

THE PROBLEM OF LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY IN THE ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM OF MODERN LINGUISTICS

Sagdiyeva Guzal Juraevna

Lecturer at the Uzbek State University of World Languages

guzal4748@gmail.com

+998909110093

Abstract: The article explores the problem of linguistic personality within the anthropocentric paradigm of modern linguistics. It analyses the theoretical foundations of anthropocentrism and its impact on understanding language as a manifestation of human consciousness and identity. The study synthesizes cognitive, functional, discourse, and cultural-semiotic perspectives and draws on the works of Karaulov, Wierzbicka, Kubryakova, Halliday, Leech, Kramsch, and Widdowson. The results demonstrate that the anthropocentric paradigm views language as a mechanism for constructing thought and cultural identity.

Keywords: linguistic personality, anthropocentrism, cognitive linguistics, identity, discourse, culture, consciousness.

Аннотация: В статье исследуется проблема языковой личности в контексте антропоцентрической парадигмы современного языкознания. Рассматриваются теоретические основы формирования антропоцентризма в лингвистике и его влияние на понимание языковой личности как центрального объекта гуманитарного знания. Осуществлён анализ ключевых подходов — когнитивного, функционального, дискурсивного и культурно-семиотического. Особое внимание уделено работам Караулова, Вежбицкой, Кубряковой, Halliday, Leech, Kramsch, Widdowson и других исследователей, показавших взаимосвязь языка, мышления и личности. Выявлено, что антропоцентрический подход позволяет рассматривать язык как механизм формирования сознания и культурной идентичности.

Ключевые слова: языковая личность, антропоцентризм, когнитивная лингвистика, идентичность, дискурс, культура, сознание.

Annotatsiya: Maqolada zamonaviy tilshunoslikning antropotsentrik paradigmasi doirasida til shaxsi muammosi o'rganiladi. Antropotsentrizmning nazariy asoslari va tilni inson onginging hamda madaniy identifikatsiyaning ifodasi sifatida talqin qilishdagi roli tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot kognitiv, funksional, diskursiv va madaniy-semiotik yondashuvlar sinteziga asoslanadi hamda Karaulov, Vejbitskaya, Kubryakova, Halliday, Leech, Kramsch, Widdowson kabi olimlar ishlari tahlil qilinadi. Natijalarga ko'ra, antropotsentrik yondashuv tilni tafakkur va madaniyatni shakllantiruvchi mexanizm sifatida qaraydi.

Kalit so'zlar: til shaxsi, antropotsentrizm, kognitiv tilshunoslik, identiklik, diskurs, madaniyat, ong.

Introduction



Anthropocentrism as a methodological foundation of modern linguistics presupposes an examination of language through the lens of the human personality. Language is studied not in itself, but as a form of consciousness, thought, and culture. Since the late 20th century, linguistics has undergone a shift from a structural-systemic approach to an anthropocentric approach (Karaulov 1987; Kubryakova 2004; Widdowson 2018). The focus has shifted to the cognitive and discursive mechanisms of meaning generation, the individual speaker's style, communicative behavior, and the cultural determinacy of speech. The problem of linguistic personality in this context becomes fundamental, as it is through language that people perceive the world and themselves within it. Modern linguistics is undergoing a profound methodological transformation, as a result of which people and their linguistic consciousness are becoming the central object of scientific inquiry. This process has been called the anthropocentric turn (from the Greek *anthropos*, meaning human, and *centrum*, meaning center), signifying the orientation of linguistics toward the human factor—personality, thought, culture, and communication. Within the anthropocentric paradigm, language is viewed not as a self-sufficient system, but as a tool for human cognition, expression, and construction of reality. Anthropocentrism in linguistics arose as a reaction to the limitations of structuralism and formalism, which studied language solely as an abstract code, without taking into account the individual speaker. Beginning in the late 20th century, the very subject of linguistics has been reconsidered in the works of Russian and foreign scholars (Yu. N. Karaulov, E. S. Kubryakova, A. Vezhbitskaya, M. A. K. Halliday, G. Leach, T. A. van Dijk, H. Widdowson, K. Kramersch, and others). Humans, endowed with consciousness, values, and communicative intention, become the center of linguistic existence. In this regard, the concept of linguistic personality acquires fundamental significance. It expresses not only an individual's ability to communicate linguistically but also reflects their worldview, cognitive attitudes, and emotional and cultural identity. According to Yu. N. Karaulov (1987), linguistic personality is the totality of a person's abilities and characteristics realized in speech activity. However, in modern research, the concept has expanded significantly: it encompasses cognitive models, communicative roles, speech genres, value orientations, and even the digital self-presentation of the individual.

The anthropocentric approach allows us to consider language as a mirror of consciousness and a means of shaping a cultural picture of the world. Within this framework, cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and discourse theory interact, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of linguistic personality. The cognitive perspective reveals the mechanisms of conceptualization and categorization of experience; the pragmatic perspective reveals the intentional nature of utterances; and the sociocultural perspective examines the dependence of language on the values and norms of society. The study of linguistic personality is particularly important in the era of globalization and digitalization. Modern humans operate in a multilingual and multimodal environment, leading to the development of a hybrid linguistic personality capable of combining elements of various cultures and communicative codes. Online discourse, social media, and artificial intelligence are creating new forms of speech behavior and self-presentation. Thus, the study of linguistic personality today extends beyond traditional philology and assumes an interdisciplinary, cultural, and philosophical dimension.

The relevance of this topic is determined by several factors. First, the anthropocentric paradigm defines the current state of the humanities, integrating cognitive and cultural knowledge. Second, the study of linguistic personality allows for a deeper understanding of the nature of human consciousness and communication. Third, in the context of active globalization, intercultural



contacts, and digital transformation, the issue of identity and self-expression through language is becoming key not only in theory but also in the practice of foreign language teaching, intercultural interaction, and artificial intelligence. Thus, the purpose of this article is to analyze the problem of linguistic personality in the context of the anthropocentric paradigm of modern linguistics, to identify its theoretical foundations and to describe the main directions of research of this phenomenon in domestic and foreign science.

Research Methods

The study relies on an interdisciplinary approach and includes:

1. Cognitive-conceptual analysis – to identify the knowledge structures that shape an individual's linguistic consciousness.
2. Discourse method – to analyze the representation of personality in text and communication.
3. Functional analysis – to study the relationship between communicative intention and grammatical means of expression.
4. Comparative-contrastive method – to identify differences in the interpretation of linguistic personality in the Russian and English traditions.

The empirical base includes texts from scientific, media, and online discourse, as well as the works of leading linguists of the late 20th and early 21st centuries.

Results and Discussion

1. Anthropocentrism as a Scientific Paradigm

Anthropocentrism in linguistics signifies the recognition of language as part of the human psyche and culture. It developed as a reaction to structuralism, which viewed humans as a "function of language." Modern linguistics, by contrast, argues that language is a tool of personality (Halliday 1994; Leech 2014).

2. The Concept of Linguistic Personality

Yu. N. Karaulov defines linguistic personality as a set of abilities and characteristics realized in speech. Its structure includes three levels: verbal-semantic, cognitive, and motivational-pragmatic. In English-language scholarship, similar ideas are reflected in Widdowson (2018), Kramsch (2013), and Byram (1997), who view linguistic personality as a combination of cognitive and sociocultural competencies.

3. The Cognitive-Pragmatic Aspect

Cognitive linguistics (Lakoff & Johnson 1980) interprets language as a system of concepts reflecting mental models of the world. Pragmatics (Leech 2014; Brown & Levinson 1987) complements this by analyzing the choice of politeness and self-identification strategies.



4. The Cultural-Discursive Dimension

Discourse serves as a space for the manifestation of linguistic personality. It embodies cultural experience, values, and emotional attitudes. Van Dijk (2008) points out that discourse is a form of social action through which the individual asserts themselves in society.

5. Current Trends: Digital Personality

Digital communication is shaping a new type of linguistic personality—hybrid, multimodal, and multicultural. In online discourse, personality expresses itself through text, image, and symbol, combining linguistic and visual codes (Kramsch 2021).

Conclusion

The anthropocentric paradigm enables a holistic understanding of language as a reflection of human nature. Linguistic personality acts as a link between language, thought, and culture. Its study allows us to understand how consciousness, worldview, and identity are formed. Prospects for further research include studying the cognitive mechanisms of self-presentation, the role of artificial intelligence in shaping linguistic personality, and the development of a theory of multilingual identity.

References:

1. Караулов Ю. Н. (1987). Русская языковая личность. — М.: Наука.
2. Кубрякова Е. С. (2004). Язык и знание: На пути получения знаний о языке. — М.: Языки славянской культуры.
3. Вежбицкая А. (1996). Язык. Культура. Познание. — М.: Русские словари.
4. Brown P., & Levinson S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press.
5. Byram M. (1997). Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence. Multilingual Matters.
6. Halliday M. A. K. (1994). An Introduction to Functional Grammar. Edward Arnold.
7. Kramsch C. (2021). Language as Symbolic Power in Digital Discourse. Cambridge University Press.
8. Lakoff G., & Johnson M. (1980). Metaphors We Live By. University of Chicago Press.
9. Leech G. (2014). The Pragmatics of Politeness. Oxford University Press.
10. van Dijk T. A. (2008). Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach. Cambridge University Press.
11. Widdowson H. G. (2018). Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis. Routledge.

