

New Approaches to a Subject of Anthropocentric Linguistics

Valentine S. Lee^a, Ainakul B. Tumanova^a and Zhanat H. Salkhanova^a

^aAl-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN

ABSTRACT

The article studies theoretical issues of modern anthropocentric paradigm of scientific knowledge from the history of anthropocentric linguistics development as a special field of language science. The purpose of this study is to answer the question about human influence on the semiotic system. The material result is the unification of specific approaches to anthropological linguistics subject. Therefore, approach based on linguistics solved the problem of establishment of the human's linguistic nature, his language world. Conversely, the anthropocentric approach is focused on the person as a subject of speech activity that implements his communicative intentions in certain speech acts oriented to the world of semantics and mental human activities. Offered situations are examined on the actual material of the Russian language, which was analyzed from the standpoint of cognitive semantics. The problematics of anthropological linguistics, therefore, is not new and there are no sufficient grounds to consider it firmly established and generally accepted direction; only obvious trends are outlined, therefore it is better to talk about it as a linguistic paradigm having its own background in linguistics and closely related to other related sciences' issues.

KEYWORDS

the Anthropocentrism principle, language and man,
the human factor in language, linguistic based
approach, cognitive semantics

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 14 June 2016
Revised 26 July 2016
Accepted 03 August 2016

Introduction

On way of knowing of the language nature, linguistics by the end of 20 – beginning 21 century, has reached a high level, evidence of which can serve as linguistic expansionism, which manifests itself not only in the use of linguistic knowledge in all scientific branches, but also in solving practical, applied problems. Here applied linguistics demonstrates (Kubriakova, 2004; Stepanov, 2009) the high level of modern language science.

Such researchers as P. Kostomarov & A. Ptashkin (2015) focus on the anthropocentric approach to linguistics in the discourse of authorship. D.M.

CORRESPONDENCE Ainakul B. Tumanova ✉ a.tumanova@inbox.ru

© 2016 Lee, Tumanova and Salkhanova. Open Access terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) apply. The license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, on the condition that users give exact credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if they made any changes.

Dreeva (2016) explores the phenomenon of intertextuality as a category from the point of view of anthropocentric approach, while N.N. Boldyrev & O.G. Dubrovskaya (2016) state that socio-cultural discourse of text research is an integral part of anthropocentric approach. T.V. Romanova (2015) in the study of the latter relies on the history of linguistics, and J.V. Krochuk (2015) refers to the language view of the individual. All these researchers somehow appeal to the anthropocentric nature of linguistics, and the conflict is implemented here only in the detection methods of anthropocentric grain in linguistics.

The problem becomes more urgent, because with a large number of simultaneous researches in the linguistic field that have related insights, there is still no recognition of anthropocentric linguistics as a field of knowledge.

Thus, the practical value of this study lies in the consolidation of linguists' anthropocentric views, which will result in the knowledge field adoption of anthropological linguistics in the system of linguistic science.

Purpose

To establish the impact of new approaches to anthropocentric linguistics and to determine their importance for the linguistic science development.

Objectives

To determine the list of cognitive approaches to linguistic science, as well as the paradigm of anthropocentric linguistics.

Method

In this work, the interdisciplinary methods, structural and linguistic analysis were used. In addition, the influence of the exact sciences were introduced in linguistic analysis of mathematical and logical methods. However, at the same time, the described impact resulted in the isolation of linguistics, its deposition from humanities and the extract of language national specifics. The impact of anthropological philosophy and psychology returns linguistics to the humanitarian context.

Moreover, linguistic analysis becomes a part of philosophy and psychology, which fully corresponds to the anthropocentric approach.

Results

In the language science, traditionally, there are three scientific paradigms: a comparative historical (characteristic for linguistics of the XIX century and based on the comparative-historical method), the system-structural (which is centered on the word), and finally, anthropocentric, which "returned to the human the status of "all things' harmony" and returned him to the center of the universe" (de Courtenay, 1963).

Pre-paradigmatic state of anthropocentric linguistics determines it as a developing field of knowledge about man and semiotic systems, which in the future can become a separate branch of linguistics. What determines the value of this probability?

First, the view of language as a system of signs, the content of which is determined by their relation to each other (a value system). In the framework of this paradigm (immanent), the school of structuralism reached most of the



results. The theoretical principles and methods of its scientific research became the scientific domain not only in linguistics but also in other humanitarian sciences and branches of knowledge (compare, for example, structural anthropology, semiotics, literary studies, poetry, the study of the culture phenomena, social and psychological phenomena and processes).

Secondly, the view of language as speaking subjects' activity, which is achieved in certain conditions of communication with a particular purpose (lingual-pragmatic paradigm).

Thirdly, the view of language as a tool, the main purpose of which is verbal communication (communication paradigm).

Fourthly, the view of language as a form of consciousness and thinking, which is implemented in the system of human knowledge about the world, speaking and thinking particular language (cognitive paradigm).

A substantive side of the anthropological paradigm (subject and object) is the study of human language. However, it is not easy to establish, which phenomena and processes are determined and predefined in the language by the human factor, and which do not depend on it. It is also clear that it is incorrect to keep the problems of anthropological linguistics to the metaphysical connection of two artificially shared concepts, namely the concepts of language and human.

Therefore, a change of view on language can be represented with the help of following projection: if in the structural paradigm, the attention of researchers was focused on the chess board, its figures (signs), game rules (language structure), now the research interest has shifted to the players themselves. This determined the nomination of anthropocentrism as the leading principle of modern linguistics.

Discussion

What is the list of knowledge paradigms in the language science?

For example, S.Y. Stepanov (2009), characterizing the main "language images" or "perspectives on language", believes that they can be reduced to the following: "the language as the individual language" (1); "language as a member of a language family" (2); "language as a structure" (3); "language as a system" (4); "language as a type and character" (5); "computer approach to language" (6); "language as a thought field and as the spirit house" (7). The following "language images" or linguistic paradigms, according to S.Y. Stepanov (2009), are not arranged in order of historical or chronological change of the scientific eras, completely negating each other: "...throughout the twentieth century, different definitions of language and, consequently, different "language images" alternated each other in the linguistic science.

However, the evolution proceeded so that each subsequent definition did not entirely displace the previous, and included some of its traits." That is why the denoted basic linguistic paradigms (there are other versions of the list of paradigms (Kubryakova, 2004), presented in recent years cannot be considered alternative, mutually exclusive language approaches. When talking about changing knowledge paradigms, it should not be understood in the sense of one paradigm replacement by another. It is not just a "changing of the guard", but a new approach to language, which may have become relevant due to the external

or actual linguistic reasons. We should also consider the coexistence of paradigms (according to certain historians of science, the paradigmatic pluralism state), as such a complex phenomenon as human language cannot be described by a single paradigm, even the most “revolutionary” or “trendy”.

General scientific complementarity principle presupposes the coexistence of multiple interpretations of any multidimensional phenomenon (such as a natural language) depending on the perspective of the observer to the investigated object, language, in particular. In addition, there is also a described situation in linguistic historiography, when there was a kind of “self-return” of different paradigms in different periods of the linguistics history. S.Y. Stepanov (2009) introduces such an example: “Completing the description of pragmatics or being close to its completion, the paradigm begins a new turn of the spiral – the semantics description, probably followed by the syntactic description, enriched with pragmatics, and finally, the pragmatics description on a new, higher level.”

There are, however, more complicated situations, when a kind of “reconciliation” appears at a certain stage of scientific knowledge development, a synthesis of the opposing paradigms in the field of new issues, in particular in the field of cognitive science. “The contours of a new paradigm are the following: semantics and pragmatics “throw antenna” (through the complex cognitive problems) to the biology areas, on the one hand, and to the mythology areas, “deep mythology”, “conceptualized areas” on the other. In turn, both areas detect trends towards convergence”. A similar trend is observed in recent decades in linguistics: “despite the diversity of paradigms, the appearance of modern linguistics is defined by the convergence of its two main opposed paradigms (cognitive and communicative) and the formation of a unified system of assumptions” (Kubryakova, 2004). This system of assumptions is the basis of those theoretical principles that define the status of modern linguistics as a single branch of scientific knowledge.

The change of knowledge paradigms in the history of any science always causes the deepening of scientific reflection, accompanied by a revision of the very foundations of this branch of knowledge. Particularly acute, this process occurs in the humanities: “...the practice of scientific research in the field of astronomy, physics, chemistry or biology normally has no reason to challenge the very foundations of these sciences, whereas among psychologists and sociologists that occurs often” (Kuhn, 2009). This observation can reasonably be attributed to the state of modern linguistics. In the framework of the established beliefs about the studied object (in this case, the human language) under the influence of new, non-traditional scientific postulates and assumptions, the new principles begin to take shape governing the disciplinary matrix of the emerging paradigm or paradigms. In the historiography of scientific knowledge such state is called iparadigms or operativsystem when “...especially characterized by frequent and serious debate about the legality of the methods, problems and standard solutions” (Kuhn, 2009).

In linguistics, this condition happened at the end of XX – beginning of XXI centuries. The middle of the twentieth century was marked by new trends. A fresh look at the language penetrated from the outside: from the exact sciences – on the one hand, and the sciences of man and his world on the other. In the first case, it was about borrowing methods, while in the second – more about borrowing ideas.



Thus, the view of language as the source of human cognition has attracted interest not only to language as a self-sufficient value, but also to the things that man discusses by the language, what knowledge about the world he puts into his language and how does he manipulate with this linguistic knowledge. This knowledge defines the content side of general scientific and linguistic principles, which bring together all the knowledge paradigms of the last decades. The aspect “what man discusses by the language” has prioritized the study of the language semantics on a new level. The aspect of “what knowledge about the world do people invest in language and how does the language correlate with this knowledge about the world” revived the problem that is most often associated with teaching the language (naïve) worldview. Aspect “how does person manipulate his language knowledge” was reflected in linguistic pragmatics and neofunctionalism.

Under the influence of anthropocentrism, non-traditional approaches to the description of individual language systems, language levels and their units were formed. The inclusion of the so-called human factor into the scope of the linguistic research put forward the functional approach to language (the principle of neofunctionalism) into the number of leading contemporary scientific principles.

Functionalism as a linguistic principle is based on a number of assumptions, often differing from established in traditional schools understanding of the purpose of language scientific description. First of all, it is the study of language in action, in its functions. Because of this, the object of linguistics is not a language (in Saussure sense), but speech, recognition of speech and language as an ontologically unified phenomenon. Orientation to the speech, particularly to the statement, discourse, forces us to reconsider the theory of hierarchical organization of language, reordering its units not by place in the general hierarchical system, but using their internal functions. However, the main thing in modern functionalism is the principal setting for the study and description of language from the semantic functions to the means of their realization in language. In this respect, functionalism takes into account the different approaches to language, depending on the role, in which the user of the language distinguishes grammar, speaker and listener in the speech act. They may not be the same due to different objectives of both (speaker and listener).

Becoming the leading general scientific principles of modern linguistics, anthropocentrism and functionalism largely determine the further development of linguistics and at the same time change ideas about the goals and objectives of the scientific research. These changes are primarily associated with the rejection of rigid, categorical schemes of the language description (the rejection of the definitional description principle), of a purely taxonomic approach to the analysis of the language system. Moreover, they are associated with the reorientation to the description-explanation (principle of explanatoriness: “The HOW-linguistics (taxonomy superiority), successes of which marked this century, will be replaced by WHY-linguistics (the explanation superiority)”. It is accepted to distinguish the different types of explanations depending on the goals and objectives of the study, characteristics of object and subject descriptions. For example, in the semantics it is usual to distinguish between denotative and significative descriptions. In the first case, the explanation is taken to be some object of reality or of its verbal sign, the second explanation is

given by using the intra-language resources, i.e. more explicit expressions with fully or partially equivalent meaning.

The essence of the explanatoriness principle is the priority of description-explanation over the description-definition. However, this principle in modern linguistics acts more like a trend, not as an imperative in researches. In this sense, the research and methodological apparatus of modern anthropocentric and anthropological paradigm explains human nature, especially its linguistic nature.

Directly anthropological linguistics (and thus the anthropological paradigm) has not yet acquired full and recognized “citizenship” in contrast to, for example, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, pragmatic linguistics, and others that have become independent fields of scientific knowledge. This is due to the fact that till now the object and subject of anthropological linguistics, its methodological and methodical apparatus of the study of language and languages, its relationships and communication with related disciplines of modern linguistics and the other humanities are not clearly defined.

A substantive side of the anthropological paradigm is the study of human language. However, it is not easy to establish, which phenomena and processes are determined and predefined in the language by the human factor, and which do not depend on it. It is also clear that the problems of anthropological linguistics are incorrect to keep to the metaphysical connection of two artificially separated concepts, namely the concepts of language and person.

Such a mechanistic approach to anthropological linguistics is reflected, for example, in the following quote: “In linguistics, which has chosen the anthropological principle as its methodological bases, in the center of attention are two issues: 1) identifying how do people affect the language, and 2) determining how does language influence the person, his thinking, culture” (Nikolaeva, 2008). Such a question on the subject of anthropological linguistics leads to the postulation of the provision on autonomous, independent existence of language and person.

However, Baudouin de Courtenay (1963), summarizing the results of the XIX century linguistics and considering the concept of languages’ genealogical classification, says: “... neither one nor the other theory is not tenable, as, on the one hand, they proceed from the assumption that language exists outside of person, on the other hand, does not take into account the complexity of the language phenomena”. Moreover, he continues: “... the language cannot exist independently from the person”. The recognition of this immutable fact as a presupposition of anthropological paradigm and its sequential use in theoretical and applied research advances a number of problems caused by the interaction of entities such as: 1) language and the mental activity of the person; 2) language, thought and consciousness of a person; 3) human language and physiology; 4) the language and psyche of the individual; 5) language and culture; 6) language and human behavior; 7) language and communication; 8) language and society; 9) language and human values; 10) language and cognition. Let us add the following problems to the enumerated: language and speech activity of a person, language and the formation of human knowledge and opinions about the world, language and speech-thinking activity of a person, language and information, language and human intelligence.



Listed problems clearly show that in the framework of anthropological paradigm of language, the interests of many disciplines of modern linguistics intersect, some of which have a fairly long and rich history (for example, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, philosophy of language, linguistic epistemology, ethno linguistics, pragmalinguistics, linguoculturology).

In addition, it should be borne in mind that both the principle of anthropocentrism and anthropological perspectives are not clearly understood by linguists of different schools. The concept of A. Vezhbetskaya (2001) about semantic metalanguage claims: “The anthropocentric approach can be interpreted in different ways: (1) as helping to understand how the language actually works and why it works this way and not otherwise.” From the A. Vezhbetskaya (2001) point of view, “in fact” language is arranged functionally, i.e. it necessarily reflects the important points to the person; (2) as explaining the specific property of language, especially important for the whole concept of A. Vezhbetskaya (2001) – its “ubiquitous transparency”. In further research, R.M. Frumkina (2008) agrees with her.

Thus, the principle of anthropocentrism, which became the leading one in the contemporary humanities, linguistics is interpreted in different ways, and sometimes it is proclaimed purely declarative, without introducing anything fundamentally new in the traditional perspective. Y.S. Kubryakova (2004), who writes the following about the human factor in the language as the central issue of anthropological linguistics: “At first glance, the question itself about the role of the human factor in the language may seem rather trivial – all in a language created by man, and the language itself exists for the individual. In fact, however, we are dealing with problems of incredible complexity, and not only because everything associated with man, it is very difficult, but also because, indeed, it is difficult to highlight the range of important for the whole science problems, in which you can make something truly new.” However, linguistics will always refer to this eternal problem, however, is not eliminating completely the need to consider the language “in itself and for itself”.

Undoubtedly, linguistics has always addressed the issue of “language and people”, or at least had it in my mind, only at different stages of the history of science and in different linguistic schools (paradigms) focus on the ground, the second component of this dichotomous unity. Enough attention is paid to common graphical highlighting of type “People and Language” or “Man and Language” (e.g., Y. N. Karaulova – “Language with the “capital letter”) or the crucial emphasis in the following quote: “It seems that the movement of the linguistics of the twentieth century was the drift from the thesis about the functioning of language “in itself and for itself” – “under the influence of external circumstances and for us.” Linked to this is the drift of the interest is on how language connects people with Reality? to How language connects people with reality?” (Nikolaev, 2008).

In our opinion, the more legitimate it would be to not verbalize with coordinating the connection of concepts “man” and “language” (for example, the title of the book budaqov “Man and his language”, 1976), and subordinating, i.e. “human language” with the following emphases (graphic selections): “the human language” and “language of man”. These two aspects reflect the different approaches to language, which can be called linguistically and anthropocentric

(two types of linguistic descriptions V.M. Alpatov (2005) – systematic and anthropocentric).

When linguastream approach to language, the researcher aims at the description of “the human Language”. The information obtained from the analysis of speech manifestations, particularly information about their content, helps to understand the person, its linguistic nature, which varies in the national specific of linguistic representations, because the organization world semantics (cognitive semantics) largely idioethnic, national-cultural character (Boldyrev, 2014) and a work on linguistics, ethnolinguistics). A fairly complete description of the man is impossible without considering its linguistic nature, it is therefore necessary to distinguish not only three different plans of existence of the person – biological, personal, individual, but add to these characteristics of human linguistic plan that makes it not just a rational being, but speaking, homo loquens'ohms. The linguistic study of human nature is the main task of anthropological linguistics. The solution of this problem will help to recreate the image of man, and through him, and with his help naive linguistic picture of the world, describe the major systems that make up man (Apresyan, 2009).

Of course, these systems and their constituent components interact with each other. Thus, the system of perception of the physical world the person is in close relations with the mental system, and this, apparently, is based not so much on the basis of any similarities, how many direct and related situated on equal latitude with the relationship. In the linguistic literature already addressed attention to it (see, for example, collections of “Logical analysis of language”). Therefore, verbs of perceptual realms to see, to watch, to consider, to discern, and their derivatives, that characterize visual perception, acquire in the Russian (and not only Russian) language and cognitive status in such instances: never, we Never go to Moscow... I see that you do not go; to see ‘to understand’, ‘feel’, ‘to realize’. We, adults, on children's grief looks very easy. Unless the child is seriously hurt?; watch – ‘treated in a certain way to something’. Therefore, one can “see through” or “see” something that exists only in his consciousness and in the subconscious (vision, dream, etc.). Moreover, the cognitive status of such verbs allows us to “see” abstract concepts, actions, and indications: it happens quite often to us and work and wisdom to see where it stands can only guess for the cause just to take. Doubt, confidence, conjecture, probability, or other similar mental States and feelings relating to the world of man, can be described through visual association: He took Podgorin by the arm and led them all forward, apparently intending to talk to him about something. This scandal, despite his apparent insignificance, has cost him dearly. On the basis of visual perception can be passed, and the world of human emotions, in particular surprise: Where have you seen! Have you seen this case? My eyes have not seen (looked, seen)! Look! etc.

More interesting information can be extracted from the analysis of the word eye, who calls himself the organ of vision. Significant use of this word in Russian paremia: my eyes are burning – ‘strong will’ open one's eyes wide – ‘to be surprised’, make a new look – ‘rate from another point of view’, to stand in the eyes of – ‘imagine’, shut one's eyes to something – ‘to deliberately not pay attention’, etc. Thus, the system of physical perception, primarily visual, linguistic world of man is closely connected with his mental world.



For Indo-European languages appear to be characterized by the prominence of a verb of visual perception. In support of this provision is the Russian verb *look* in the meaning 'to seem', 'to introduce myself' (for example, this hypothesis seems more convincing), which is known to be a carbon copy of the German 'aussehen' (look).

In creating the linguistic image (portrait) of a man, his inner world may also participate in the language phenomena, denotative associated with the physical world and describing, in particular, the natural properties of those or other material objects fact or describing certain processes inherent in them. Therefore, in the Russian language, the verbs to burn, to cool down and the adjectives hot, cold in the cognitive functions describe the world of feelings and human emotions: Insarov had long ago finished all their fees and were eager hurry to escape from Moscow. His ugly face, animated a quick ride, glowed with hardihood and determination. From the other side: the excitement, the anger in me was so strong that I did not expect allegiance hands and to give yourself time to cool down, gave him the first shot.

A fairly wide range of man's inner world is described using adjectives like hot and cold: It was the evil, cold and sarcastic person.

Thus, when linguastream approach to human language that we can learn from the language (or rather speech) formations are very interesting and very useful information about the linguistic world of man, describe the image and to create a language portrait of a man.

Manipulation of language is connected with intellect to human activity, with its capacity, based on knowledge about the world, knowledge of vocabulary and grammar to develop linguistic scenario, to describe and define roles for participants of the "language game". In this approach, the focus of linguistics is human language, linguistic competence of the subject, ie the use of language, its functioning in the speech, which ultimately contributes to the verification of language-speech as an ontologically unified phenomenon. This view of language (anthropocentric) draws special attention to the facts that traditionally imposed beyond the language system and interpreted as a phenomenon of marginal character. Methodologically, this was motivated by the search for common system, the desire to be more objective in their observations and conclusions, the desire to develop seemingly precise methods of research to get closer to the essence of the object.

The implication in the language is not that other, as a consequence of the functioning of language-speech as a result of the use of language, the result of the manipulation of the language and manipulate perpetrated by homo loquens'ohms. A similar manifestation of "the human factor in language ' can be seen on all levels and in all types of voice implementations.

As illustrative material it is possible to consider the occurrences in the speech forms of the imperative. For example, in describing some of the situations and events in negative constructions of the Russian language is possible only continuous verbs.

As subtly noted by T. V. Bulygina (2014), "the perfect can't be a verb, signifying an action which depends on the will of the subject." As examples are correct and anomalous use (Bulygina, 2014). Indeed, the value of the 'depends/does not depend on the will of the subject' should be recognized in this

case, one of the distinctive features of the species of opposition to the verb. Perfect, as you can see, means an action not controlled by an entity not subject to him, which appears most clearly in such examples: We have no power in their pomestie. Don't you dare banish sloth! Happy or not happy, Feed him, don't poach!

The priority of the semantic over grammatical form A.A. Potebnia (1985) expressed the following: "There are languages in which the summing up, under the overall scheme, what are the object and its spatial relations, action, time, person, etc., requires a new effort of thought. What we form in them is just content, so the grammatical forms they do not have." Indeed, the overcoming of the form "requires a new effort of thought, and this thought is not connected with the compliance with formal grammatical rules (in the words of A.A. Potebnia (1985), "not costing us... almost in anything"), and on summing up the content under a common scheme." These thoughts of A.A. Potebnia (1985) consonant with modern ideas about the nature of grammar. In confirmation of this we quote A. Vezhbitskaya (2001): "...the grammar encodes meaning. It is not a system of rules for generating grammatically correct sentences, but a system of rules for generation and interpretation of meaningful statements. The main problem is not the speaker to produce grammatically correct sentences, and to say what he wants to say and to understand what others say".

In this approach to grammar and its categories, in particular to morphological, grammatical forms and grammatical meanings is not just a combatant elements and markers with which the creation of meaningful, semantically referential (marked) statements highlight the will and intentions of the speaking subject (what is called illocutionary force).

The role of markers may also be units that are traditionally not summarized under the category of grammar, but the speaker uses them on a par with the latter. Indicative in this respect is the so-called predicates of propositional attitudes, which is administered dependent proposition and express the attitude on the part of the subject installation (Lee, 2016). Valent orientation of their on a proposition determines the grammatical role of a predicate of propositional installation, which is to express the syntactical relation between the main part of the complex sentence and subordinate sentence exposed a basic implementation of a proposition, for example: Lisa was sorry for the indiscreet question expressing secret windy Tomsk. Ivan loves, if someone makes a gift or a present. This he liked very much. The old man never wanted us to leave.

However, the formal-syntactic (combatant) properties of predicates of propositional units allow combining them with the infinitive, nominalisation, nouns: I like to read, reading, the mountains, thirsty, ice cream. In all these cases, propositional setting, associated with mental activity of the person, specifies the semantics of the words, which occupies the syntactic position of the dependent component. In addition, the semantics are tied to world events and situations with the world nepredmetno objects, because proposition – cognitive model of what is happening. Thus, predicates of propositional relations function as markers propositional (event) values. In addition to verbs, as markers of propositional settings are also used names. Thanks to these markers (in this case, the predicates propositional setting) speaking the subject implements his communicative intentions, overcoming the restrictions of the system and the



resistance level of language proficiency. Indicative in this respect, the use of the Russian language in a specific subject nouns in the event the meaning: I want a new suit – ‘I want to buy (made, gave, etc.) new suit’. A specific subject name suit becomes a sign of a proposition and denotes in this case not an object, but an event associated with it. Occurs thus the manipulation of language and manipulation of language by using the predicates of propositional relations, which focused on the world of the mental sphere, the internal state of the speaker of the subject.

Sometimes in functions propositional units can be the relationship neprofesionalni verbs, including verbs of perceptual sphere (Apresyan, 2009). In addition, some verbs combine both functions. Therefore, for example, if the verb to love is a dependent object gets a different reference in different combinations: 1) she likes Peter, 2) Tanya loves movies (books, opera). In the second statement in contrast to the first the name of the object becomes propositive meaning, namely, ‘likes to watch movies, to read books, to listen to opera’. Propositive (event) value is created here and in similar examples as a result of updating the generic status object name, in the case of a specific subject name is emphasized by the plural form: She loves books, flowers, mountains, etc. (the incorrect use of these statements forms singular: *She likes a book, a flower, a mountain). Resistance forms of knowledge of Russian language is to overcome it with the help of the content of the verb to like: She likes the book, the flower, etc.

Propositional or substantive reference of a name can sometimes speak in opposition of variability of case forms, acting in the function of token semantics. This drew the attention A.A. Zaliznyak (2006): “the correlation with the object or situation is due to the distribution of the accusative or the genitive with the verb to be afraid of in the Russian language: Supplement in the form of the accusative is a substantive value, and in the form of the genitive – propositive”.

Subject name gets the value of the event with markers (including grammatical categories), by which what was the form becomes the content. This process of semantic development of the forms is cognitive in nature, and this again appears the human factor in language.

Practical application

Overall anthropocentric approach to language that focuses on the world of semantics and mental activities of a person, revises the existing theory to draw attention to the facts, is not seen the same concepts, to get closer to the essence of language and human nature, therefore, it should be recognized that anthropocentrism as the leading principle of scientific opens new perspectives to linguistics. Presented in this article approaches to definition of the subject of the anthropocentric paradigm will contribute, in our opinion, the establishment of the ontology of language as being human, because when linguastream approach to semiotic system, you can retrieve information about the linguistic world of man, describe the image and to create a language portrait of a man.

The principle of anthropocentrism is not just brought linguistics into the fold of the Humanities, he changed the subject, put forward new theories and concepts that are introduced in the field of view of the researcher the facts and phenomena previously considered marginal to linguistics, and finally made substantial changes in the research unit and the language (or metalanguage) linguistics. However, anthropocentrism as a general scientific and own linguistic

principle manifests itself not only in a set-theoretical declarations, but also in the specific research practice in the heart of the solution general and particular problems and, more importantly, in view of the language. In addition, the anthropocentric approach puts us in the modern linguistics a new humanistic objectives, which largely determine the relevance of a problem, for the solution of which is taken to be a linguist.

Functionalism, like anthropocentrism, and promotes the development of linguistic pragmatics, theory of speech acts, theory of discourse, functional grammar, and in these branches of knowledge is the development of the theme of this study.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Valentine S. Lee holds a Doctor of the Philology, Professor of Department of Russian Philology and World Literature, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Ainakul B. Tumanova holds a Doctor of the Philology, Professor of Department of Russian Philology and World Literature, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Zhanat H. Salkhanova a Doctor of the Education, Professor of Department of Russian Philology and World Literature, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

References

- Alpatov, V. M. (2005). *History of Linguistics*. Moscow: Languages Slavic culture, 367 p.
- Apresyan, Y. D. (2009). *Research in Semantics and Lexicography*. Moscow: Languages Slavic culture, 568 p.
- Courtenay Baudouin de J. N. (1963). *Selected Works on General Linguistics*. St.Petersburg: Authors, 315 p.
- Boldyrev, N. N. (2014). *Cognitive Semantics. Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. Tambov: Derzhavin Tambov State University press, 236 p.
- Boldyrev, N. N. & Dubrovskaya, O. G. (2016). Sociocultural Commitment of Cognitive Linguistics. *Ilha do Desterro*, 69(1), 173-182.
- Budagov, R. A. (1976). *A Person and His Language*. Moscow: Moscow University press, 253 p.
- Bulygina, T. V., & Shmelev, A. D. (2014). *Language Conceptualization of the World*. Moscow: Nauka, 482 p.
- Dreeva, D. M. (2016). Onomastic Citation as the Means of Expression of Intertextual Connections in the Poetic Discourse. *Science Vector of Togliatti State University*, 2(36), 242-246.
- Frumkina, R. M. (2008). *Psycholinguistics: Manual for graduate students*. Moscow: "Akademiia" press, 320 p.
- Kostomarov, P., & Ptashkin, A. (2015). The Identification of "Author" and "Addressee" in the Discourse of the Representative of Volga Germans of Siberia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 206, 103-107.
- Krochuk, J. V. (2015). Language Personality as an Investigation Object of Anthropocentric Linguistic Studies. *Molodiy vcheniy*, 17(2), 204-214.
- Kubriakova, Y. S. (2004). *Language and Knowledge*. Moscow: Languages Slavic culture, 560 p.
- Kuhn, T. S. (2009). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Moscow: AST, 310 p.
- Lee, V. (2016). On Human Factor Influence on Semantic Processes in the Language System. *GISAP: Philological Sciences*, 9, 224-231.
- Nikolaeva, T. M. (2008). *Non-paradigmatic Linguistics*. Moscow: Languages Slavic culture, 376 p.



- Potebnia, A. A. (1985). From the Notes on Russian Grammar, I-II. Moscow: *Prosveschenie*, 549 p.
- Romanova, T. V. (2015). Tracing the Roots of Cognitive Linguistics in Hermann Paul's Principles of the History of Language. *Respectus Philologicus*, 28(33). 142-154.
- Stepanov, S. Y. (2009). *Methods and Principles of Modern Linguistics*. Moscow: Nauka, 313 p.
- Vezhbitskaya, A. (2001). *Understanding Cultures Through Key Words*. Moscow: Languages Slavic culture, 288 p.
- Zaliznyak, A. A. (2006). *The Ambiguity in Language and the Ways of its Representation*. Moscow: Languages Slavic culture, 672 p.