

Transitioning Linguistics from Abstraction to Reality, from Intra-Disciplinarity to Inter-Disciplinarity

Lazzat Zhanalina and Luiza Fot

Kazakh National Pedagogical University Named after Abai, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract: The article discusses the history how linguistics is defining its subject of study where an alternation between abstract language modelling and attempts to reify its reality are discovered, accompanied with transition from purely linguistic approaches to interdisciplinary. Commonly broader conception of contemporary studies of language is demonstrated through anthropocentric paradigm which is a foundation for integrative ideology. The latter strives to holistic representation of language and proliferates via multiplication of intra-linguistic integrative models as well as via interdisciplinary descriptions of language. Both have to combat limitations of scientific knowledge about linguistic reality due to complementarity principle that they both share.

Key words: Integrative approach • Integrative linguistics • Intra- and inter-disciplinary integration

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary language studies saw proliferation of the term “paradigm” which took hold in linguistics. Recently, it is ever more frequently associated with “linguistic theory”, “linguistic approach”, “school of linguistics” and as such allows to demonstrate the hierarchy of multiple ideas and approaches in contemporary science of linguistics.

Study of language is directed by the subject itself is reflected in the body of applied scientific methods, approaches, principles; results in terminological diversity and structured scientific description. Due to these factors, study of language reshapes the real subject into a gnoseological phenomenon. Selected position works as a marker of reality in this state of “reflected language”. In the words of E. Benveniste, we believe that we can comprehend the linguistic fact directly as some objective reality. Factually, “we comprehend it only from a certain point of view which must be defined” [1: 53].

The centuries-long history of linguistics witnessed its development as a constant change of different approaches which included attempts to describe language as either gnoseological models or an ontological given. George Lakoff confirms this oscillation by differentiating between experientialism and objectivism: “Experientialism

is thus defined in contrast with objectivism” [2: xv]. Language as an abstraction is typical for medieval Oriental and European linguistic traditions where knowledge of language is combined with philosophy and logic. It is not entirely pure and complemented by language as reality due to attempts to develop applied approaches, trying to teach language and commenting texts. Universal grammar is the apex of knowledge-based linguistics at this time period. Development of methodological dimensions of the science such as principles of describing language (lexicographic, etymological, historical, phonetic), defining structure of language study, construction of its vocabulary, laid foundation for establishing study of language as an independent science by early 19th century when the period of ‘traditional linguistics’ ended.

New state is marked by prioritizing specific language, gnoseology of describing which is linked to comparison, which took form as linguistic comparativism based on comparative-historical method.

Domination of comparative-historical language study in 19th century marked a new level of ‘gnoseology’ of language as a subject of study which was evident in attempts to reconstruct protolanguage. In broader sense, comparative-historical method required study of knowledge about language reality rather than language

reality itself due to its temporal distance from the researcher and as such relied on an intellectual process as a method of research.

A new worldview takes hold in 20th and early 21st century. Latest developments in other sciences B mathematics, logic, semiotics, anthropology, ethnography, analytical philosophy and so on B directs attention of linguists to structural-system organization of language and its functioning in sync.

This stage reveals clear fluctuations between a 'gnoseological' subject and an 'ontological' one. Modelling exhibits the knowledge basis of systemic-structural representation of language. It is limited to demonstrating language relations in general or focus on specific manifestations of language units, their aspects. Methodology of relativity and reductionism, inherent to linguistic structuralism, rapidly exhausted its resources. Linguistics faced the necessity of expanding its platform by using methodology of other sciences, developing new research instruments. Particularly, it became important to formulate new interdisciplinary and multidimensional vision of language which would integrate advances of various sciences and encompass different dimensions of language through unifying descriptions of system-structural languages stored in memory and language in its function of a speech act. Approaching language in its two major forms of existence represents an attempt to reconstitute language as holistic subject and demonstrates evolution of study towards 'ontologization', to language reality. Advancement of the anthropological principle to the leading position and emergence of a multitude of theories due to the multitude of language applications heralds these new heights in linguistics.

Specifically, second half of 20th century dominant language-centric paradigm (represented mostly by the systemic-structural approach) loses out in favor the anthropocentric paradigm which for the first time in its long history was able to claim leadership role. Language always had a vital role in defining ethnic identity and issues of links between language and culture, individual and language were frequently studied including those by W. von Humbolt, A.A. Potebni, E. Benveniste, H. Steinthal and others. However, the necessity of an integrative approach to the study of language and its unity with individuals became widely recognized only in the last century. Studies by Franz Boas, Edward Sapir, Benjamin Lee Whorf contributed to development of anthropocentric approach in linguistics. Beeman associates them with early stages of integration of

linguistics and anthropology [3]. Anthrocentric approach helped researchers to switch their focus from the subject of study to its object, that is, within this scientific paradigm, both individual within language as well as language within an individual are analyzed. Individual is a point of reference in the analysis of various phenomena and processes, he is involved in this analysis and defines its perspectives and ultimate goals. Individual in modern science, according to E.S. Kubryakova, is the hallmark of "tendency to put an individual at an apex of theoretical foundation for research and determines a specific approach" [4: 212].

Generally it is accepted that the history of development of language study is represented by the succession of three scientific paradigms:

- Comparative-historical paradigm specific to language studies in 19th century (such scientific paradigm is based on comparative-historical method);
- Systemic-structural paradigm founded on an attempt to formulate systematic description of language units, their functions and peculiarities of interaction of units at different levels;
- Anthropological paradigm whereas research focus is placed on the object of comprehension B individual in a language and language in an individual.

Main Body: In the midst of the anthropological paradigm, which diverges in an anthropocentric (individual in a language) and lingocentric (language in an individual) directions, a new integrative linguistic paradigm emerged and is gaining strength. It is in an attempt to present different models of integrative representation of language due to the complexity of object's multiplicity, its dimensions [5] and complexity of combining various aspects of knowledge [6], which so far dealt with through oversimplification. Major principle of integration B complementarity principle B works both in separate integrative model-theories and their resultant integrative paradigm. The former symbolize movement toward the language reality with limitations, the latter stands for removing the limitation thanks to the wholesomeness of the subject established via joining of integrated subjects of different theories. Intra-linguistic integration expands the subject by means of inclusion of its various aspects, that is, multidimensionality. Along with that, linguistics borrows achievements of other sciences and develops multidisciplinary integration, which represents language through the synthesis of various sciences (cognitive psychology, psycholinguistics, neuro-linguistics,

lingo-cognition, lingo-psychology, lingo-culture and so on). J.R. Anderson identifies cognitive psychology as having the largest impact on human sciences: “Cognitive psychology is the foundation for many other areas of social science.” [7: 3].

Contemporary scientific environment insures the autonomy of linguistics by keeping focus on the first type of integration and away from its second type. The most developed models of intra-disciplinary integration in the study of Russian language are cognitive linguistics, theory of linguistic individual, cognitive-discursive approach. Their productiveness is the result of applying integrative approach, principle that allows viewing language as a product of all of its dimensions. Therein, any dimension of the language acts like a litmus test and reacts to a speaker’s cognitive-psychological, cultural-social and physiological dimensions, forming a general conception that goes beyond any particular theory. The broad goal of this theory is to combine the existing multiplicity, as noted by L.K Zhanalina: “Integrative principle envisages expanding language description by including linkage between language and mental process, society, culture, traditions, customs, morality, religion and so on. Y Integrative approach which implements integrative principle is a unification of semasiological and onomasiological, synchronic and diachronic, systemic semantic, functional and cognitive approaches” [8: 11].

Formation of integrative paradigm is evident today through development of new theoretical approaches to language and its units (including text): language is studied as a synergetic dynamic system; a lingo-synergy with special methodology is being implemented; a unified theory of psychological processes, concept of living symbol and other specific methods of studying language material are being created. Such attempts could be found in publications by R.G. Piotrovsky, I.A. Herman, V.A. Pischalnikova, A.A. Zalevskaya, G.G. Moskalkuk, L.O. Butakova, O.A. Staroselets, N.A. Blaznova, A.Y. Korbut, N.I. Doronina and others.

One of the constituent sciences of integrative paradigm is integrative psychology which represents an general approach to psychology. It strives to unify the truths of different psychological theories on the basis of the fact that each of them provides an excellent explanation in their own right but none of them can claim ultimate truth if they do not include discoveries in other fields into consideration.

Conception of integral psychology emerged out of studies of various thinkers of Orient and Europe. The term “integral psychology” was introduced in 1940s by Indra

Sen, student of an Indian mystic Sri Aurobindo. In 1970s, Haridas Chaudhuri contributed to further development of integral psychology who established its foundation in the form a triad of uniqueness principles, interconnectedness and transcendence, corresponding personal, inter-personal and extra-personal spheres of individual experience. More recent studies dedicated to integral psychology are produced within the framework of Ken Wilber’s integral approach who established a common scientific environment for all sciences and other types of information. In 1977 he published his first book entitled “The Spectrum of Consciousness” which attempts to present integral approach to psychology. *Journal of Consciousness Studies* published Ken Wilber’s article “An Integral Theory of Consciousness” in 1997, in there, Wilber lists 12 fields of psychology which may contribute to the establishment of integral model of consciousness. In 1999, he published his monograph, titled “Integral Psychology”, which is a condensed account of his voluminous study of integral psychology that Wilber works on since 1992.

Ken Wilber’s integral model is a synthesis of discoveries that were made in various fields of human life such as psychology, sociology, philosophy, mysticism and religion studies, postmodernism, empirical sciences, systems theory and others. Wilber’s integral model includes five components: quadrants, levels, lines, states and types. These five components (“all quadrants, all levels, all lines, all states, all types”), abbreviated as AQAL (stands for “all quadrants, all levels”), are applicable to all dimensions of human life and general human existence. The identified four quadrants are considered as irreducible basic points of view on anything (that is, anything possible, considering the universality of the model) and include dimensions of *interior individual/1st person* (internal aspects of an individual); *exterior individual/3rd person* (external aspects of an individual); *interior collective/2nd person* (internal aspects of a collective); *exterior collective/3rd person* (external aspects of a collective). Therefore, quadrants are external and external manifestations of individual and collective [9].

The contemporary scientific relevance of Ken Wilber’s ideas is still very high. First of all, as mentioned above, his model combines (integrates) achievements of various fields of science. Secondly, such integral model might be called universal since it can be applied in a variety of fields. Currently, researchers from over 50 different scientific disciplines rely on AQAL model with the goal of developing comprehensive models for solving

various tasks and problems. Principles of integral psychology and integral model find application in such fields as environmental studies, social development, medicine, jurisprudence, psychotherapy and so on. One example of an application of Wilber's integral theory is found in 7-year long educational research project undertaken by Terri O'Fallon [10]. Uniqueness of this model is also in the ease of its adaptability and transformation for studying various kinds of subjects including text, for example.

CONCLUSION

Advancements of integrative approaches to subjects of various sciences open up new horizons for developing integrative linguistics which solidifies its position as an independent discipline. Russian and Kazakhstan's scientists active employ integrative modelling of the Russian language within the framework of various functional and cognitive theories as well as an independent science which complements the disciplinary structure of linguistics. Integrative linguistics (term introduced by L.K. Zhanalina) as an independent science with its own subject of study, structure, methods, scientific approaches and principles, categories, own vocabulary is being developed by L.K. Zhanalina. It has a significant potential for further development thanks to its goal of representing language in its entirety.

Inference: Integrative linguistics represents a new emerging integrative (integral) paradigm, substantiated by growth of multi-aspect modelling of language and interdisciplinary sciences. New paradigm furthers the long established tendency of moving linguistics closer to language reality and away from its abstract representation. It offers new opportunities for overcoming limitations of scientific knowledge through multi-aspect description of language and its enrichment with advancements in other sciences. Integration of language dimensions and integration of sciences at new level raises the question of independence of linguistics as a science. "One of the ways that linguistics may preserve its own image is the development of integrative linguistics, which on the one hand does not move away from the material foundation of the language and on the other B demonstrates its ideal dimension with its multiple components that represent reality, mental processes, individual; both as a static system and dynamic of its verbalization in speech acts". [11].

REFERENCES

1. Benveniste, Émile, 1974. General linguistics. Moscow, Progress, pp: 447.
2. Lakoff, George, 1990. Women, Fire and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind. University of Chicago Press, pp: 632.
3. Beeman, William O., 2013. Linguistics and Anthropology. Date viewed 12.12.2013 www.brown.edu/Departments/Antropology/publications/Anthling.htm.
4. Kubryakova, E.S., 1995. Evolution of linguistic ideas in the second half of the XX century (the experience of paradigmatic analysis). A collection of articles Language and science of the end of the XX century. Moscow, Russian State University for the Humanities, pp: 144-238.
5. Karaulov, Yu.N., 1987. Russian language and linguistic identity. Moscow, Nauka, pp: 262.
6. Ufimtseva, N.V., 2011. Linguistic consciousness: the dynamics and variability. Moscow, Institute of Linguistics of Russian Academy of Sciences, pp: 252.
7. Anderson John, R., 2010. Cognitive Psychology and Its Implications. Seventh Edition, Worth Publishers, pp: 469.
8. Zhanalina, Lazzat K., 2011. Integrative derivation: Monograph. Almaty, Kazakh National Pedagogical University Named after Abai, pp: 492.
9. Wilber, K., 2006. Introduction to Integral Theory and Practice: IOS Basic and the AQAL Map. AQAL: Journal of Integral Theory and Practice, 1(1): 1-40.
10. O'Fallon, Terri, 2013. The Senses: Demystifying Awakening. In the Proceedings of the July 2013 Integral Theory Conference, pp: 1-23.
11. Zhanalina, Lazzat K., 2013. Modern linguistics: multiparadigmatic and development trends. Date viewed 12.12.2013 www.rusnauka.com/14_NPRT_2010/Philologia/66920.doc.htm.