

Lecture №7

The notion of the man and the linguistics

Indoubtedly, the linguistics always dealt with a problem “ language and the person ” or anyway had it in a kind, only at different stages of history of a science and at different linguistic schools (paradigms) putting accent that on the first, on the second component of this dichotomizing unity. And language "or" the person and Language ” (compare, for example, at J.N.Karaulov - “ Language from “ the big letter ” (Sentries 1987, 4) or the Person is enough for it to pay attention to essentially important accentuation in the following citation on often meeting graphic allocation of type “: “ As it is represented, movement of linguistics XX of a century was drift from the thesis about functioning language “ in itself and for itself ” in the thesis - “ under influence of external circumstances and for us ”. Drift of interest is connected With it from that also *As language connects the person with the Validity?* To that *As language connects the Person with the validity?* ” (Nikolaev 1995, 379). In our opinion, more lawful would be this problem verbalisation not by means of coordinating connection of concepts "person" and "language" (compare, for example, the name of the book of R.A.Budagov “ the Person and its language ” (Budagov 1974), and subordinative, i.e. “ language of the person ” with following accents: “ Language of the person ” and “ language of the Person ”. These two aspects of a problem reflect different approaches to language which can be named linguacentral and antropocentral (Alpatov 1995, 16-19).

At linguaocentral the approach to language the researcher sets as the purpose the description of “ Language of the person ”. The information received from the analysis of speech displays, first of all the information on their substantial party, helps to understand the person, its linguistic nature which varies in national specific language репрезентациях as the organization of the world of semantics in many respects carries idioethnical character. Full enough description of the person is impossible without taking into account its linguistic nature, therefore it is necessary to distinguish not only “ three different plans of existence of the person - the general, biological, first, social both more concrete, secondly, and personal, individual, the most concrete, thirdly ” (the Human factor in language. Language and generation of speech 1991, 16) but also to add to these characteristics of the person the plan linguistic, that does it by not easier essence reasonable, but speaking, homo loquens’ом. Research of linguistic human nature is the primary goal of anthropological linguistics. The decision of this problem will help to recreate an image of the person both through it and with its help a "naive" (language) picture of the world, to describe the basic systems of which there is a person (see Апресян 1995, 348-384). Certainly these systems and components making them cooperate with each other. So, the system of perception of the physical world at the person is in close communications with mental system, and this communication, probably, is under construction not so much on the basis of their any similarity, how many on straight lines, adjacent attitudes. In the linguistic literature already paid to this attention (see, for example, collections “ the Logic analysis of language ”). So, verbs perceptual spheres in Russian *видеть, смотреть, рассматривать, усматривать* and their derivatives describing

visual perception, get in Russian (and not only in Russian) language когнитивный the status in such examples: *Никогда, никогда мы не уедем в Москву... Я вижу, что не уедем* (А.Чехов); *видеть* – ‘понимать’, ‘чувствовать’, ‘осознавать’. *Мы, взрослые люди, на детском горе смотрим очень легко. Разве может ребенок серьезно страдать?* (Н.Помяловский); *смотреть* – ‘относиться определенным образом к чему-либо’. Moreover, cognition the status of similar verbs allows "to see" abstract concepts, actions, attributes: *Случается нередко нам и труд и мудрость видеть там, Где стоит только догадаться За дело просто взяться* (I.Krylov). The doubt, confidence, the assumption, probability, etc. similar mental conditions and the feelings concerning the world of the person, can be described through visual associations: *Он взял Подгорина под руку и все уводил его вперед, видимо, собираясь поговорить с ним о чем-то* (А.Чехов). *Этот скандал, несмотря на видимую ничтожность, обошелся ему дорого* (А.Чехов). On the basis of visual perception it can be transferred and the world of human emotions, in particular surprise: *Где это видано! Виданное ли это дело? Глаза бы мои не видели (глядели, видели)! Смотри-ка!, etc.*

Not мене the interesting information can be taken from the analysis of a word of eyes calling body of sight. The use of this word in Russian паремии is indicative: eyes burn - ‘strong desire’, to do greater (round) eyes - ‘to be surprised’, to look other eyes - ‘to estimate from other point of view’, to stand in opinion of - ‘mentally to present’, to shut eyes to something - ‘purposely to not pay attention’, etc. Thus, the system of physical perception, first of all visual, in the linguistic world of the person is closely connected with its mental world, and consequently rights Н.Д of Arutyunov which writes: “as a whole it is possible to assume, that visions give in cognition processing, than acoustical perception is easier. The first are more connected with the sensual and rational human nature, the second associate more likely with its irrational beginning. In this sense the intuition is closer to hearing, than sight.