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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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