology of the Socialist literary personality determines the specificity of ethos-logos-pathos coordinates embodied in their works. No linguistic literary personality could

survive without ideological compromises between the ideas put to paper and the realities of both building and “developing” Communism which testifies to the mental diglossia of linguistic rhetorical type. This specificity of the linguistic situation of the Communist times defined as ideological diglossia or “totalitarian bilingualism” resulted in the Socialist linguistic personality being essentially bilingual and oscillating between Communist and “human” languages in official or non-official communication.

In rhetorical terms, the Socialist linguistic personality appears to be largely flawed, and the levels of its structure – verbal-semantic, cognitive, motivational – turn out to be deformed as a result of the systematic violation in the use of the officialese of the pragmatic conventions concerning the unity of words, beliefs and actions which causes a “functional disorder” in the collective linguistic personality as a society representative.

These deformations of Socialist linguistic personality are embodied in the so-called “rostrum syndrome” described in Alexander Dovzhenko’s diaries: “Enchanted Rostrum” (notes for a story).

“The rostrum was made from special wood by some carpenters who apparently enchanted it. The rostrum differed from all other podiums since while standing on it no one could tell the truth. And such brave people used to come to it sometimes! But something tied their tongues, and they produced some gibberish. They left the podium. And as soon as they finished speaking and stepped down everything returned to the normal. Needless to say, the rostrum was bewitched and the people standing at it spoke as if in a dream. Everyone talked in a similar tone. Having come to this enchanted place some personages changed beyond recognition. Therefore, the transcripts of their talk had to be corrected afterwards and they were as far from what had been said as firewood from trees” (Dovzhenko 1964).

Due to the dominance of the ideologized officialese, the “migration” of a literary linguistic personality from one discourse type to another, even alternative, is quite possible which is exemplified by Mikhail Prishvin’s diary entries. In the pre-war years their ideological essence and orientation are anti-Communist. However, during World War II the tone of his confessional prose changes: the writer sympathizes with the Bolsheviks, associating with them exclusively

the opportunity to defeat the Nazis (Prishvin 1986).

Diary entries, unpublished literature and memoirs capture the unique characteristics of the Socialist collective linguistic personality’s speech activity in the ideological looking-glass world. The speech culture of the collective Socialist linguistic personality is a manifestation of the qualitative characteristics of the worldview, forming a conceptual schema of the dominant official discourse, embodying the pathos of a political episteme. “Newspeak metastases” are much scary because of style formation, but mostly as mechanisms of ethos-logos deformation of the motivational and cognitive levels of the collective linguistic personality. Unlike Alexey Tolstoy’s pre-war articles from abroad which impart hostile perception of the service culture on the Socialist linguistic personality’s stereotypes, e.g. “Fear these shop windows, they are worse than the Odyssey’s sirens ...”; “Confound it, you think, what German proletarians’ laborious workdays are!” etc), the auto-communication in the diaries of Prishvin, Dovzhenko, Berggolts criticizes the meanness of the “new life” and the hypocrisy of the powers would be, verbalizing specific, officially non-existent, but anti-Soviet referents, squeezed out of linguistic consciousness by the filter of “Communist discourse as a forced mental world”: “The creation of a rich state by the poor is absurd”; “The tattered old and young walk without any signs of human dignity in their eyes” (Dovzhenko 1964), etc.

This “categorical ethos imperative” of a literary linguistic personality is even more pronounced in Alexander Fadeyev’s suicide letter sent to the Communist Party’s Central Committee and seized by the KGB on May 13, 1956. Published only in 1990, it runs:

“I don’t see any sense in life because the literature I devoted my whole life to has been ruined by the self-confident and ignorant party leadership which cannot be corrected. My writer’s activity loses all its meaning, and I take my life with great joy since I get rid of this vile existence immersed in meanness, lies and slander falling upon me. The last hope was to talk to the people who govern the state, but despite my requests throughout the last three years they couldn’t meet with me. I ask you to bury me next to my mother” (Bulletin of the Central Committee of the CPSU 1990: 147–151).

The fierce struggle of the Socialist linguistic personality against the Communist discourse is

revealed by an entry from Yury Nagibin's diary of 26 December 1962:

"I am firmly convinced that the whole story of mine will end in the worst possible way: a scandal, streams of slander, and the inability to publish my works in the coming two or three years. I cannot swim. I try to swim as if I were in deep waters, but I am aware that I am in a heavy mixture of shit and pus. I can't get to the shore" (Nagibin, 1996).

Being referentially half-hearted and therefore inferior in terms of ethos the speech activity of the Socialist linguistic personality in the Communist discourse may be appropriate for one writer and disgusting for another because of the attitude to the pragmatic content, emotional and motivational "fuel" feeding their creative intentions and their embodiment in the text. Within the ethos-logos-pathos coordinates Dovzhenko and Tolstoy's legacies are quite different giving varying interpretations of the reality brought about by the conditions of ideological mental diglossia and division of the Communist discourse into party bureaucracy's officialese and separate authors' public language, on the one hand, and the real language of the underground literature, on the other. Alexey Tolstoy, the outstanding representative of the pre-war anti-fascist public discourse, offered a sort of "geographical map" of the Soviet mental world coming into a pronounced interpretative conflict with the real language of Dovzhenko's diaries.

The referential aggression of the Communist discourse is specific. The analysis of Alexey Tolstoy's publications about the West (Tolstoy, 1953) reveals that he draws a truthful "map of existing territory" of capitalist life but lacks the presentation of the Socialist life "territory" without embellishment which is characteristic of the diaries of Korney Chukovsky, Alexander Dovzhenko, Yury Nagibin and others. And Tolstoy's personal discourse becomes false because of the absence of contrasts. It can be regarded as a verbal fetishistic phenomenon of ousting the facts that do not fit into the framework of socio-political utopia. Against this background, the notorious "modern tongue-tied deputies", referring to the real rather than surreal context, seem preferable to A. Tolstoy's exemplary Russian works distorting the reality since language is primarily real consciousness, a medium of orienting the collective linguistic personality within the real world.

The harmful effects of the literary linguistic personality's confrontation with the bureaucratic machine as well as the aggressiveness of Communist discourse manifest themselves in various ways: they affect human consciousness and beliefs or openly violate personal views which is illustrated by an excerpt from Leonid Leonov's speech at a meeting of the Bureau of the Union of Soviet Writers on 14 August 1942: "I was asked to write an article. I produced it. Sent to Moscow. Aseyev passed it over to *Pravda*. Everything necessary was done. The first copy was sent, then another but to no avail. I believe that in case of mistakes, if I did not do what was necessary, the answer was due. Nothing. And at that very time the Germans occupied my native village of Vysokichni. At last, I received a telegram concerning my article. But in what shredded form it was published! What for was it done? Why was it distorted so much? After all, this is my language, hatred of the enemy is as individual as each person's face. This is each person's business. We cannot be treated like that" (Leonov, 1984).

The diaries kept by the war time writers reveal the specificity of the existence of a literary personality within the Communist discourse. The ideological ethos-logos-pathos continuum, which forms a forced mental world, determines the activity of all mechanisms for implementing an author's linguistic competence and subjugates his / her existence under an autocratic regime. Olga Berggolts' records of 1942 run:

"The essay about Shostakovich is all cut and emasculated to their liking" (11 April 1942); "Passes agreements" – it may happen that I will be prohibited to read the final version. Our propaganda is still mediocre and cowardly, the "leadership" is stupid and mediocre"; "The central newspaper of 30 June printed "Leningrad". Though they removed one valuable stanza, on the whole it is a surprise. However, the lines "our gloomy brotherhood" and "our path is gloomy and burdensome" are missing. This is my first publication in the central papers, and it is not shameful – it is honest, and the verses are not bad, although not excellent. At least there is pain and feelings in them" (2 July 1942) (Berggolts 1990). In the cited passage honesty is interpreted as an antipode to the deceitful and synonymous to the truth, i.e. corresponding to the literary personality's real perceptions. The discussed diary entry makes it clear what particularly was unacceptable to the Communist discourse and worldview: the ideas which contradicted the tinsel heroism and reflected the ordinary people's

feelings of the real or failed to fit into the mythology of the Soviet superman.

The Communist official discourse created for the masses of people violates the most important pragmatic requirement of informational novelty. Communicating ideas obvious to the addressee is a departure from the accepted maxims of communication. The absence of new information about the referent belonging to the presupposition of the addressee triggers a negative communicative effect of pseudo-referentiality, revealing the thesaurus insufficiency of the official discourse. Its inventory core rests on a flawed logos-cognitive basis and as a result a writer as a professional linguistic personality and a qualified consumer experiences information thirst, “deficiency of the referent”, senses a cognitive stupor of the *officialese*. This is especially felt in the diaries of the intelligentsia of the Stalinist era. For example, in the following entry Dovzhenko’s real discourse ridicules the logos-thesaurus-inventory strategy of official communication:

“26 Aug 1945. Today I have read Comrade Stalin’s historical address to the nation. My joy is boundless. I rejoice as if I were a seven year old. It is such great, pure and transparent joy for me. I have found out that Germany is in the West, Japan is in the East, the Japanese attacked us several times in 1904, 1918, 1922 etc and that World War II has come to an end. And although I have not learned anything new and though the key phrase “Eternal Glory to the Heroes Fallen in the Battles for the Honor and Victory of Our Motherland” is devoid of a single warm word as if we had lost less than American with their 299,000 perished soldiers, “I say to myself after the great marshal-generalissimo, our leader and teacher: glory to our great victorious people, all the glory.”

In Dovzhenko’s next diary entry *officialese* appears at first glance more referentially correct than the writer’s real discourse, but the verbalization of the referent is adequate only in a purely formal sense (cf. with Antoine de Saint-Exupéry’s phrase “You cannot see essence with your eyes”):

“N. read my article “Ukraine on Fire” and told me:

- One passage is not true. You write that there was a wailing cry. It is far from the truth. There was no crying. They did look sad, but they did not cry. Nobody cried, do you understand?

You are lying, I thought, you are lying, blind official. All the country cried, shedding tears onto your road, and you looked at her through your glasses and through the closed windows of a car and did not see anything because you were reluctant to do it, blind man. My land cried, oh how it wailed! No country in the world has cried like that. Even the old men lamented so much that their eyes got swollen with tears.”

In the cited passage, the official cognitive communicative strategy demonstrates a consistent anti-humanism convinced of its correctness and therefore exceptionally terrible, since it acts as an integral part of the red tape system, personified in this type of “a soulless Soviet bureaucrat.” It is a seemingly paradox: in this case Dovzhenko, the master and passionate preacher of the real discourse, draws a map that does not correspond to any real territory, i.e. tells a lie, insisting on his vision with the utmost pathos, indicating an increasing metabolism of auto-communication reflected in addresses, repetitions, metaphors, personifications.

However, intuitively the writer’s interpretation is perceived as more consistent with reality – not physical, but psychological. The logos of ethos refutes the common logic of the obvious, being more adequate for the sphere of ideal and mental reality – the “blind official” was reluctant to see” and therefore “failed”.

The modeling of perception and cognition within the mental space underlying the *officialese* is carried out through the verbal manifestation of thesaurus frames (Malevinsky et al, 2019), triggered by the flawed pragmatism of the authoritative linguistic personality (Barabash et al, 2019). Idioms like “test of power”, “power spoils a person”, etc record the results of the “ethos diagnosis” carried out by the naïve linguistic consciousness, fixed at the intersection of the conceptual fields of the power and the individual. This tendency is embodied in the imposed mental space of the Communist official discourse, distorting the structure of the linguistic identity of its convinced speakers.

The discussed text excerpts reflect the specificity of the functioning of the Socialist linguistic personality within two planes of the Communist discourse formed by its official and real types. They trigger a linguistic paradigm of Communist discourse entering complex syntagmatic relations both in a pure form and within the framework of the public electorate as a marginal area of journalism.

Conclusion

The Communist discourse is a special communicative cognitive product of the collective Socialist linguistic personality, i.e. the global subject of ideologically deformed information-communicative-discursive processes that have a complex linguistic & rhetorical nature. The deep mental diglossia of Communist discourse consisting in opposition between the officialese and the real speech manifests in the public discourse allowed by the authorities.

As the results of the analysis of the text of the "ABC of communism" showed, in terms of the greatest ideological and pragmatic semantic load in the hierarchy of values, the concept of power (basic) dominates. Quite frequent in the text and the most significant in ideological and substantive terms is the lexeme power, which is part of various combinations: Soviet power, proletarian power, people's democratic power, the power of workers and peasants, etc.

It reveals itself as a linguistic & rhetorical construct determining a paradigm of discourse ensembles and discourse practices resulting in the specificity of the structural levels of the global Socialist linguistic personality in collective and individual forms and its functioning.

Revolution, having destroyed "the old world", becomes not simply the starting point of a new state with a "continuous" history, and "moves" the world under construction in which "who was nobody, that will become all", in fundamentally different system coordinates.

The conflict between the two political systems is presented as a decisive battle between the chthonic forces and the Cosmos. The entire Soviet history is a stretched eschatological myth, permanently masquerading as cosmogonic, with the expectation of a future "Golden age" obligatory for any eschatology. The demiurge / cultural hero of the Soviet myth-the proletariat-is not so much building this "new world" as acting as a construction victim. The basis of the image of the leader of the proletariat is either the same archetype of the atoning sacrifice (who, "death is death", is "more alive than all living"), or the archetype of God the Father, the "father of Nations", who sacrificed his own son for the sake of a "bright future".

The main literary socialist realism is, in fact, a method of Soviet myth-modeling (Karabulatova et al, 2018).

Thus, the modern nostalgic discourse is conditioned by the internal logic of an already established myth. Soviet history, as the time of the first Creation, under the law of mythological inversion a priori undergoes idealization or even sacralization. This is the time of the first Ancestors and first Subjects, the time of creating patterns and paradigms of behavior. Soviet: people, their feelings, their deeds, songs, products, machines, etc. - perceived genuine feelings and real life.

References

- Barabash V.V., Kotelenets Elena A., Karabulatova Irina S., Lavrentyeva Maria Y., Mitina Yulia S. (2019). The confrontation between the Eastern and Western worldviews in the conceptual space of the information war against Russia: the genesis and evolution of the terminological apparatus//Amazonia investiga, Vol. 8 Núm. 1 9: 246 - 254.
- Berggolts, O. (1990). From Diaries. In.: Star, N. 5-6.
- Berdyaev, N.A. (1990). Arches of Russian revolution. In: From the depth: A collection of articles about Russian revolution. Moscow: Moscow University Publishing House, 55-89.
- Dovzhenko, A. (1964). The Enchanted Desna. Autobiographic story. Stories. From diaries. Moscow: Soviet writer.
- Ebzeeva, Y.N., Karabulatova, I.S., Nakisbaev, D.A. (2018). The problems of transformation of the personal identity in a modern migrant// Astra Salvensis. V. 6. № 1. p.729-738.
- Karabulatova, I., Vildanov, Kh., Zinchenko A., Vasilishina, E., Vassilenko, A. (2017). Problems of transformation matrices modern multicultural identity of the person in the variability of the discourse of identity Electronic Information Society //Pertanika Journal of Social Science & Humanities, № 25(S). Jul., p.1-16.
- Karaulov, Yu.N. (1987). The Russian Language and Linguistic Personality. Moscow: Science.
- Khachmafova, Z.R., Karabulatova, I.S., Serebryakova, S.V., Zinkovskaya, A.V., Ermakova, E.N. (2017). The Specifics of an Estimate discourse of gender stereotypes in small forms of Folklore in a Network Discourse of Electronic and Information society at the Beginning of 21st Century // Pertanika Journal of Social Science & Humanities, № 25 (S) Jul., p.137-150.
- Kupina, N.A. (1996). Totalitarian thinking according to Russian dictionaries and texts of the

- Soviet times// Issues of linguistics and linguodidactics: Materials of conference of International Association of Teachers of Russian Language and Literature. Krakow, pp. 15–19.
- Leonov, L.M. (1984). Collection of works in ten volumes, Vol. 10. Moscow: Belletristic literature.
- Luchinskaya E. N., Karabulatova, I. S., Tkhoriik V. I., Zelenskaya, V.V., Golubtsov, S.A. (2018). New aspects of intercultural communication discourse modeling in the context of globalization and migration// *Opción*, Año 34, No. 85 (2018): pp. 789-800.
- Malevinsky, Sergey O., Ahmadzai Sultan Aziz, Karabulatova, Irina S., Luchinskiy, Yury V., Fanyan, Nelly Yu., Grushevskaya, Elena S., Zelenskaya, Valentina V. (2019). Main types of values of full-numeration words// *Amazonia investiga*, Vol. 8 Núm. 21 /Julio - agosto 2019, pp.513-521.
- Nagibin, Yu. M. (1996). *Diary*. Moscow: Garden of books.
- Parra, Reyber (2010). Visión del socialismo en el pensamiento de Rafael María Baralt. *Revista de la Universidad del Zulia*. Tercera Época. Año 1, Número 1, septiembre-diciembre, 2010, 31-63. ISSN 0041-8811.
- Prishvin, M. M. (1986). *Diaries, 1905–1954*. In: Collection of Works in 8 volumes. Vol. 8. Moscow: Belletristic literature.
- Ryazanova-Clarke, L., Petrov P. (2014). Introduction. In: *The Vernaculars of Communism. Language, ideology and power in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*. London and New York: Routledge, 1–16.
- Seriot, P. (1986). How to do sentences with nouns. Analysing nominalizations in Soviet political discourse. In: *Russian Linguistics*, 10 (1), 33–52.
- Seriot, P. (1992). Officialese and straight talk in Socialist Europe of the 1980s. In: *Ideology and System Change in the USSR and East Europe*, ed M. E. Urban. London: The Macmillan Press, 202–212.
- Thom, F. (1989). *Newspeak: The Language of Soviet Communism*. Claridge Press.
- Tolstoy, A.N. (1953). Collection of works in six volumes. Vol. 6. Moscow: Soviet writer.
- Vorozhbitova, A.A., Potapenko, S.I. (2013). Linguistic & rhetorical paradigm as innovative theoretical methodological platform of studying discursive processes of East Slavic and Western cultures. In: *European Researcher*. Vol. 61, N. 10-2, 2536–2543.
- Watts, M.W. (1994). Was There Anything Left of the "Socialist Personality"? Values of Eastern and Western German Youth at the Beginning of Unification. In: *Political Psychology*, 15 (3), 481–508.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1990). Antitotalitarian language in Poland: Some mechanisms of linguistic self-defense. In: *Language in Society*, 19 (1), 1–59.
- Young, J. W. (1992). *Totalitarian Language: Orwell's Newspeak and Its Nazi and Communist Antecedents*. University of Virginia.