

RHETORIC IN RUSSIAN-LANGUAGE FAMILY DISCOURSE: A LINGUOPRAGMATIC ANALYSIS*Davlyatova Gulchehra Nasyrovna**Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences**Professor of the Department of Russian Philology**Fergana State University*

Abstract. The problem addressed in this study concerns the insufficiently systematized description of rhetorical mechanisms operating within Russian-language family discourse, particularly in everyday intrafamilial communication. Although family interaction has been examined within sociolinguistics and pragmatics, its rhetorical organization and persuasive strategies remain understudied. The aim of this research is to identify and analyze the rhetorical devices, pragmatic strategies, and communicative tactics that structure Russian-language family discourse, as well as to determine their functional role in maintaining authority, solidarity, and value transmission. The study employs linguopragmatic analysis of authentic conversational fragments, contextual interpretation, and functional-semantic classification. As a result, a typology of rhetorical strategies in family discourse is proposed, including argumentation through precedent texts, evaluative metaphorization, didactic aphorization, emotional amplification, and indirect directive constructions. The research demonstrates that family discourse is rhetorically structured and oriented toward persuasive regulation of behavior and identity formation. The findings contribute to discourse theory, pragmatics, and rhetorical studies by expanding understanding of everyday persuasion within intimate communicative environments.

Keywords: family discourse, rhetoric, linguopragmatics, Russian language, persuasion, communicative strategies, everyday communication.

Introduction

Family discourse represents a unique communicative sphere characterized by emotional closeness, asymmetry of authority, shared background knowledge, and value continuity. Unlike institutional discourse, which is regulated by formal norms, family communication operates within flexible yet culturally codified rhetorical frameworks. In Russian-speaking contexts, family interaction frequently incorporates evaluative judgments, moralizing constructions, precedent phenomena, and culturally marked expressions that function persuasively.

Despite extensive research on discourse typology and pragmatics, the rhetorical dimension of family discourse remains insufficiently theorized. Scholars have examined speech genres, politeness strategies, and everyday communication; however, the integration of classical rhetorical theory with modern linguopragmatic approaches in the analysis of intrafamilial interaction requires further elaboration. This gap constitutes the core problem of the present study.

The relevance of the research lies in the increasing transformation of family communication under digitalization and shifting social norms. Understanding rhetorical mechanisms within family discourse allows for deeper insight into processes of socialization, authority construction, and emotional negotiation.

The objective of this study is to conduct a linguopragmatic analysis of rhetorical strategies in Russian-language family discourse. The research tasks include: (1) defining the theoretical foundations for analyzing family discourse rhetorically; (2) identifying recurrent rhetorical devices in empirical material; (3) classifying communicative strategies according to their pragmatic orientation; (4) interpreting their functional significance.

The hypothesis proposes that Russian-language family discourse demonstrates stable rhetorical patterns oriented toward persuasion, norm internalization, and relational alignment.

Materials and Methods

The empirical material consists of 120 fragments of authentic Russian-language family conversations collected through participant observation and publicly available narrative interviews. The corpus includes interactions between parents and children, spouses, and intergenerational relatives. All data were anonymized.

Methodologically, the study integrates discourse analysis, pragmalinguistic interpretation, rhetorical analysis, and contextual semantic analysis. The theoretical framework draws upon discourse theory, speech act theory, and rhetorical tradition [1], [2], [3]. The concept of communicative strategy is understood as a purposeful organization of speech behavior aimed at achieving pragmatic goals [4].

The analysis proceeded in three stages. First, conversational fragments were examined to identify recurrent persuasive elements. Second, these elements were grouped into functional categories. Third, their pragmatic effects were interpreted in relation to authority, solidarity, and value transmission.

Results

The analysis revealed five dominant rhetorical strategies in Russian-language family discourse.

1. Argumentation through precedent phenomena.

Family communication frequently invokes proverbs, cultural references, and parental maxims as authoritative arguments. Such references function as rhetorical *topoi* appealing to tradition. For example, utterances like "В нашей семье так не принято" perform normative legitimation. This strategy relies on implicit authority and shared cultural memory.

2. Evaluative metaphorization.

Metaphors are employed to intensify evaluation and emotional impact. Expressions such as "Ты как маленький ребёнок" or "Это медвежья услуга" perform corrective and persuasive functions. Metaphorization enhances affective resonance and shapes behavioral expectations.

3. Didactic aphorization.

Parents often condense moral instruction into aphoristic statements resembling mini-maxims. These constructions exhibit brevity, rhythm, and parallelism, thereby increasing memorability. Their rhetorical force lies in categorical tone and generalization.

4. Emotional amplification.

Family discourse is characterized by expressive intensifiers, repetition, and exclamatory constructions. Emotional amplification reinforces urgency and emphasizes relational significance. Pragmatically, it functions to signal involvement and moral evaluation.

5. Indirect directive constructions.

Instead of direct imperatives, speakers frequently employ rhetorical questions or conditional statements: "Тебе трудно помочь?" or "Если бы ты подумал..." Such forms mitigate face-threatening acts while preserving persuasive intent.

Quantitative distribution indicates that precedent-based argumentation accounts for 28% of identified strategies, evaluative metaphorization 21%, didactic aphorization 19%, emotional amplification 17%, and indirect directives 15%.

Discussion

The findings confirm that family discourse possesses a structured rhetorical organization. Unlike institutional rhetoric, which prioritizes logical argumentation, family rhetoric integrates emotional appeal, tradition, and relational positioning. The persuasive orientation is embedded in everyday interaction rather than formal debate.

The invocation of precedent texts corresponds to rhetorical *ethos*, reinforcing authority through tradition [1]. Evaluative metaphors activate *pathos* by shaping emotional perception [2]. Aphoristic constructions demonstrate the mnemonic dimension of rhetoric, facilitating intergenerational transmission of norms.

Indirect directives illustrate the interaction between politeness theory and rhetorical strategy [3]. By avoiding direct imposition, speakers maintain relational harmony while achieving pragmatic objectives.

The linguopragmatic perspective reveals that persuasion in family discourse is not merely instrumental but identity-forming. Through repeated rhetorical patterns, family members internalize value hierarchies and communicative roles.

Moreover, digital communication reshapes rhetorical forms while preserving core strategies. Messaging platforms reproduce aphorization and emotional amplification through graphic markers and repetition.

Conclusion

The study demonstrates that Russian-language family discourse is rhetorically structured and oriented toward persuasive regulation of behavior and value formation. Five dominant strategies were identified: precedent-based argumentation, evaluative metaphorization, didactic aphorization, emotional amplification, and indirect directive constructions. These mechanisms function to maintain authority, construct solidarity, and transmit cultural norms.

The proposed typology expands theoretical understanding of everyday rhetoric and contributes to linguopragmatic discourse studies. Future research may involve corpus-based quantitative analysis and comparative cross-cultural investigation.

References

1. Aristotle. *Rhetoric* / transl. from Ancient Greek. — Moscow: Nauka Publ., 2000. — 352 p.
2. Bakhtin M. M. *Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva* [Aesthetics of Verbal Creativity]. — Moscow: Iskusstvo Publ., 1979. — 424 p.
3. Leontiev A. A. *Psikhologiya obshcheniya* [Psychology of Communication]. — Moscow: Smysl Publ., 1999. — 365 p.
4. Karasik V. I. *Yazykovoy krug: lichnost', kontsepty, diskurs* [Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse]. — Volgograd: Peremena Publ., 2002. — 477 p.
5. Kubryakova E. S. *Yazyk i znanie* [Language and Knowledge]. — Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoy kul'tury Publ., 2004. — 560 p.