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*In article were considered topical theoretical issues of a modern anthropocentric paradigm of scientific knowledge. Some data were provided from history of formation of anthropocentric linguistics as special direction of science about language. In this direction the question of a human factor admits central language. Influence of this factor in article is treated as interaction of such concepts, as "person" and "language". In general anthropocentric approach to language, is focused on the world of semantics and mental activity of the person.*
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The condition of modern linguistics can't be characterized any one general scheme as the object of this science – language of the person is so difficult and many-sided. Richness of modern science about language is explained first of all by its high level which was 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 any activity is connected directly with language. The truth is shown in the slogan of M. Heidegger "Language – the house of Life". This "house", clearly, is so huge and many-sided that it should be mastered not simply, but also constantly to investigate, reveal its new secrets. On this way of knowledge of the nature of language the linguistics by the end 20 – to the beginning of 21 centuries reached high level, the certificate of that that can serve as the phenomen which it is accepted to call a linguistic expansionism. This expansionism is shown not only in use of linguistic knowledge in all other scientific branches (and not only humanitarian), but also at the solution of practical, applied tasks. It is known that in the modern world the level and the importance of any science is defined first of all by ability to solve applied problems. And in it the applied linguistics clearly demonstrates the high general level of modern science about language. On the other hand, the linguistic expansionism is shown also in emergence of new branches of scientific knowledge of interdisciplinary character in which name uses the word "linguistics".

Deepening of a scientific reflection and high level of modern linguistics forces scientific community not only to comprehend new achievements, somehow to estimate them, but also to think of prospects and tendencies of further development of science about language. The questions appearing thus concern not only destinies of the object of linguistics – language of the person and languages, but prospect of further development as sciences in general, and its separate branches. The name of the book of one of the leading linguists of the present of Vyacheslava Ivanova is in this regard very indicative. "Linguistics of the third millennium: questions to the future" [2]. These questions concern destiny of linguistics in general and its separate branches. It is clear that the greatest interest is caused by those directions, theories and concepts which aren't simply actual today, but also are represented scientifically significant in the future. It is necessary to carry such branch which it is accepted to call anthropocentric linguistics to number of those.

The anthropocentric linguistics (and respectively - an anthropocentric paradigm) didn't gain full and conventional "nationality" in difference, for example, from psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, pragmatical linguistics and other areas of scientific knowledge which already became independent yet. It is caused by that circumstance that the object and a subject of anthropocentric linguistics, its methodological and scientific and methodical device of research of language and languages, its relations and communication with related subjects of modern linguistics and with other humanities are still finally accurately not defined. Moreover, in the term "anthropocentric linguistics" in the history of linguistics the different sense (i.e. an internal form of the word "anthropocentric") depending on object of this scientific discipline was staticized. It is known, what contents was traditionally put in this concept and in this term in the American linguistics: "The anthropological linguistics can be characterized briefly as the area of linguistic research devoted to generally synchronous studying of languages which speak the people which don't have writing." [5: 44]. As it is possible to notice, the sense connected with studying of language of the people is staticized here.

In the scientific literature leaving in Russian, the subject and substantial party of an anthropocentric paradigm is defined usually as studying of language of the person. Therefore most often understand that aspect of research of a natural language which call a human factor in language as anthropocentric linguistics (see work [3] and other of this cycle). However it isn't simple to establish at all, what phenomena and processes are caused and predetermined in language by a human factor and what don't depend on it. It is obvious also that it is incorrect to reduce a perspective of anthropocentric linguistics to metaphysical connection of two artificially shared 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 which chose the anthropocentric principle as the methodological basis two circles of problems come under the spotlight: 1) definition of how the person influences language, and 2) definition of how language influences the person, his thinking, culture" [4: 9].

Similar statement of a question of a subject of anthropocentric linguistics involuntarily, but logically quite naturally leads to postulation of provision on existence of language and the person autonomous, not dependent from each other. However still of I.A. Baudouin de Courtene, summing up the results of linguistics of the XIX century and considering concepts of genealogical classification of languages of the world, in particular the known theory of a family tree of A. Shleykher and the theory of concentric waves of I. Schmidt, notices: "… neither that, nor other theory doesn't maintain criticism as, on the one hand, they proceed from the assumption that language exists out of the person, and with another, doesn't consider complexity of the phenomena of language" [1: 7]. And here it continues: "… language can't exist irrespective of the person".

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 whole complex of the problems caused by interaction of such essence 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 society, 9) language and values of the person, 10) language and knowledge. We will add to the listed problems and such: language and speech activity of the person, language and formation at the person of knowledge and opinions on the world, language and cogitative activity of the person, language and information, language and intelligence of the person and still some others.

The listed perspective with evidence shows that within an anthropocentric paradigm of language interests of a number of disciplines of modern linguistics are crossed, some of which have quite long and rich history (for example, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, language philosophy, a ethnolinguistics, a pragmatical linguistics, etc.).

The perspective of anthropocentric linguistics, thus, isn't new, and there are no sufficient bases to consider it finally created and conventional direction. Only obvious tendencies to it therefore it is more lawful to speak about it as about the linguistic paradigm having the background in linguistics and which is closely connected with a perspective of other interdisciplinary sciences are outlined. Besides, it must be kept in mind that as well as the principle of anthropocentrism, and an anthropocentric perspective are understood by linguists of different schools far not unambiguously. About it R. M. Frumkina, sorting Anna Vezhbitskaya's concept about semantic meta language, writes the following: "But after all and anthropocentric approach can be interpreted differently:

(1) as allowing to understand correctly how the language "it is actually arranged and why it is arranged quite so, but not differently". From the point of view of Vezhbitskaya, "actually" language is arranged especially functionally, i.e. surely reflects important for the person using it. From this with need "anthropocentricity" already not only as the principle of the description, and as essential property of the language object also follows;

(2) as explaining the specific property of language especially important for all concept of Vezhbitskaya – it "everywhere - transparency" …

… The idea "transparency is everywhere" a natural language consists that all grammatical and other distinctions observed in the speech have semantic and pragmatical interpretation. For the way "see things" peculiar to Vezhbitskaya she is natural and logical" [4: 75-76].

The principle of anthropocentrism which became to leaders in the modern humanities in linguistics is interpreted differently, and at times it is proclaimed is purely declarative, without bringing anything essentially new in a traditional perspective. And therefore E.S. Kubryakov is right, who writes the following about a human factor in language as the central question of anthropocentric linguistics: "At first sight, statement of a question of a role of a human factor in language can seem to rather trivial – everything in language is created by the person and language exists for the person. Actually, however, we deal with problems of improbable complexity, besides not only because everything, connected with the person, is represented very difficult but also because, it is valid, difficult to allocate that circle of problems, important for all science, in which lighting it is possible to bring something originally new" [6: 15]. Nevertheless, the linguistics will constantly address to this eternal problem, however, without excluding completely need of consideration of 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, to pay attention to the facts which aren't noticed how writes N. D. Arutyunov, with "eyes" of former concepts", to come nearer to essence of language and its human nature therefore it is necessary to recognize that anthropocentrism as the leading general scientific principle opens new prospects before linguistics.
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**LINGUISTIC PARADIGM AS THE TERM AND AS CATEGORY OF THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF SCIENCE ABOUT LANGUAGE**

**Abstract.** In article problems of ontology of language and their treatment in various paradigms of scientific knowledge are considered. The sciences presented to historiographies about language the most widespread interpretations of concept of a linguistic paradigm are analyzed. By the greatest explanatory force will bark at world outlook approach as it allows to unite various understanding of a paradigm as scientific category in the uniform epistemological system allowing to understand and describe more precisely the language nature.
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It is known that the concept of a scientific paradigm is used as methodological base for the description of a condition of modern linguistics, its main concepts, schools and the directions: "Entered originally by T. Kuhn, repeatedly subsequently modified, rejected by one methodologists of science and still used by others, the concept of a scientific paradigm, or knowledge paradigm, found the place and in a linguistic historiography" [1: 19]. However in modern linguistics the concept of a scientific paradigm not only is interpreted ambiguously, but also often used in relation to different aspects of language and to different components of the science about language. In one cases the scientific paradigm is understood as this or that direction, in others - one of aspects of language object, in the third - a certain branch of linguistics.

The term "paradigm" and in the metodologo-philosophical relation is ambiguously treated: besides kunovsky understanding of a paradigm as "models of statement of problems and their decisions in this scientific community" [2: 7], in linguistics its treatment as "a view of language, its ontology", "style of linguistic thinking", "position of a certain linguistic school in the scientific world", "communication of linguistic school with a certain cultural tradition", "language philosophy", "a language epistemologiya", etc. is presented.

Due to such broad and diverse interpretation of scientific concept of a linguistic paradigm arises, naturally, need of establishment of those its aspects which allow to prove after all the acceptability of this term and the concept corresponding to it in relation to a science historiography about language and to its current state.

The concept of a linguistic paradigm is used quite often for the characteristic of various concepts in the certain direction or independent school of modern linguistics. Along with it one of paradigms (descriptive, glossematichesky, transformational, generating) differ from each other first of all in the research device within uniform "view" of language, "uniform statement of problems", others (cognitive and communicative) - different "views" of language ontology. Such seeming contradiction is explained by that circumstance that general scientific concepts (and the terms corresponding to them), passing a stage of development, use and judgment, are often used or in very wide value (in this case they start duplicating the existing terms), or in highly specialized, usually reflecting some aspect, new to science, of the studied phenomenon. Therefore similar approach at allocation and qualification of modern linguistic paradigms is quite explainable and methodologically acceptable. At the same time the expert who is engaged in this or that branch of knowledge needs most to be defined accurately, in what value he uses the chosen term, to distinguish the uzkoterminologichesky use and nonterminological, broad understanding of the corresponding word term.

Thus, linguistic paradigms in relation to a current state of science about language are new concepts and theories of language object (1), a special view of language, of its ontologic features (2), new schools of sciences, currents, the directions in linguistics (3), the new methodological principles and new methods of research of language (4) and, at last, new approaches to the solution of these or those linguistic problems (5). The listed parameters making a disciplinary matrix of a paradigm and allowing to outline a circle of distinctive signs by means of which it is possible to explain concept of a modern linguistic paradigm are in the complementarity relation (or crossings), i.e. for example, a certain new concept (1) is connected usually with the change of a view of the nature of language (2) leading to formation of the new methodological principles and scientific methods and receptions of the analysis of language (4) and new approaches to the solution of the put problems (5) that as a result leads to formation of the new linguistic directions and schools (3). Therefore when speak, for example, about a cognitive paradigm of language, mean also the nonconventional branch of science studying language processes and the phenomena as realization of knowledge of the person of the world and their use in mental activity, and a special view of language, and system of research receptions by means of which language as the tool of knowledge and conceptualization of the world, and the corresponding model of statement of problems and their decisions is learned.

The set of the values put in concept of a linguistic paradigm is connected with complexity and inexhaustibility of object of research (human language) and, strangely enough, a maturity of the science studying and describing it. It is obvious also that there is a need for establishment of the initial, most general, invariant property defining other possible, private realization of this concept and its private interpretations. The interpretation of a condition of the modern linguistic theory as "paradigms of paradigms" doesn't remove methodological questions on which decision "the model of statement of problems" depends. Therefore as the most acceptable it is necessary to recognize the "world outlook" treatment considering a linguistic paradigm as system of certain views of language according to which are formed the standard theory, model, a sample of the solution of linguistic problems, style of scientific thinking and, at last, methods of linguistic research. In total this feature set at each school of sciences, in each certain direction of modern linguistics is shown, naturally, differently, as defines an originality of this or that school of sciences. Therefore, the concept of the linguistic direction needs to be distinguished from concept of a linguistic paradigm. Originality and originality of this or that school is shown in features of a linguistic paradigm (or paradigms). In addition some schools within a uniform, general view on language, similar statement of problems, can differ and in a technique of the solution of objectives and in various aspects of the studied material that finally gives the grounds to speak about various directions within one linguistic paradigm. Such difficult interaction between the concepts "linguistic direction" or "linguistic school" and "linguistic paradigm" as model of statement of problems, set of views of language leads sometimes to their mixture which, however, has no basic character as it belongs to area of mainly metaphysical or scholastic disputes round a choice of terminological "label" for this or that concept or the phenomenon.

By the end of XX – the beginning of the XXI centuries some "views" of language conventional and dominating in linguistic community were created (naturally, within the corresponding general scientific paradigms). These linguistic paradigms can be characterized as follows. First, a view of language as system of signs which contents is defined by their relation to each other (system of values). Within this paradigm (immanetny) of the greatest results reached, as we know, school of structuralism, many theoretical provisions and which methods of scientific research became general scientific property not only in linguistics, but also in other humanities and branches of knowledge (cf., for example, structural anthropology, semiotics, literary criticism, first of all poetics, research of phenomena of culture, the social, psychological phenomena and processes, etc.) . Secondly, a view of language as the activity of the speaking subjects which is carrying out in certain conditions of communication and with a certain installation and the purpose (a lingvopragmatichesky paradigm). Thirdly, a view of language as the tool, which basic purpose – verbal (verbal and speech) communication (a communicative paradigm). Fourthly, a view of language as a form of consciousness and thinking in which the system of knowledge of the person of the world speaking and thinking in this or that language (a cognitive paradigm) is realized.

Naturally, the listed knowledge paradigms in linguistics of the XX-XXI centuries according to "world outlook" approach to a concept "a linguistic paradigm" are allocated at the most general and fragmentary review of a state of affairs in linguistics of the considered period. Here only the most noticeable paradigms about which most often there are disputes and discussions in scientific community and which, so to speak, constantly "very famous" are specified. Any linguist seeking to be aware of the latest scientific developments including a linguistic historiography is obliged to know them.

Are possible, however, and other lists of "views" of language as object of linguistics and, respectively, other list of paradigms of knowledge in science of language. So, for example, Yu.S. Stepanov, characterizing the main "images of language", or "views of language", in the XX century, considers that they can be reduced to the following: "language as the individual's language" (1), "language as the member of the family of languages" (2), "language as structure" (3), "language as system" (4), "language as type and character" (5), "computer approach to language" (6), "language as space of thought and as the house of spirit" [4:19], (see also [5]). Thus the given "images of language", or linguistic paradigms, according to YU.S. Stepanova, don't settle down as historical or chronological change of the scientific eras which are completely denying each other Poetoma the called main linguistic paradigms (are possible also other versions of the list of paradigms) presented in the XX century it is impossible to consider as the alternative, mutually excluding each other approaches to language and when speak about change of paradigms of knowledge, it isn't necessary to understand it that is replacements of one paradigm another. It, really, not simply "changing of the guard", and new approach to language which, perhaps, became actual owing to action of external or actually linguistic reasons.

It is necessary to speak about coexistence of paradigms (a condition of paradigmatic pluralism) as such difficult phenomenon what language of the person is, can't be described by means of one even if the most "revolutionary" or "fashionable" paradigm. The general scientific principle of a complementarity assumes coexistence of several interpretation of any multidimensional phenomenon (such the natural language acts) depending on the point of view of the observer on the studied object, language in particular. Besides, in a linguistic historiography also the situation when there was some kind of "self-return" of this or that paradigm to the different periods of history of linguistics is often noted. Therefore there was quite obvious a need for establishment of the most general regularities of science about language throughout a considerable interval of time. It is felt not only historiographers of linguistics, but also everything who deals with modern problems of linguistics.

It is also required to define a place of each scientific direction in the general development of science about language, to characterize features of separate linguistic school, its contribution to development of science. These and many other aspects of history of linguistic doctrines and a modern linguistic historiography can be presented consistently and with a necessary explanatory force in concepts and terms of the uniform general scientific and historiographic concept. From used in modern theories of language and in a linguistic historiography of conceptual constructions (about them see [3: 204-205]) the greatest explanatory force the theory of a scientific paradigm possesses first of all the concept of a paradigm of knowledge unites various directions and currents in one scientific discipline, promotes their more complete idea by means of the standard initial principles and, at last, helps to resolve a contradiction between theses: "the modern linguistics - uniform science" and "modern linguistics broke up to some independent sciences".
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