

## Lecture №6

### An anthropological paradigm

The anthropological linguistics (and accordingly - an anthropological paradigm) yet has not got full and conventional "citizenship" in difference, for example, from psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, pragmatical linguistics and others already become independent areas of scientific knowledge. It is caused by that circumstance, that till now the object and a subject of anthropological linguistics, its methodological and scientifically-methodical device of research of language and languages, its attitudes and communication with related subjects of modern linguistics and with other humanities finally precisely are not certain. Moreover, in the term " anthropological linguistics " in history of linguistics the different sense (i.e. the internal form of a word "anthropological") depending on object of the given scientific discipline was staticized. It is known, what maintenance 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 in basic synchronic or diachronic to the studying of languages, on which speak people (it is allocated by us - B.J.I.), Not having writings. The theory and methods of modern linguists-anthropologists do not differ a little considerably from the theory and methods of other linguists " (Hoyer 1999, 44). As it is possible to notice, the sense connected with studying of language of people here is staticized. In the scientific literature leaving in Russian, the in detail-substantial party of an anthropological paradigm usually define as studying of language of the person. Therefore as anthropological linguistics understand that aspect of research of a natural language which name the human factor in language more often. However completely not simply to establish, what phenomena and processes are caused and predetermined in language by the human factor and what do not depend on it. It is obvious also, that the problematics of anthropological linguistics is incorrect for reducing to metaphysical connection of two it is artificial divided concepts, namely, concepts of language and the person. Such, "mechanistic", the approach to a problematics of anthropological linguistics is reflected, for example, in the following citation: " In the linguistics which has selected as the methodological basis an anthropological principle, in the center of attention there are two circles of problems: 1) definition of how the person influences language, and 2) definition of how language influences the person, its thinking, culture " (the Role of the human factor in language 1988, 9). Similar statement of a question on a subject of anthropological linguistics involuntarily, but logically quite naturally leads to postulation of position about independent, not existence of language dependent from each other and the person. However still Бодуэн де Куртене, summing up linguistics of XIX century and considering concepts of genealogic classification of languages of the world, in particular the known theory of a family tree of A.Shlejhera and the theory of concentric waves of I.Shmidt, notices: " ... neither that, nor other theory does not maintain criticism as, on the one hand, they start with the assumption, that language exists outside of the person, and with another, does not consider complexity of the phenomena of language " (Boduen de Kurtene 1963. II, 7). Here again it continues: " ... language

cannot exist irrespective of the person ”. The recognition of this unbiased fact as initial посылки an anthropological paradigm and in theoretical and applied researches puts forward its consecutive use, at the same time, the whole complex of the problems caused by interaction such существей, 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 behaviour of the person, 7) language and the communications, 8) language and a society, 9) language and values of the person, 10) language and knowledge (the Role of the human factor in language 1988, 9). We shall add to the listed problems both such: language and speech activity of the person, language and formation at the person of knowledge and opinions on the world, language and речемыслительная activity of the person, language and the information, language and intelligence of the person and still the some people др.

The problematics of anthropological linguistics, thus, is not new, and there are no sufficient bases to consider as its finally generated and conventional direction; only obvious tendencies to it are outlined, therefore it is more lawful to speak about it as about the linguistic paradigm having the background in linguistics and closely connected with a problematics of other adjacent sciences. Besides it is necessary to mean, that as well as a principle антропоцентризма, and an anthropological problematics are understood by linguists of different schools far not unequivocally. About this R.M.Frumkina, assorting Anna Vezhbitskoj's concept about a semantic meta language, writes the following: “ But in fact and itself антропоцентрический the approach can be interpreted differently:

(1) as allowing correctly to understand how language “ actually is arranged and why it is arranged so, instead of differently ”. From the point of view of Vezhbitskaja, "actually" language is arranged especially functionally, i.e. necessarily reflects important for a person using by it. From this with necessity also follows “антропоцентрический” any more only as a principle of the description, and as essential property of the language-object;

(2) as explaining specific property of language, especially important for concept Вежбицкой - it "everywhere-transparency" ...

Thus, the principle антропоцентрический, become to leader in the modern humanities, in linguistics is interpreted differently, and at times it is proclaimed purely, not bringing anything essentially new in a traditional problematics. And consequently E.S.Kubrjakova's rights which writes the following about the human factor in language as the central question of anthropological linguistics: “ At first sight, statement of a question on a role of the human factor in language can seem enough trivial - all 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 rather uneasy, but also because, really, difficultly to allocate that circle of the important problems for all science, in which illumination it is possible to bring something originally new ” (the Human factor in language. Language and generation of speech 1991, 15).