ABOUT THE SUBJECT OF THE ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

V.S. Lee, Doctor of Philology, Full Professor
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan

The author considers the topical theoretical issues of a modern anthropocentric paradigm of scientific knowledge. Some data were provided from the history of formation of anthropocentric linguistics as the special direction of the science about language. In this direction the question of a human factor is considered to be essential by the language. Influence of this factor is treated by the author as interaction of such concepts as «person» and «language». In general, the anthropocentric approach to language is focused on the world of semantics and mental activity of the person.

Keywords: anthropocentrism principle, anthropocentric linguistics, language and person, human factor in language, linguocentric approach, anthropocentric approach.

The state of modern linguistics cannot be characterized by any one general scheme, as the object of this science – human language, is so complex and many-sided. Richness of modern science about language is explained first of all by the high level reached by linguistics today. These achievements promoted understanding of a special role of linguistics in the general system of modern branches of scientific knowledge, and not only humanitarian. On the other hand, linguistic knowledge was demanded in all spheres of human activity because all kinds of activities are connected with language directly. The truth is shown in the slogan by M. Heidegger: "Language is the house of the truth of Being". This "house", clearly, is so huge and many-sided that it should be not simply mastered once, but constantly investigated; its new secrets must be revealed. On this way of knowledge about the nature of language the linguistics has reached quite a high level by the late 20th – early 21st century. A phenomenon generally called linguistic expansionism can serve as an evidence for this. This expansionism is shown not only in use of linguistic knowledge in all other scientific branches (and not only humanitarian), but also in solution of practical, applied tasks. It is known that in the modern world the level and importance of every science is defined first of all by the ability to solve practical issues. And in this area the applied linguistics clearly demonstrates the high general level of modern science about language. On the other hand, the linguistic expansionism is also manifested by emergence of new branches of scientific knowledge of interdisciplinary character, the names of which include the word "linguistics".

Deepening of scientific reflection and high level of modern linguistics forces the scientific community not only to comprehend new achievements, to assess them somehow, but also to think of prospects and trends of further development of language science. The questions appearing thus are related not only to the destiny of the object of linguistics – human language, but also the prospects of further development of both - the science in general and its separate branches. The title of the book, written by one of the leading linguists of the present - Vyacheslava Ivanova, is very indicative in this regard: "Linguistics of the third millennium: questions to the future" [2]. These questions concern the destiny of linguistics in general, as well as its separate branches. It is clear that the greatest interest is caused by those directions, theories and concepts which aren't simply relevant today, but are also considered to be scientifically significant in the future. The branch widely called anthropocentric linguistics should be considered to be one of such directions.

The anthropocentric linguistics (and respectively - the anthropocentric paradigm) hasn't gained full and conventional "nationality" unlike, for example, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, ethnical linguistics, pragmatic linguistics and other areas of scientific knowledge which have already became independent. It is caused by the fact that the object and the subject of anthropocentric linguistics, its methodological, scientific and methodical mechanism of linguistic study, its relations and ties with related subjects of modern linguistics and with other humanities are still not finally accurately defined. Moreover, throughout the history of linguistics the term "anthropocentric linguistics" had different meanings (i.e. an internal form of the word "anthropocentric") depending on the object of this scientific discipline. It is known, which meaning this concept and this term traditionally had in American linguistics: "The anthropological linguistics can be characterized briefly as the area of linguistic research devoted to generally synchronous studying of languages spoken by people unfamiliar with writing." [5: 44]. As we can see, here we have the meaning connected with studying of language of people.

In the Russian scientific literature, the subject and the substantial part of an anthropocentric paradigm is defined usually as studying the language of the person. Therefore most often the aspect of research of a natural language called the human factor in language is understood as anthropocentric linguistics (see work [3] and others of this cycle). However it isn't simple at all to distinguish the phenomena and processes caused and predetermined in language by the human factor from those not depending on it. It is also obvious that it is incorrect to reduce a perspective of anthropocentric linguistics to metaphysical connection between two artificially divided concepts, namely, concepts of language and the person. Such, "mechanistic", approach to a perspective of anthropocentric linguistics is reflected, for example, in the following quote: "In the linguistics

having the anthropocentric principle as its methodological basis two circles of problems come under the spotlight: 1) determination of how the person influences the language, and 2) determination of how the language influences the person, human thinking and culture" [4: 9].

Such statement of a question of a subject of anthropocentric linguistics involuntarily, but logically and quite naturally leads to postulation of provision on existence of language and the person as autonomous objects, independent from each other. However, I.A. Baudouin de Courtene, summing up the results of linguistics of the XIX century and considering the concepts of genealogical classification of the world languages (in particular, the well-known theory of a family tree of A. Shleykher and the theory of concentric waves by I. Schmidt) notices: "…neither that, nor other theory doesn't hold water as, on the one hand, they proceed from the assumption that language exists out of the person, and on another, don't consider the complexity of the language phenomena" [1: 7]. And then he continues: "…language can't exist independently from an individual".

Recognition of this unbiased fact as initial parcel of an anthropocentric paradigm and its consecutive use in theoretical and applied researches puts forward, at the same time, the entire complex of problems caused by interaction of such essences as: 1) language and spiritual activity of the person; 2) language, thinking and consciousness of the person; 3) language and human physiology; 4) language and mentality of the individual; 5) language and culture; 6) language and behavior of the person; 7) language and communication; 8) language and the society; 9) language and personal values; 10) language and knowledge. We will add the following to the listed areas: language and speech activity of the person, language and formation of the person's knowledge and opinions about the world, language and the person's cogitative activity, language and information, language and person's intelligence etc.

The abovementioned shows that the language-related interests of a number of disciplines of modern linguistics clash within the anthropocentric paradigm, and some of them have quite long and rich history (for example, psycholinguistics,

sociolinguistics, language philosophy, ethnic linguistics, pragmatic linguistics, etc.).

The perspective of anthropocentric linguistics, thus, isn't new; there are no sufficient bases to consider it finally created and conventional direction. There are only obvious trends leading to such a state of affairs. It is therefore much more reasonable to speak about it as the linguistic paradigm having the background in linguistics and closely connected with perspectives of other interdisciplinary sciences. Besides, it must be kept in mind that the principle of anthropocentrism and the anthropocentric perspective are quite ambiguously understood by linguists of different schools. R.M. Frumkina writes the following while analysing Anna Vezhbitskaya's concept of semantic meta language: "But after all anthropocentric approach can be interpreted in various ways:

(1) as the one allowing to understand correctly how the language "is actually arranged and why it is arranged this way, but not another". From the point of view of Vezhbitskaya, "actually" the language is arranged on especially functional basis, i.e. it surely reflects things important for the person using it. From this also follows the need to consider "anthropocentricity" not only as the description principle, but as an essential property of the language object;

(2) as the one explaining the specific property of language, especially important for all concepts of Vezhbitskaya – "everywhere is transparency"…

…The idea that in a natural language "transparency is everywhere" assumes that all grammatical and other distinctions observed in the speech have semantic and pragmatic interpretation. For the way we "see things", according to Vezhbitskaya, it is natural and logical" [4: 75-76].

The anthropocentrism principle, becoming the leading in the modern humanities (linguistics), is interpreted differently, and at times it is proclaimed as purely declarative – not bringing anything essentially new into the traditional perspective. And therefore E.S. Kubryakov is right when writing the following words about the human factor in language as the central question of anthropocentric linguistics: "At first sight, statement of a question of a human factor's

role in language can seem rather trivial – everything in language is created by the human, and language exists for the person. However, we are dealing with problems of improbable complexity, because everything connected with the person is obviously very complex, and also because it is truly difficult to allocate the circle of problems (being important for all sciences), in which it would be possible to bring something fundamentally new" [6: 15]. Nevertheless, the linguistics will constantly address this eternal issue, but it will not completely reject the need to consider the language "in itself and for itself".

In general the anthropocentric approach to language focused on the world of semantics and mental activity of the person forces to revise many developed theories. It makes us pay attention to the facts which aren't noticed, as said by N.D. Arutyunov, with "eyes of former concepts". It makes us come closer to the essence of language and its human nature. Therefore it is necessary to acknowledge that anthropocentrism, being the leading general scientific principle, opens new horizons for linguistics.

References:

1. Baudouin de Courtene I.A. The chosen works on general linguistics. Vol. I, II. – Moscow., Science, 1968. - 376 p.

2. Ivanov Vyach. Bc. Linguistics of the third millennium: Questions to the future. – Moscow., Languages of Slavic culture, 2004. - 208 p.

3. A role of a human factor in language: Language and thinking. – Moscow., Editorial of URSS, 2010. – 248 p.

4. Frumkina R.M. Psikholingvistika [Psycholinguistics]. – Moscow., Publishing center "Akademiya", 2008. – 320 p.

5. Hoyer G. Antropologicheskaya linguistics. Foreign linguistics. II. – Moscow., Progress, 1999., pp. 37-69.

6. Kubryakova E.S. Types of language values. Semantics of the derivative word. Monograph. Prod. the 3rd. – Moscow., Publishing house of LIBROKOM, 2009.

Information about author:

1. Valentin Lee - Doctor of Philology, Full Professor, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University; address: Kazakhstan, Almaty city; e-mail: li-vs@mail.ru