

Таким образом, нечеткость дефиниций ключевых терминов свидетельствует о неопределенности понятий, номинированных этими терминами, что, в свою очередь, не позволяет построить четко структурированную модель терминополья языковой политики и сформировать единую терминосистему.

БИБЛИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЕ ССЫЛКИ

1. Языковая политика, конфликты и согласие / Российская Академия наук Институт этнологии и антропологии им. Н.Н. Миклухо-Маклая; редкол.: С.В. Соколовский [и др.]. Москва: ИЭА РАН, 2018. – 334 с.
2. Amorós-Negre, C. Different paradigms in the history of Spanish language policy and planning / C. Amorós-Negre // Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1165232>. – Date of access: 20.12.2019.
3. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: <https://rm.coe.int/1680459f97>. - Date of access: 20.12.2019.
4. Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education / Jean-Claude Beacco [et. al.]. – Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2016. – 167 p.
5. Guide For the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe: Executive Version [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806a892c#_Toc172301779. – Date of access: 20.12.2019.

ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM IN LINGUISTICS AND THE PROBLEM OF METHOD

АНТРОПОЦЕНТРИЧЕСКАЯ ПАРАДИГМА В ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ И ПРОБЛЕМА МЕТОДА

I. A. Gordienko

И. А. Гордиенко

Rostov-on-Don, Russia

Ростов-на-Дону, Россия

e-mail: i.gordienko2017@yandex.ru

The article considers the problem of choosing an adequate methodology for conducting linguistic research in the framework of the anthropocentric approach of the modern polyparadigm system of linguistics.

Keywords: method; paradigm; anthropocentric approach; polyparadigm system of linguistics.

Статья рассматривает проблему выбора адекватной методологии в проведении лингвистических исследований в рамках антропоцентрического подхода современной полипарадигмальной системы языкознания.

Ключевые слова: метод; парадигма; антропоцентрический подход; полипарадигмальная система лингвистики.

Recently, linguistics around the world has been experiencing another scientific revolution, which, first of all, is associated with the crisis of the new scientific paradigm that defines both the issues under study and the methods and techniques used to solve specific linguistic problems.

It is fair to note that today in the world of linguistics there is no single paradigm within which the linguists conduct their research, rather, it is worth talking about a polyparadigm system of linguistics. This is not surprising, because different scientists use different approaches of different scientific paradigms, developed over the long history of linguistics.

Thus, Yu.N. Karaulov distinguishes historical, system-structural, psychological and social paradigms [4].

V.I. Postovalova mentions immanent-semiological, anthropological, theoanthropocosmic (transcendental) paradigms [8].

In the classification of E.S. Kubryakova there are four leading paradigms: traditional, generative, cognitive and communicative. According to the scientist, “each of them combines, although in different proportions, elements of formal description with functional explanations. But each of them represents a special model for describing the language and solving the main problems in its organization and functioning” [6, p. 190].

V.A. Maslova [7, p. 5] identifies three scientific paradigms: comparative-historical, system-structural and anthropocentric.

The author of the article, following V.A. Maslova, adheres to this classification.

As we know, the comparative-historical paradigm was the first scientific paradigm in linguistics, and the comparative-historical method was the first special method of language research.

Within the framework of the system-structural paradigm, the attention of linguists was focused on the word. To date, the language continues to be studied within this scientific paradigm: textbooks and academic grammars, reference publications are based on the methodology developed by the system-structural paradigm.

Anthropocentric paradigm, according to V.A. Maslova, “shifts interests of the researcher from the objects of knowledge on the subject” [7, p. 5], and thus examines man in language and language in man I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay once noted that “language exists only in individual brains, only in

souls, only in the psyche of individuals or of individuals that make up this linguistic society” [2, p. 71].

The anthropocentric orientation of linguistics was seen by V. Humboldt, who defined language as “the world lying between the world of external phenomena and the inner world of man” [3, p. 304].

Later, the French linguist E. Benveniste introduced the author and the addressee as necessary components in the system description of the language, naming one of the parts as “Man in language” of his “General linguistics” [1, p. 45].

In Russian linguistics back in the 70s of the 20th century, Yu.S. Stepanov stated about anthropocentrism as the main principle of modern linguistics: “Language is created by the measure of man, and this scale is imprinted in the very organization of language; according to it, the language should be studied. Therefore, in its main trunk, linguistics will always be a science about language in man and about man in language, a humanitarian science, in a word, such as we find it in the book of Benveniste” [10, p. 15].

As the leading principle of linguistics, anthropocentrism was recognized in the 90s of the 20th century, the essence of which is that “scientific objects are studied primarily by their role for a person, by their purpose in his life, by their functions for the development of human personality and its improvement. It is found in the fact that a person becomes a reference point in the analysis of certain phenomena, that he is involved in this analysis, determining its prospects and final goals” [6, p. 212].

The anthropocentric view of language has led to the expansion of linguistics to other areas of human knowledge, resulting in psycho- and ethnolinguistics, socio- and paralinguistics, linguoculturology and pragmalinguistics, communicative and cognitive linguistics.

From the point of view of the anthropocentric paradigm, a person learns the world through self-awareness, defines his spiritual essence with the help of language, defines his actions, determines his place in language, culture, and society. From the standpoint of research, all this can be determined by studying a person's speech, or rather his language personality.

At the same time, the new paradigm implies new attitudes and goals of language research, new key concepts and methods.

The anthropocentric approach in linguistics and the expansionism of modern linguistics has led to a surprising situation when, on the one hand, linguistics turns to the study of facts not strictly linguistic, using the methodology of other human sciences – psychology, cultural studies, political science, etc., and on the other hand, methodological failures or inaccuracies of research are justified by anthropocentrism.

Therefore, at the present moment in world linguistics there is a rather acute problem of linguistic methodology as such within the framework of the anthropocentric paradigm, since, according to T.V. Dubrovskaya, it is obvious that “methodological admissibility must have its limits in order that scientific knowledge does not turn into the fruit of intuitive guesses and subjective opinion” [9, p. 3].

In the community of linguists, the question of relevance, validity and applicability of linguistic methods in a specific research situation has already been raised. The following materials should be noted in this respect: collections of scientific works “Language and method”, published under the editorship of Professor Dorota Shumskaya on the results of the III International conference “Language and method. Russian language in linguistic research of the XXI century”, conducted at the Jagiellonian University (Krakow, Poland) [11, 12, 13]; monograph by Z.I. Komarova “Methodology, method, technique and technology of scientific research in linguistics” [5]; materials of the III International scientific-practical conference “Modern trends in linguistics and language teaching: the problem of method” held in 2019, edited by T.V. Dubrovskaya (Penza, Russia) [9].

For example, at the last conference in Penza, scientists were interested in the methodology of modern discourse analysis², the application of functional linguistics methods in modern linguistic research³; considered modern⁴ and traditional⁵ methods of conducting language research and ways of interpreting the data; gave an assessment of existing and new methods of analysis of language phenomena and their validity⁶.

² “Was there a method?”: on the principles and categories of modern discourse analysis (Dubrovskaya T. N.) / «А был ли метод?»: о принципах и категориях современного дискурс-анализа (Дубровская Т.Н.).

³ Functional linguistics: new aspects and return to traditions (Alpatov V.M.) / Функциональная лингвистика: новое и возврат к традициям (Алпатов В.М.).

⁴ Methods of linguistic research and processing of the obtained data (Privalova I.V.) / Методы лингвистических исследований и обработка полученных данных (Привалова И. В.).

⁵ To the problem of the diachronic method in political discourse (Lisyutkin I.S.) / К проблеме диахронического метода в политическом дискурсе (Лисюткина И.С.).

⁶ Methods of obtaining material for speech research (Kozhukhova I.V.) / Методика получения материала для речеактовых исследований (Кожухова И.В.); The use of methods of linguosensory in the study of professional scientific discourse (Mukhina Yu.N.) / Использование методов лингвосенсорики при изучении профессионального научного дискурса (Мухина Ю.Н.); The method of questioning in the study of epilinguistic discourse (on the material of the French

In addition, I would like to note that the main problem in the methodology of modern linguistic research is that “hiding behind” the anthropocentric approach to the study of the language phenomenon, many researchers significantly neglect the methodological side of the study, since the methods and techniques of analysis do not always get the proper description and justification in the work.

Yet we should not assume that, in contrast to the anthropocentric approach, the system-structural paradigm with its functional methodological apparatus is superior to other paradigms of linguistics.

If we consider the language as a form of human existence, it should be noted that language, like man, is multi-planed and multi-faceted, so as the use of strict scientific approaches in describing the functional side of language life is quite justified, and the permissibility of using methods and techniques of other human sciences in linguistic matters is quite possible.

The main thing, as it seems, is a strict criterion for selecting the language units or phenomena to be studied, and a clear, applicable to all analyzed phenomena method of their analysis.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

1. Benveniste, E. General linguistics / E. Benveniste. – Moscow, 1974. – 448 p.
2. Baudouin de Courtenay, I.A. Selected works on General linguistics / I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay. – M.: Publishing house of the Academy of sciences of the USSR, 1963. – Vol. 2. – 392 p.
3. Humboldt, V. Selected works on linguistics / V. Humboldt. – M.: Progress, 1984. – 400 p.
4. Karaulov, Yu.N. Russian language and linguistic personality / Yu.N. Karaulov. – M.: Publishing House LKI, 2010. – 264 p.
5. Komarova, Z.I. Methodology, method, technique and technology of scientific research in linguistics: textbook / Z.I. Komarova. – Ekaterinburg: Publishing house of the Ural Federal University, 2012 – 818 p.
6. Kubryakova, E.S. Evolution of linguistic ideas in the second half of the twentieth century / E.S. Kubryakova / Language and science of the late 20th century. – Moscow, 1995. – P. 144-234.
7. Maslova, V.A. Modern linguistic approaches. KSR. Methodical recommendation / V.A. Maslova. – 2003. –37 p.

language) (Nevezhina E.A.) / Метод анкетирования в изучении эпилингвистического дискурса (на материале французского языка) (Невежина Е.А.); The validity of the method of self-observation in the study of professional language personality in the process of its formation (Kinderknecht A.S.) / Валидность метода самонаблюдения в исследовании профессиональной языковой личности в процессе ее формирования (Киндеркнехт А.С.).

8. Postovalova, V.I. Linguoculturology in the light of the anthropological paradigm / V.I. Postovalova // Phraseology in the context of culture. – Moscow, 1999.
9. Modern trends in linguistics and language teaching: the problem of method: collection of scientific articles on the materials of the III international. scientific.-pract. Conf.: in 2 vols. T. I. Methods in linguistics / under the General ed. by T.V. Dubrovskaya. – Penza: publishing house of the PSU, 2019. – 304 p.
10. Stepanov, Yu. S. Introductory article / Yu.S. Stepanov // E. Benveniste. General linguistics. – Moscow, 1974. – P. 5-16.
11. Language and method (1) Russian language in linguistic studies of the XXI century / ed. D. Shumskaya. – Krakow: Publishing house of the Jagiellonian University, 2012. – 377 p.
12. Language and method (2) Russian language in linguistic research of the XXI century. Linguistic analysis on the verge of methodological failure / ed. D. Shumskaya, K. Ozga. – Krakow: Publishing house of the Jagiellonian University and, 2015. – 430 p.
13. Language and method (3) Russian language in linguistic research of the XXI century. Linguistic analysis on the verge of methodological failure / ed. D. Shumskaya, K. Ozga. – Krakow: Publishing house of the Jagiellonian University, 2016. – 386 p.

**РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦИЯ КОНЦЕПТА «НАРОД»
В ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ
МЕДИЙНЫХ СРЕДСТВ КАЗАХСТАНА**

**REPRESENTATION OF THE "PEOPLE" CONCEPT
IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE
OF MEDIA RESOURCES OF KAZAKHSTAN**

*Ж. А. Джамбаева¹⁾, К. О. Жанибекова
Zh. A. Jambayeva¹⁾, K. O. Zhanibekova*

Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева
Нур-Султан, Казахстан

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University
Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

e-mail: ¹⁾dzhambayeva@gmail.com

В статье представлен анализ медиаисточников для выявления способов репрезентации концепта «народ» в политическом дискурсе Казахстана. Материалом исследования выступили публичные выступления Президента Н. Назарбаева, опубликованные на страницах печати, на сайтах, а также видеоматериалы.

Ключевые слова: концепт; дискурс; народ; репрезентация концепта; политическая речь.

The article presents an analysis of media sources to identify ways to represent the concept of "people" in the political discourse of Kazakhstan. The