N.I. Buketova[1*], A.T. Aratayeva[1], S.S. Turkenova[1], A.S. Amrenova[2], B.I. Jussupov[3]

¹Karaganda University of the name of Academician Ye.A. Buketov, Kazakhstan;
²L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan;
³Karaganda University of Kazpotrebsoyuz, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: nursulu.buketova@mail.ru, sgaat@mail.ru, saltanat_turkeno@mail.ru, assel.s.a@mail.ru, berik_jussupov@mail.ru)

Intertextual implications of E.A. Buketov's philosophy of humanism and multiculturalism

Philosophy as a developing cognitive science had been significantly influenced by the scientific paradigm of Ferdinand de Saussure. In the Chapter on Langue and Parole Ferdinand de Saussure draws a distinction between Language and Speech, particularly on their interdependence. The language is a tool and the manifestation of the speech, i.e. connecting the spoken activity and written language. The notion of Intertextuality was first used by Juliya Kristeva, and then increased under postmodernism up to "All texts are intertexts" since they refer to the pre-existing texts and current ones. This Article considers the linguistic personality of a bilingual author within the frames of Intertextuality. In this sense, the literary works and translations of Academician Evney Buketov arouse an intense interest to his linguistic personality. The novelty of this approach refers to research gap of intertexts and their meanings. The texts of the Author are being analyzed across philosophical and linguistic sciences. Such approach empowers the multidimensional and holistic analysis of the linguistic personality's discourse. In this particular case the linguistic personality, the author of the texts is a bilingual person whose mother tongue is the Kazakh language and is proficient in Russian, powerfully writing literary texts. In the meantime, the author is a multicultural personality with overlapping cultural fields that give depth and breadth to the intertext from the standpoint of postmodern discourse.

Keywords: intertextuality, intertextual meanings, humanism, multiculture, linguistic personality, postmodern discourse, metatext, semantic field, semiotic field, intertext.

Introduction

The discoveries of science and development of scientific thought had been influencing on Philosophy, resulted in losing its classical principles, which recently represented a solid model. Little by little, since the middle of the XIX century, there had been dynamic changes in its status and philosophy was being formed as a developing system of knowledge. Herewith, the object of philosophical thought was represented not only by a linguistic persona, their thinking and consciousness, but also the social factor, culture and religion. In other words, the scope of scientific philosophical analysis was increasing, and new special studies on the cognitive theory, culture, religion, etc. were determined.

The early XXth century was marked by fundamental changes in linguistics and philosophy influenced by the Saussure's scientific paradigm. In his lecture Ferdinand de Saussure points out the sign theory of a language and two types of dichotomy: the dichotomy of language and speech and the dichotomy of synchrony and diachrony. The matter of the non-linguistic nature of phonology leads him to the discovery of the sign theory of language:

"Language is a system of signs; a language per se builds the relations that our thought (e'sprit) establishes between these signs. Whereas the material value of these signs, on its own terms, can be considered as something indifferent to the sign."

Indeed, we are forced to use only sound image for linguistic signs, but even if the sounds changed, they would be indifferent for the language, since the relations would remain the same: c.f., for instance, nautical signals: nothing will change in the system, even if the colors faded [1; 13]. In his chapter on the theory of language and speech Ferdinand de Saussure notes the need to draw a distinction between language and speech and recognizes the symbiotic relationship between these entities. Consequently, he comes to the conclusion that the evolution of language is conditioned by speech phenomena: "... our language skills change with respect to the impressions received when listening to others. Thus, the interdependence between language and speech is established: language is both a tool and a product of speech. But all this does not prevent language and speech from being two completely different things [1; 57].

---

* Corresponding author's e-mail: *nursulu.buketova@mail.ru*

Basically, the text analysis was made possible only by doing that distinction, considering that as a connector of the spoken activity and written language. Literary works had always been of interest to the text linguistics. In 1967 Juliya Kristeva, post-structuralism theorist, [2] introduced the term "intertextuality", giving a new meaning to "The problem of content, material and form in verbal art" by M. Bakhtin, 1924 [3].

Whereas M. Bakhtin puts a very deep sense into the creation of a literary text, arguing that this process allows the author once to find himself in different time periods, and at the same breath deals with previous literature, and calls these relations a "dialogue". J. Kristeva approached Bakhtin's concept of "dialogue" as a tool for providing a literary analysis. In a broader sense, intertextuality acquired a different understanding influenced by the theory of the signs of J. Derrida [4], who considered the sign with no referential distinctive function.

During all discussions the formulation of R. Barthes [5; 78] becomes fundamental: "Each text is an intertext; other texts are present in it at various levels in more or less recognizable forms: texts of the background culture and texts of the surrounding culture.

Each text is a new structure created from the garlands of quotations. Fragments of cultural codes, formulas, rhythmic structures, fragments of social idioms, etc. — are all absorbed by the text and blended in it, because there are always a background and surrounding languages. Being a required postulate for any text, intertextuality cannot be reduced to the problem of sources and influences; it is a common field of unidentified formulas, with unknown origin in most cases, as well as unconscious or automatic quotations with no quotation marks" [5; 78]. The frames of intertextuality present the world as a huge text wherein everything was already said, and new things would be possible only on the principle of a kaleidoscope: blending certain elements gives new combinations. R. Barthes considers any text as a kind of "echo chamber" [5; 78].

The linguistic persona of Academician E.A. Buketov shall be considered as the representative of the Kazakh ethnic culture with a peculiar worldview a special connotative and verbal corpus in the semantic space, and therefore is valuable to the scientific research. From the perspective of the anthropocentric paradigm, the linguistic persona of E.A. Buketov has developed and consolidated historically, ethnically and socially in semiotic systems, therefore represents the interest to the humanism and ethnic culture.

Evney Buketov's texts can be categorized as intertexts since they contain the semantic and semiotic meanings of several languages, along with the fact that his main epistolary, artistic, journalistic, scientific texts belong to three different languages — Kazakh, Russian, English. The linguistic persona of Yevney Buketov, being the object of scientific linguistic research, is characterized by a special conceptual framework due to the fact that he lived and wrote his works in the multicultural environment, and had a higher worldview and a multidimensional picture of the world.

The approach described in this article is unique and new due to the lack of scientific researches of E.A. Buketov's texts across his linguistic persona and in the frames of intertextual meanings. Currently, anthropocentric paradigm researches of the conceptual framework of the author and his literary characters are relevant as a consequence of considering texts as intertexts, particularly in combination with the external world along with personal characteristics and values. E.A. Buketov as a linguistic persona is a prominent representative not only of the Kazakh people, but also a multiculture-bearer, a citizen of the world.

Methodology and research methods

The written text is believed to be considered as the identity of thinking and consciousness influenced by the ideas of such prominent representatives of structuralism and post-structuralism as R. Barthes, J. Lacan, M. Foucault, J. Derrida, et al. As a result, literature, culture, society, history, and the person specifically came to be regarded as a "text", which led to the fact that the entire spectrum of a person's external environment and own personal characteristics appeared to be considered as a "text within a text", in other words, as a single "intertext".

On this basis, any literary text, no matter how insipid or dull it may seem, would shine in new splendor for its recipient, depending on reader's cultural, educational and emotional background. This approach provides great possibilities for the researcher to use the concept of "intertextuality" as a specific analytical unit with its internal meanings conveyed from the linguistic persona bearing the ethnic and cultural codes, as well as external meanings conveyed from that very linguistic persona representing the community of living. In such frames the linguistic persona, author, literary texts, creative memoirs, manuscripts, worldview dimensions as a research object have broadened a scientific horizon for a scholar. We will focus more carefully on the concept of a linguistic persona since literary works have been a subject to intertextual analysis to a greater extent because of their specificity.

Yuri Karaulov initiated the theory of linguistic persona [6] and at the same time actively supporting and inspiring the anthropocentric approach to language learning. Regarding this, the scholar Karaulov paraphrased the Ferdinand De Saussure's well-known statement: "There is a language system behind every text". With regard to linguistic anthropocentrism, Yuri Karaulov modifies this quotation as following: "There is a linguistic persona behind every text" [7; 3-5]. This statement splendidly describes the current linguistics as a whole: the study of the human factor in language has been relevant for several decades and on. In this regard, the interaction of linguistics with such social sciences as psychology, sociology, philosophy, political science, pedagogy appears to be crucial.

Baudouin de Courtenay points out that a language is related to a "psychic, central nervous system" basis: "Everything that concerns human language, as a linguistic phenomenon is concentrated in the brain. Without a brain, without a soul, a talking machine can exist, but not a cogitative, thinking and communicative soul, as far as cogitation and community are the necessary stipulations of a real language" [8; 212] is concentrated in the brain. Without a brain, without a soul, a talking machine can exist, but not a human being, thinking and social, and thinking and sociality are the necessary conditions of real language" [8; 212]. He considers linguistics to be a psychological and sociological science due to the reasons that human mental development is possible only in communication and the language can be realized only in society [8; 217]. After nearly a century, in XX century as the confirmation of the scientist's words, such sciences as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics have appeared designating straightforward, inextricable connection of the given areas of knowledge with linguistics, and consequently, significating the central object of their study — a human being who knows language and uses it as a tool for communication and generation of meanings.

The American linguist Edward Sepir rightly observes: "It is difficult for the modern linguist to limit himself to his traditional subject. Unless he is one barren of imagination, he cannot disintegrate the mutual interests which tie up linguistics with anthropology and cultural history as well as sociology, psychology, philosophy — and for the longer term — with physiology and physics" [9; 128].

In modern science, linguistics, in its interrelation with social fields of knowledge, increasingly integrates the concept of personality thus creating its comprehensive and holistic image. As for the linguistic personality as a category of linguistics, it should be noted that this concept, as well as linguistic phenomena directly related to it, has been actively applied in research and, as a consequence, in practical activities of many fields of knowledge. For example, scientific research in the field of philosophy had revealed the dynamic relationship between human subjectivity and discourse in the course of linguistic activity and scientific practice. Formation of discourse, in this case, is interpreted as a process of normalization of thinking and practical activities [10].

The interaction of language and culture is observed in scientific works on cultural studies. In particular, one of such works offers a unified concept of the linguistic world-image of the national language. Besides, the correlation of the scientific picture of the world and the linguistic world-image is given. The characteristic feature of this study is that it was conducted on the materials of three languages, namely by studying their lexical-phraseological system, on the basis of which it proved that the lexical-phraseological system of language corresponds to the status of the national linguistic world-image [11].

In one of sociological researches it was found out that the structural components of a linguistic personality could be successfully subjected to sociological research methods. In the process of the research, some functions performed by the linguistic personality in communication were identified and described from the sociological point of view. Additionally a closed system of markers for identifying the linguistic personality was proposed [12].

In the field of pedagogy research areas identifying linguistic personality formation in the conditions of a modern polylingual education are considered to be relevant [13] as well as researches recognizing linguistic personality as a phenomenon of culture and working out the technology for its personal development in the process of teaching some disciplines [14]. Scientific works substantiating models of development of linguistic personality as a teacher are also currently topical [15].

Researchers in the sphere of psychology suggested three levels of the process of linguistic personality development and generally defined the theoretical and methodological status of the psychological problem [16].

Thus, the prospect of further studying a language personality problem with regard to the mental processes determining human activity has been opened in psychological science. Among scientific works in psychology which have found a direct correlation with the concepts used in linguistics and, in particular, in the study of linguistic personality, it is possible to point out the research aimed at revealing the role of the

linguistic world-image in political communication. In addition to that psychological factors of society's political picture of the world formation and determinants of political choice have been defined, and the priority of the verbal level becomes scientifically grounded among levels of communication influencing the formation of political picture of the world [17].

As S.G. Agapova states, "the problem of activation of language experience of the individual is inseparably connected with the analysis of general problems of a human being, his life foundations as well as spiritual development, intellectual, emotional, intuitive, moral, aesthetic manifestation. No science exists by itself and for itself; its development is conditioned by the practical needs of the society" [18; 12].

Results

Academician E.A. Buketov as a linguistic personality is of interest for scientific research, as he is a representative of the Kazakh people. In this context, the conclusions of the works of, a scholar, an expert of Kazakh literature — Koylybai Asanov are of great significance. K. Asanov made a profound research of all the literary translations and articles of E.A. Buketov in Kazakh, — the native language for the academician. All works of the academician E.A. Buketov reveal his multifaceted sides as an analyst:

Buketov as a researcher-analyst of literary prose and poetry;

Buketov as a theater critic, an author of many articles and plays reviews;

Buketov as a publicist-essayist close to documentary genre;

Buketov as a poet, writer, and translator of classical foreign literature — prose and poetry; in addition to that as a translator of Russian prose and poetry and Soviet-era literature — into Kazakh language.

Beyond that E.A. Buketov wrote a lot of journalistic articles as part of the formation of moral and humanistic beginnings of personality, not in the form of edification, but in the form of a dialogue with a person — the addressee, to whom the given revelation was addressed [19; 74-75].

As mentioned above, E.A. Buketov as a linguistic personality is also of considerable interest in philosophical terms, since his texts and works are permeated with both linguistic metaphors and intersecting cultural projections. The analysis of texts as the corpus of conceptual frameworks of the multilingual linguistic personality can be studied in the process of scientific linguistic research. For example, during the study of translations of William Shakespeare's play "Julius Caesar" in the pragmalinguistic aspect, A.S. Amrenova notes that E.A. Buketov made his translation into the Kazakh language more accurate, correctly interpreting grammar phenomena given in the original play. He used the text translated into Russian as a metalanguage and to clarify the meaning of the translated text he exploited the original text in English. E.A. Buketov as a translator can be characterized by a number of examples taken from the pragmalinguistic analysis of his translated texts [20; 76].

From the grammatical point of view, the following sentence is of interest. In these conditions let us call the text translated into Russian by M. Zenkevich as "metatext1" and E.A. Buketov's translation of the same text into Kazakh — as "metatext2".

Are not you mov'd? — А ты спокоен? — Қозғалмайтын сен боларсын? (Kozgalmaytyn sen bolarsyn?) A substitution of the passive construction *to be mov'd* — for the adjective *спокоен* has been made in metatext1, while in metatext2 a more suitable variant *қозғалмайтын* (kozghalmaityn) has been used, and it has a common denotation with the prototext in English [20; 76].

In most cases the problem of finding an equivalent in metatext2 results in misinterpretation in translation text, as we can see in the following passage [20; 76].

Cassius tells Brutus:
And, since you know you cannot see yourself
So well as by reflection, I, your glass,
Will modestly discover to yourself
That of yourself which you yet know not of.

Word-for-word translation:
И так как ты знаешь, что ты себя не можешь увидеть так отчетливо,
как в отражении, я твое зеркало, я скромно покажу тебе твою суть, таким,
каким ты пока еще не знаешь.

Translation of M. Zenkevich:
И так как ты себя увидеть можешь

Лишь в отражении, то я, как стекло,
Смиренно покажу тебе твой лик,
Какого ты пока еще не знаешь.

Translation of E.A. Buketov:
Өз бейнеңді зат бетінен көремін деп
Айттың ғой. Олай болса, мен айнаң болайында,
Өз тұлғаңның өзіне мәлім емес
Жерлерін көрсетейін.

According to dictionary data, the word *glass* is translated as both *стекло* and *зеркало*. In this context the word was translated as *зеркало*. It should be noted that in metatext2 the choice of the word *айна* (aina) — *зеркало* corresponds to the original, as evidenced by the translation into Kazakh not through metatext1, but through the resort to the original [20; 83].

There is an original concept of N.K. Rerikh, according to which culture is seen as a universal measure of human activity. N.K. Rerikh develops the idea that "he who dares in the name of Culture and Beauty is invincible, for he is fed by the most powerful unearthly and cosmic forces, the energy of fire and light" [21]. Human activities take on a cultural character only when it is illuminated by the light of Truth, Goodness, and Beauty, when it seeks to affirm its humanistic meaning. He believes the culture of spirit especially should be characteristic of the learned engaged in science and technology, because they are most responsible for ensuring that the Earth does not become lifeless, i.e. a scientist must have an ethical responsibility to nature [22; 78].

The ideas of humanism are clearly manifested in the work and scientific concepts of E.A. Buketov. In this sense, scientific research and the scientist's search for an environmentally friendly energy source are a confirmation of his high culture and humane attitude to the environment in the light of today's prospects of the country and the world as a whole. E.A. Buketov writes: "In order to prepare food, give warmth to his home, a man first used what was at hand and easily extracted: vegetable fuel... The latter had dominated in the natural human activities until the middle of the last century, until people began to gradually switch to coal and oil, and even later — to gas. This transition, however, was outlined in time: the terrible devastation begun on the Earth — that is deforestation of forested areas — was halted... Nature cannot renew fossil fuels quickly, so coal, oil and gas are non-renewable fuels". Further he writes that energy is taken from nature, it turns out that man, boasting both of his abilities and the ability to use bounty of nature, proudly calling it a victory over the forces of nature, poorly realized that he simply remained a dependant of nature and a dependant, unfortunately, not entirely grateful" [23; 79-80]. These lines were written more than thirty years ago, but it seems that E.A. Buketov today tells about the catastrophically growing littering of the globe and the threatening violation of the natural balance.

Discussion

E.A. Buketov's book "Six Letters to a Friend" is very interesting to identify intertextual meanings in works of fiction [24], where a wide range of meanings is presented in accordance with the definitions of intertextuality and concepts, which allow to consider this phenomenon in a broader context than mere linguistic analysis. It should be noted that from the point of view of literary criticism the book was investigated by T.T. Savchenko: "...E.A. Buketov, starting his narration in letters, brings the reader into the process of searching form and its definition in his creative laboratory: "You suggested me to write about life a long time ago... [24; 15]. I will write to you about my life, but in this piece of writing please do not expect any system and consecution [24; 17].

The very title of the book considered to be a heading, a subject of intertextual analysis is of interest not only from the semantic side but also from the point of view of its structural form, which implies "dialogue". Let us consider the meanings inherent in the title of the book.

The genre of the book which was written was determined by the word "letters" in the form of epistolary heritage. In addition the word "friend" the title suggested a confidential positive author's position in the form of "dialogue". At the same time, the use of the numeral "six" concretized the semantic scope, but does not narrow it. On the contrary, it acts as a kind of influence from outside and gives a boost to reading "the first letter".

It is a common fact that the time of E.A. Buketov's life from 1925 to 1983 is the period of the formation of the Soviet regime, wartime, heavy postwar construction, and the rise of science and education in the Soviet Union. For students, it was the time of half-starved existence when scholarship and state meal provision was an important factor in choosing a university and specialty. This fact also played a crucial role in the life of E.A. Buketov, when he came to enter the Faculty of Philology but having found out that the Ore Mining and Smelting Institute provided its students with food, he applied there. Life showed that he chose the right direction — technical sciences were his forte, besides technics was not subject to censorship and ideological pressure, so there was enough room for free thought. At the same time, all works of fiction, journalism, and humanities were under the tight control for compliance with Soviet ideology. From this angle even the titles of articles and books were exposed to respective semantic analysis, so the first journal version of the book was published under the title "Time of Bright Destiny" recommended by the journal editors, although the working title was "Memoirs of a Scientific Worker" or "Six Letters to a Friend".

T.T. Savchenko, the theorist of literature, writes the following about that time: "E.A. Buketov's story "Six Letters To a Friend" was created at the end of the 1970s. It was the period when both authors and readers felt tired of being officially authorized to read and study literature. The extreme limitation of the sphere which was the source of artistic reflection, and the impossibility to turn to a critical depiction of many sides of surrounding reality brought documentaries and memoirs to the foreground of literary life. E.A. Buketov caught this spirit and created a work in which the interest to the document was traced. In the novella, there is a paphos of approval and glorification of social conditions of the formation of the man... However, in the last two letters of the narration critical paphos becomes strong...In those years such pathos was considered as impudence, unforgivable breaking out of the system. For the inadmissible, for those years courage writer paid with a break in his fate; scandalization, accusation of non-existent crimes, exaggeration of facts, separation from the most important thing in life — the construction of the University — all this was the result of an attempt to speak about the time not in the language of eulogy, but in the language of objective images" [25; 13].

From the very first page of the story all the time there was a dialogue, in which was born and preserved intertextual sphere in the form of the dynamics of deployment of the plot and meanings, where the texts of the author and "friend" intersect:

"...And now, striving to fit into the program that you have outlined, I began to think about myself, my own business, the people among whom I rotate, trying to look at it all from the side: from above, from the side, from a distance, etc" [24; 15]. The author's position of a multidirectional nature, where seemingly completely logically incompatible forms and meanings intersect, is a sign of intertextuality according to the structural principle within postmodernist discourse.

E.A. Buketov describes the formation of multicultural philosophy and interethnic relations in a bilingual environment in a special way. On the example of the change of views of the old Aljighan-ata, whose name itself carries the meaning as "a man not in himself", but with the implication and some joking connotation of sympathy — "a little crazy", we observe how views even of older people change. In the dialogue of Alzhigan — ata with Mekaila (probably Mikhail), the stove-maker, who was kind, cheerful, spoke Kazakh well, and therefore was not considered a "stranger":

"Mekayla! Why aren't you Kazakh, you're such a good man, I'm sorry you're Russian! I don't want you to be Russian!"

Mekaila answered him, "Aksakal, you are a clever man, and you should not wish that all good Russians become Kazakhs. Then the Russians will have only evil people, and it will not be good, the Russians and Kazakhs will not live peacefully, it will be bad on earth. It is better for Kazakhs and Russians to have equally many good people. And I'd rather stay, as I was a Russian, since I am, as you say, a good man. According to Alzhigan- ata, the wisdom of these words so struck our aksakal that Mekaila remained the most esteemed person for the rest of his life" [24; 55]. The rapprochement on a humane, universal level, which the author conveys in the dialogue between a Russian and a Kazakh eliminates the barrier of "friend" and "stranger" — "alien" and makes relations equal, close, and lays the philosophical foundations for peaceful coexistence.

The intertextual approach opens up new possibilities for the analysis of the deep semantics of the text. E.A. Buketov's story is a vivid demonstration of the author's creative evolution when he in his dialog with his "friend", and to a greater extent with himself, analyses the philosophy of being, coming to a simple conclusion: "No matter what you say, a man cannot change his nature, he always remains a man" [24; 17].

The secular way of life, life in a completely different reality than his native, ethnic, makes the main character Mazhit Nurbaev behave differently, dress differently. A small sketch of a clearly autobiographical nature by E.A. Buketov is a vivid testimony to this:

"And here I am in my dreams, having reached an age, becoming a teacher, and certainly a teacher of history, and leaning forward slightly, like Ivan Antonovich, waving my arms in a picture, I tell my students about the amazing deeds of Alexander the Great and Spartacus.

I wear a dark suit, a satin shirt, and factory shoes with beautiful, intricate patterns stamped on the rubber soles. In short, I go to class dressed as my teacher. But I don't have the hedgehog that Ivan Antonovich has, I have a shaved head because I'm Kazakh.

And in general at home, outside school hours I am a real Kazakh: in summer I wear dandy, as I think, high-heeled boots sewn by my father (they are sewn the same for both right and left feet, and in order not to wear them apart, I do not forget to change them every time) and chapan sewn by my mother, and in winter I wear a fox hat — тымак (tymak), boots — саптама (saptama), also sewn by my father" [24; 20].

As a graduate student the main character, the prototype of which is the author himself, comes to his native place and as always mows hay with his uncle Zhaktai-aga. The name of Uncle Zhaktai, the prototype of which was a native uncle of E.A. Buketov Ibrai, contains a deep meaning. It was derived from the verb "жактау" (zhaktau), which means "to be on the side of someone, to protect, defend". The author writes: "I knew that Zhaktai-aga did not recognize such feelings as pain and fear. He passionately wanted me to grow up brave and fearless [24; 128]. He was a man who at any moment was ready to rush to the rescue, to fight hand-to-hand if his "young jackdaw" was threatened by any danger. The author writes that Zhaktai-aga never speculated about the high goals of man associated with his great destination. He did not speculate on this subject at all, despite the fact that, like many aksakals, liked to talk and was able to speak flowery, figurative, convincing. He knew well that, struggling for the minimum necessary and possible for the sense of being, he never compromised his conscience, honor, and dignity, and this was for him sufficient criterion for being satisfied with life. He lived simply and confidently, having no doubts about the goals of his existence, for he had done nothing in life that could not look people in the eye straight and guileless [24; 130-131]. The author shows on the example of Zhaktai-aga the type of people whose character was formed in a purely national environment, the strength of convictions and moral foundations without excessive philosophizing about being, goals of life, for which the main thing in the value scale was the concept "адамгершілік" (adamgershilik)-humanity.

Conclusions

The title of the text "Six Letters to a Friend" is a vivid evidence of the unity of the text of the story, which already presupposes the author's intention to have a confidential conversation. The text of each letter is full of implications, generated by a linguistic personality with a multicultural associative-verbal network when several semantic fields overlap in the mind. Moreover, the overlaps are not only in the meanings, but also in the semiotic system, that is, the world pictures of the author and the literary characters. If hypothetically to present the hierarchy of meaning generation of the author texts as a linguistic personality in the form of field structuring [26; 26-29], then the linguistic personality of the author will be in the core of the field. In this case the author is bilingual, that means he combines the linguistic personality with the native Kazakh language and Russian language, which he speaks at a high professional level of a writer. At the same time as a multicultural personality with overlapping cultural fields, which give depth and breadth to the intertext from the perspective of postmodernist discourse.

Recommendations

Intertextuality allows to place all the meanings in the universal field of time and consciousness of the person, the author and his characters, where it is difficult to imagine the point of transition of one text to another, which is of great interest for subsequent scientific research.

References

1   Ф. де Соссюр. Труды по языкознанию / Ф. де Соссюр. — М.: Прогресс, 1977.

2   Кристева Ю. Семиотика. Исследования по семанализу / Ю. Кристева. — М.: Академический проект, 2013. — 288 с.

3 Бахтин М. Проблема содержания, материала и формы в словесном художественном творчестве [Электронный ресурс] / М. Бахтин. — М.: Искусство, 1986. — С. 9–191. — Режим доступа: https://wplanet.ru/index.php? show=article&id=26

4 Derrida J. Dissemination / J. Derrida // Athlone Press. — 1981.

5 Barthes Roland. Mythologies. Paladin Books / Roland Barthes, Lavers Annette. — 1973.

6 Караулов Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность / Ю.Н. Караулов. — М.: Наука, 1987. — 262 с.

7 Язык и личность / под ред. Д.Н. Шмелева. — М.: Наука, 1989. — 216 с.

8 Бодуэн де Куртенэ И.А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию / И.А. Бодуэн де Куртенэ. — Т. I. — М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1963. — 386 с.

9 Языки как образ мира / сост. К. Королев. — М.: ООО «Издательство "АСТ"»; СПб.: Terra Fantastica, 2003. — 568 с.

10 Сундеев А.А. Человеческая субъективность и власть дискурса: дис … канд. филос. наук: 09.00.01 —«Социальная философия» / А.А. Сундеев. — Саратов, 2002. — 140 с.

11 Корнилов О.А. Языковые картины мира как отражения национальных менталитетов: дис … д-ра: 22.00.04 — «Социальная структура, социальные институты и процессы» / О.А. Корнилов. — М., 2000. — 460 с.

12 Бабаян Т.Г. Проблемы социологического изучения феномена «языковой личности» в речевых коммуникациях: дис … канд. социол. наук: 22.00.06 — «Социология культуры, духовной жизни» / Т.Г. Бабаян. — Тамбов, 2003. — 162 с.

13 Хрусталева О.Н. Формирование языковой личности школьника в условиях полилингвального образования: дис … канд. пед. наук: 13.00.01 — «Общая педагогика, история педагогики и образования» / О.Н. Хрусталева. — Казань, 2002. — 178 с.

14 Быкова Г.И. Воспитание языковой личности в процессе преподавания лингвистических и речеведческих дисциплин: дис … канд. пед. наук: 13.00.06 — «Теория и методика электронного образования (по областям и уровням образования)» / Г.И. Быкова. — Екатеринбург, 1999. — 195 с.

15 Григорьева-Голубева В.А. Становление гуманистических ценностей педагога (в аспекте языковой личности): дис … д-ра пед. наук: 13.00.01 — «Общая педагогика, история педагогики и образования» / В.А. Григорьева-Голубева. — СПб., 2003. — 493 с.

16 Варфоломеева О.В. Формирование эффективного психотерапевта как развитой языковой личности: дис … канд. психол. наук: 19.00.13 — «Психология развития, акмеология» / О.В. Варфоломеева. — Симферополь, 1998. — 234 с.

17 Маланчук И.Г. Роль языковой картины мира в политической коммуникации: дис … канд. психол. наук: 19.00.12 — «Политическая психология» / И.Г. Маланчук. — Красноярск, 1998. — 255 с.

18 Агапова С.Г. Основы межличностной и межкультурной коммуникации (английский язык): учеб. пос. / С.Г. Агапова. — Ростов н/Д.: Феникс, 2004. — 284 с.

19 Асанұлы Қ. Евней Букетов — публицист: оқу құралы / Қ. Асанұлы. — Қарағанды: ҚарМУ баспасы, 2005. — 196 б.

20 Амренова А.С. Перевод произведения В. Шекспира «Юлий Цезарь» на русский и казахский языки: прагмалингвистический аспект: дис. …канд. филос. наук: 10.02.20 — «Сравнительно-историческое, типологическое и сопоставительное языкознание» / А.С. Амренова. — Караганда, 2005. — 159 с

21 Рерих Н.К. Культура и цивилизация / Н.К. Рерих. — М., 1994. — С. 60, 61.

22 Букетова Н.И. Ученый и гуманист. Ректор. Просто — Человек / Н.И. Букетова, А.М. Газалиев // Центрально-Казахстанское отделение Национальной академии наук Республики Казахстан: История создания и развития. — Караганда: Изд-во НАО «Караганд. ун-т им. акад. Е.А. Букетова», 2022. — 236 с.

23 Букетова Н.И. Евней Букетов на земле и небесах / Н.И. Букетова. — Караганда: Изд-во КарГУ, 2015. — 316 с.

24 Букетов Е.А. Шесть писем другу / Е.А. Букетов. — Алма-Ата: Жалын, 1989. — 288 с.

25 Савченко Т.Т. Авторская позиция и формы её выражения в «Шести письмах другу» Е.А. Букетова / Академик Е.А. Букетов — ученый, педагог, мыслитель: материалы Междунар. науч. -практ. конф., посвящ. 80–летию Е.А. Букетова (23–24 марта 2005 г.). — Караганды, 2005. — С. 11.

26 Букетова Н.И. Реликтовая корневая морфема как языковая универсалия: моногр. — 2-е изд., перераб. и доп. / Н.И. Букетова. — Караганда: ТОО Tengri LtD, 2018. — С. 26–29.

Н.И. Букетова, А.Т. Аратаева, С.С. Туркенова, А.С. Амренова, Б.И. Джусупов

Е.А. Бөкетовтің гуманизм философиясы мен мультимәдениетіндегі интертекстуалдық мағына

Даму жолындағы білім жүйесі ретінде философиядағы едәуір өзгерістердің болуына әсіресе Фердинанд де Соссюр ғылыми парадигмасының ықпалы зор. Тіл және сөйлеу тілі лингвистикасы туралы бөлімде Фердинанд де Соссюр тіл және сөйлеу тілінің өзара тәуелділігін ажыратып алу қажеттігін атап өтеді. Тіл әрі сөйлеу құралы, әрі сөйлеу тілінің өнімі, яғни сөйлеу тілі қызметін жазбаша түрде байланыстырушы. Ю. Кристева енгізген «интертекстуалдық» терминін «әр текст (мәтін) интертекст болып табылады», онда бұдан алдыңғы мәдениет пен қоршаған орта текстері бар дейтін ұстаныммен

постмодернисттер әрі қарай дамытып келеді. Мақалада билингв-автордың тілдік тұлғасы интертекстуалдық теория тұрғысынан қарастырылған. Бұл аспектіде тілдік тұлға ретінде академик Е.А. Бөкетовтің көркем туындылары мен аудармалары айтарлықтай қызығушылық тудырады, ал тәсілдің жаңалығы — интертексттер мен олардың мағыналары туралы ғылыми зерттеулердің болмауында. Автордың текстері философия және лингвистика тоғысқан екі ғылым саласында талданған. Мұндай көзқарас тілдік тұлғаның дискурсын көпаспектілі етіп, тұтастай талдауға мүмкіндік береді. Бұл жағдайда текст авторы билингв, яғни оның бойында ана тілі — қазақ тілі мен кәсіби жазушы деңгейінде биік меңгерген орыс тілі үйлесім тапқан тілдік тұлға. Сондай-ақ автордың өзі мәдени кеңістігі қиысқан мультимәдени тұлға ретінде танылып отыр. Постмодернисттік дискурс тұрғысынан алсақ, бұл интертекске тереңдік пен кеңдік береді.

Кілт сөздер: интертекстуалдық, интертекстуалдық мағыналар, гуманизм, мультимәдениет, тілдік тұлға, постмодерндік дискурс, метамәтін, семантикалық өріс, семиотикалық өріс, интертекст.

Н.И. Букетова, А.Т. Аратаева, С.С. Туркенова, А.С. Амренова, Б.И. Джусупов

Интертекстуальные смыслы философии гуманизма и мультикультуры Е.А. Букетова

В философии как развивающейся системе знаний особенно значительные изменения произошли под влиянием научной парадигмы Ф. де Соссюра. В главе «О лингвистике языка и речи» Ф. де Соссюр отмечает необходимость различения языка и речи и их взаимозависимость: язык одновременно и орудие, и продукт речи, то есть связной речевой деятельности в письменной форме. Введение термина «интертекстуальность» Ю. Кристевой развивается постмодернистами в установку: «каждый текст является интертекстом», в котором присутствуют тексты предшествующей культуры и тексты окружающей среды. В статье рассмотрена языковая личность автора-билингва с позиций теории интертекстуальности. В данном аспекте художественные произведения и переводы академика Е.А. Букетова как языковой личности представляют значительный интерес, и новизна подхода состоит в отсутствии научных исследований интертекстов и их смыслов. Тексты автора проанализированы на стыке двух областей знаний — философии и лингвистики. Такой подход дает возможность многоаспектного и целостного анализа дискурса языковой личности. В данном случае языковая личность, автор текстов — билингв, то есть в нем сочетается языковая личность с казахским — родным языком и русским, которым он владеет на высоком профессиональном уровне писателя. В то же время автор представляет собой мультикультурную личность с пересекающимися культурными полями, которые придают глубину и широту интертексту с позиций постмодернистского дискурса.

Ключевые слова: интертекстуальность, интертекстуальные смыслы, гуманизм, мультикультура, языковая личность, дискурс постмодерна, метатекст, семантическое поле, семиотическое поле, интертекст.

References

1   Saussure, F. de. (1977). *Trudy po yazykoznaniiu [Works on linguistics].* Moscow: Progress [in Russian].

2   Kristeva, Yu. (2013). *Semiotika. Issledovaniia po semanalizu [Semiotics. Research on semanalysis]* Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt [in Russian].

3   Bakhtin, M. (1986). Problema soderzhaniia, materiala i formy v slovesnom khudozhestvennom tvorchestve [The problem of content, material and form in verbal artistic creativity]. Moscow: Iskusstvo. Retrieved from https://wplanet.ru/index.php?show=article&id=26 [in Russian].

4   Derrida, J. (1981). Dissemination. Athlone Press.

5   Barthes, Roland, & Annette Lavers. (1973). *Mythologies. Paladin Books*.

6   Karaulov, Yu.N. (1987). Russkii yazyk i yazykovaia lichnost [Russian language and linguistic personality]. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].

7   Shmelev, D.N. (Ed.). (1989). Yazyk i lichnost [Language and personality]. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].

8   Baudouin de Courtenay, J. (1963). Izbrannye trudy po obshchemu yazykoznaniiu [Selected works on general linguistics]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR [in Russian].

9   Korolev, K. (2003). Yazyki kak obraz mira [Languages as an image of the world]. Moscow: OOO «Izdatelstvo "AST"»; Saint-Petersburg: Terra Fantastika [in Russian].

10   Sundeev, A.A. (2002). Chelovecheskaia subektivnost i vlast diskursa [Human subjectivity and the power of discourse]. *Candidate's thesis*. Saratov [in Russian].

11   Kornilov, O.A. (2000). Yazykovye kartiny mira kak otrazheniia natsionalnykh mentalitetov [Linguistic pictures of the world as reflections of national mentalities]. *Doctor's thesis*. Moscow [in Russian].

12 Babaian, T.G. (2003). Problemy sotsiologicheskogo izucheniia fenomena «yazykovoi lichnosti» v rechevykh kommunikatsiiakh [Problems of sociological study of the phenomenon of "linguistic personality" in speech communications]. *Candidate's thesis*. Tambov [in Russian].

13 Khrustaleva, O.A. (2002). Formirovanie yazykovoi lichnosti shkolnika v usloviiakh polilingvalnogo obrazovaniia [Formation of a student's linguistic personality in the conditions of multilingual education]. *Candidate's thesis*. Kazan [in Russian].

14 Bykova, G.I. (1999). Vospitanie yazykovoi lichnosti v protsesse prepodavaniia lingvisticheskikh i rechevedcheskikh distsiplin [Education of a linguistic personality in the process of teaching linguistic and speech disciplines]. *Candidate's thesis*. Ekaterinburg [in Russian].

15 Grigoreva-Golubeva, V.A. (2003). Stanovlenie gumanisticheskikh tsennostei pedagoga (v aspekte yazykovoi lichnosti) [Formation of humanistic values of a teacher (in the aspect of a linguistic personality)]. *Doctor's thesis*. Saint-Petersburg [in Russian].

16 Varfolomeeva, O.V. (1998). Formirovanie effektivnogo psikhoterapevta kak razvitoi yazykovoi lichnosti [Formation of an effective psychotherapist as a developed linguistic personality]. *Candidate's thesis*. Simferopol [in Russian].

17 Malanchuk, I.A. (1998). Rol yazykovoi kartiny mira v politicheskoi kommunikatsii [The role of the linguistic picture of the world in political communication]. *Candidate's thesis*. Krasnoyarsk [in Russian].

18 Agapova, S.G. (2004). Osnovy mezhlichnostnoi i mezhkulturnoi kommunikatsii (angliiskii yazyk): uchebnoe posobie [Fundamentals of interpersonal and intercultural communication (English): Textbook. Manual]. Rostov-on-Don: Feniks [in Russian].

19 Asanuly, K. (2005). Evnei Buketov — publitsist. Oqu quraly [Evney Buketov-publicist. Training manual]. Qaragandy: Qaragandy universiteti baspasy [in Kazakh].

20 Amrenova, A.S. (2005). Perevod proizvedeniia V. Shekspira «Yulii Tsezar» na russkii i kazakhskii yazyki: pragmalingvisticheskii aspekt [Translation of the work of V. Shakespeare "Julius Caesar" into Russian and Kazakh languages: pragmalinguistic aspect]. *Candidate's thesis*. Karaganda [in Russian].

21 Rerikh, N.K. (1994). *Kultura i tsivilizatsiia [Culture and civilization].* Moscow [in Russian].

22 Buketova, N.I., & Gazaliev, A.M. (2022). Uchenyi i gumanist. Rektor. Prosto — Chelovek [Scientist and humanist. Rector. Just a Man]. *Tsentralno-Kazakhstanskoe otdelenie Natsionalnoi akademii nauk Respubliki Kazakhstan: Istoriia sozdaniia i razvitiia — Central Kazakhstan Branch of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan: The history of creation and development*. Karaganda: NAO «Karagandinskii universitet imeni akademika E.A. Buketova [in Russian].

23 Buketova, N.I. (2015). Evnei Buketov na zemle i nebesakh [Evney Buketov on earth and heaven]. Karaganda: Izdatelstvo Karagandiskogo gosudarsvennogo universiteta [in Russian].

24 Buketov, E.A. (1989). Shest pisem drugu [Six letters to a friend]. Alma-Ata: Zhalyn [in Russian].

25 Savchenko, T.T. (2005). Avtorskaia pozitsiia i formy ee vyrazheniia v «Shesti pismakh drugu» E.A. Buketova / Akademik E.A. Buketov — uchenyi, pedagog, myslitel ["The author's position and the forms of its expression in "Six letters to a friend" by E.A. Buketov" / Academician E.A. Buketov — scientist, teacher, thinker]. *Materialy Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii, posviashchennoi 80-letiiu E.A. Buketova (23–24 marta 2005 goda) — Proceedings of the international scientific and practical conference dedicated to the 80th anniversary of E.A. Buketov*. Karagandy, 11 [in Russian].

26 Buketova, N.I. (2018). Reliktovaia kornevaia morfema kak yazykovaia universaliia: Monografiia. 2-e izdanie, pererabotannoe i dopolnennoe [Relict root morpheme as a linguistic universal. Monograph. 2nd edition, revised and supplemented]. Karaganda: TOO «Tengri» LtD [in Russian].