

**ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM: PROBLEMS, BASIC CONCEPTS AND  
PROVISIONS**

**Mukhtorali Zokirov**

Professor of Fergana state university

**Abstract:** The anthropocentric essence of language is viewed through the prism of a specially allocated interpretive function, which combines all additional functions, in addition to cognitive and communicative ones. The types and structure of linguistic interpretation, its manifestation at the level of cognitive processes and the representation of their results in linguistic units and categories are analyzed.

**Key words:** Anthropocentricity, interpretation, function, category, knowledge, conceptualization, categorization.

---

**Introduction**

Modern linguistics is characterized by increased interest in the problem of paradigm, in particular the anthropocentric paradigm. This is due to the fact that at the present stage of development of linguistics, many ideas, concepts, and approaches have appeared, the understanding of which requires the study of not only the fundamental postulates of individual schools, but also strategic directions for the development of modern linguistics.

**The main part**

As you know, the author of the concept of “scientific paradigm” is the American scientist T. Kuhn. In T. Kuhn’s work “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions,” the concept of “scientific paradigm” is interpreted as “a scientific achievement recognized by all, which over a certain period of time provides the scientific community with a model for posing problems and their solutions” [1]. According to T. Kuhn, as a result of the scientific revolution, in the history of linguistics there is a change in scientific paradigms and this “sequential transition from one paradigm to another through a revolution is a common model for the development of mature science” [1].

Regarding the question of the reasons for the emergence of paradigms E.S. Kubryakova believes that this is due to the desire to show the difference in the general attitudes of the scientific community, which is developing “its own research programs, its starting points, the special goals and objectives of these studies and, most importantly, integrating all these principles, attitudes, etc. to solve what is considered a global problem in language learning” [2]. E.S. Kubryakova, developing T. Kuhn’s opinion about the scientific revolution, interprets the scientific revolution as “first of all, the non-recognition of the previous set of knowledge, the resolution of “anomalies”, the discovery of gaps in this set, criticism and rejection of the initial assumptions of science that prevailed in a certain period of time” [2]. It should be emphasized that this understanding of the paradigm and the scientific revolution of T. Kuhn contributed to the emergence of numerous scientific works devoted to the concept of a scientific paradigm and its methodological foundations, initial concepts and research methods.

In modern linguistics, the issue of defining paradigms is widely debated; there is a great deal of terminological discrepancy in the designation of paradigms and their quantitative composition. There are formal, functional (D. Shifrin) [3], cognitive, communicative (E.S. Kubryakova) [4].

comparative-historical, system-structural (V.A. Maslova) [5], etc. Let's consider the points of view some researchers.

American researcher D. Shifrin distinguishes formal and functional paradigms. According to D. Shifrin, the formal paradigm is characterized by autonomy, which means the study of the internal organization of the language system. In contrast to the formal paradigm, in the functional paradigm much attention is paid to the functions of language, which, according to the author, influence the internal organization of the language system [6].

E.S. Kubryakova distinguishes traditional, generative, cognitive and communicative paradigms. Subsequently, the author combines two paradigms, cognitive and communicative, and as a new paradigm puts forward the cognitive-discursive paradigm, in which language is defined as "a cognitive process carried out in communicative activity and providing special cognitive structures and mechanisms in the human brain" [7]. A distinctive feature of this paradigm is the provision that "adequate cognition of language and linguistic phenomena occurs when analyzing them in two coordinate systems, i.e. at the intersection of cognition and communication" [8].

In our opinion, the identification of a cognitive paradigm is completely justified and contributes to the fact that the object being studied receives the most complete and adequate description. In relation to a literary text, taking into account the communicative, discursive and cognitive functions is a necessary condition for its analysis.

V.A. Maslova, following many researchers, identifies three scientific paradigms: comparative-historical, systemic-structural and anthropocentric [8]. The comparative historical paradigm is defined as the first scientific paradigm within which issues related to "the origin of languages, the reconstruction of the proto-language, the establishment of relationships between related languages and a description of their evolution in time and space were studied, and comparative historical grammars and dictionaries were created" [9].

In line with the systemic-structural paradigm, scientists have focused their attention on the current state of language, in its synchronic aspect. As noted by M.V. Pimenov, "the defining thesis was the thesis of F. de Saussure, declaring that the object of linguistics should be language "in itself and for itself" [9]. From the point of view of F. de Saussure, the internal nature of language is comprehended in synchrony, since "for a speaking person, only he is the true and only reality. Within semiotics, it has its own laws, which should be studied" [10]. It is important to note that this paradigm is still relevant and many modern researchers continue to work within its framework.

Yu.N. Karaulov defines historical, psychological, system-structural and social scientific linguistic paradigms [11].

It seems that V. A. Maslova's concept of identifying three main paradigms - comparative historical, systemic structural and anthropocentric - is the most acceptable, since it best reflects modern trends in linguistics.

Linguistics at the beginning of the 21st century is distinguished by an active search for new ways to develop the science of language. Linguistic material began to be analyzed from the position of a new approach, anthropocentric, the development of which is determined by the understanding that "language, being a human institution, cannot be understood and explained without connection with its creator and user" [12].

In the origins of the emergence of the anthropocentric paradigm, the views of such scientists as W. von Humboldt and E. Benveniste, as well as I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay are of particular importance.

One of the first, W. von Humboldt, put forward the idea that “a person becomes a person only through language, in which the creative primary powers of a person, his deepest capabilities, operate. Language is the single spiritual energy of the people” [13]. In Humboldt's understanding, language is seen as “the world lying between the world of external phenomena and the inner world of man” [13], as a system “embedded in the very nature of man and necessary for the development of his spiritual powers and the formation of a worldview” [13]. For E. Benveniste, there is also “only a person with a language, a person speaking to another person, and language, thus, belongs to the very definition of a person” [14]. According to I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, “language exists only in individual brains, only in souls, only in the psyche of individuals or individuals that make up a given linguistic society” [15].

In the works of Yu.S. Stepanov proclaims anthropocentrism as the most important principle of modern linguistics. According to this concept, linguistics is “the science of language in man and of man in language,” since “language is created according to the standards of man, and this scale is imprinted in the very organization of language” [16].

N.D. Arutyunova, reflecting on the anthropocentric nature of language, writes: “a person imprinted in language his physical appearance, his internal states, his emotions, his intellect, his attitude to the objective and non-objective world, nature, his relationship to a collective of people and another person” [17].

The point of view of E.S. deserves special attention. Kubryakova, who believes that “scientific objects are studied, first of all, according to their role for a person, according to their purpose in his life, according to their functions for the development of the human personality and its improvement” [17]. From the point of view of a scientist, when analyzing any scientific phenomena, the focus is on the person who determines “his prospects and ultimate goals” [ibid]. In other words, for the anthropocentric approach, man comes to the fore “in all theoretical prerequisites of scientific research and determines its specific perspective” [ibid.].

According to M.V. Pimenova, the anthropocentric paradigm is aimed at studying the “human factor in language”. The attention of scientists is focused on studying not the form, but the content, “not on the mechanism underlying the language, but on its application” [17].

V.A. Maslova is convinced that from the position of anthropocentrism, “a person understands the world through awareness of himself, his theoretical and substantive activity in it” [18]. This is explained by the author by the fact that “awareness of oneself as the measure of all things gives a person the right to create in his consciousness an anthropometric order of things, which needs to be studied at a scientific level” [ibid.]. This order, being in the consciousness of a person, predetermines “his spiritual essence, the motives of his actions, the hierarchy of values” [18]. Understanding all this is possible by studying a person's speech, “those turns and expressions that he most often uses, to which he shows the highest level of empathy [ibid].

In the work of S.V. Grinev-Grinevich “Fundamentals of Anthropolinguistics” states that “anthropolinguistics should deal with the linguistic aspects of human evolution - anthropogenesis” [19]. Its goal is “to recreate the picture of the evolution of the human mind based on its reflection in the corresponding evolution of language (primarily its vocabulary)” [19]. As the object of this discipline, the author identifies “lexical systems of various languages,

primarily terminology,” and its subject includes “general features of the historical development of terminologies of different languages” [ibid.], since it is in them, according to S.V. Grinev-Grinevich, the characteristic features of the process of evolution of the system of scientific knowledge are most clearly displayed.

In modern linguistics it is noted that the anthropocentric paradigm is based on a number of methodological principles, such as interdisciplinarity, functionalism, explanatoryness, semantic centrism, textocentrism, etc. For the purposes of our research, interdisciplinarity and textocentrism will be considered.

The most complete coverage of the problem of interdisciplinarity is presented in the article by D.W. Ashurova “Interdisciplinarity as the basic principle of modern linguistics” [16]. According to this provision, interdisciplinarity means “the interaction of two or more disciplines” [16]. At the same time, according to the author, “the range of interaction can vary from a simple exchange of ideas to the mutual integration of concepts, methodology and research methods” [16]. It is important to note that due to the integration of certain scientific concepts, as well as methodological settings, new sciences are emerging, such as linguoculturology, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, etc.

In the course of studying the problem of interdisciplinarity, D.W. Ashurova especially emphasizes that “interdisciplinarity is not a mechanical transfer of concepts and provisions of one science to another, but their fruitful cooperation, contributing to the formulation and solution of new problems” [16]. So, for example, linguoculturology is based on the interaction of such scientific disciplines as ethnolinguistics, cultural studies, sociolinguistics, regional linguistics, etc.

Thus, interdisciplinarity can be considered as a modern, fundamental, methodological principle of the anthropocentric paradigm, offering the study of language from the perspective of different fields of science.

The next relevant principle of the anthropocentric paradigm is textocentrism, which focuses on the study of linguistic units in the text. Due to the fact that the object of study of our work is a literary text, the most interesting concept for our research is text-centrism. The principle of anthropocentrism is most clearly manifested in the analysis of the text. In this regard, the point of view of M.V. Pimenova, who believes that the text “is impossible to study outside the person who is its creator and its addressee” [17]. At the same time, according to the author, “a text created by a person reflects the movement of human thought, reflects the image of the world, captures the dynamics of thought and ways of representing it using linguistic means” [ibid.].

The intensive development of the anthropocentric approach has contributed to increased interest among scientists in the study of literary texts, taking into account the “human factor”. The very fact that every literary text is directly related to a person testifies to its anthropocentricity, since the comprehension of the objective world in a literary text is focused primarily on understanding the inner world of man. In this regard, the point of view of M.M. Bakhtin, who writes: “A person in his human specificity always expresses himself, i.e. creates a text (even a potential one)” [20].

Within the framework of the anthropocentric approach, a literary text is interpreted taking into account the author - the creator of the work of art, the character and the reader of the work of art [21]. In other words, the anthropocentricity of a literary text is expressed in the fact that it is created by a person, the main subject of its description is a person and it is intended for a person. At the same time, the cultural nature of a literary text indicates its anthropocentricity, since a



literary text, being a unit of culture, reflects the traditions and mentality of a certain people. In this regard, the opinion of N.S. is important. Bolotnova, who believes that “the text bears the stamp of the culture of a certain stage in the history of society; the culture of a certain people with its traditions, foundations, mentality; the unique personality of the author” [26].

### **Conclusion**

Thus, to summarize, we can state that modern linguistics is characterized by a polyparadigm, but the dominant role belongs to the anthropocentric paradigm, which highlights the human factor in language, which is especially important for the analysis of a literary text, considered in the trinity “author-text-reader”.

### **References**

1. Зокиров, М., & Зокирова, С. (2010). ТИЛ ИНТЕРФЕРЕНЦИЯСИНИНГ МОҲИЯТИ ҲАҚИДА УМУМИЙ ТУШУНЧА. *Известия ВУЗов (Кыргызстан)*, (6), 10-11.
2. Zokirov, M. (2007). Lingvistik interferensiya va uning o'zbek-tojik bilimimizda namoyon bo'lishi. *MDA.–Toshkent*.
3. Зокиров, М. Т. (2015). Об общей характеристике билингвизма. *Ученый XXI века*, (7-8 (8-9)), 24-27.
4. Isomiddinov, F., & Zokirov, M. (2023). Friendship of Jomi and Navoi as Symbol of Friendship of the Tajik and Uzbek People. *Texas Journal of Philology, Culture and History*, 18, 38-40.
5. Zokirov, M. T. (2007). Lingvistik interferensiya va uning o'zbek-tojik bilingvizmida namoyon bo'lishi. *Fil. fn ilmiy darajasini olish uchun taqdim etilgan dissertatsiya*.
6. Zokirov, M. T., Zokirova, S. M., & Dadabayeva, S. S. (2021). About The Influence Of The Uzbek Language In Rishtan Tajik Dialects Of Ferghana Region. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(4).
7. Zokirov, M. T., & Zokirova, S. M. (2020). About Lexical-semantic Interference in the Speech of Tajiks, Living in Fergana Region of the Republic of Uzbekistan. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research*, 12(3), 10-11.
8. Zokirov, M. T., & Dadabayeva, S. S. (2020). ABOUT THE ROLE OF LANGUAGES CONTACTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGES. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (4), 687-691.
9. Zokirov, M. T., & Zokirova, S. M. (2020). Contrastic analysis at the phonetic level. *Academic Leadership (Online Journal)*, 21(05), 163-169.
10. Turdaliyevich, Z. M. (2022). About Grammatical or Morph syntactic Interference. *European Multidisciplinary Journal of Modern Science*, 4, 768-773.
11. Turdaliyevich, Z. M. (2022). Actual Problems of Bilingualism in a Multi-Ethnic Environment. *International Journal of Culture and Modernity*, 13, 17-23.
12. Zokirov, M. T. (2019). About the general characteristic of bilinguism. *Scientific and Technical Journal of Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology*, 1(10), 260-265.
13. Исомиддинов, Ф., & Зокиров, М. (2023). БИР ДАРАХТНИНГ ИККИ ШОХИ. *BARQARORLIK VA YETAKCHI TADQIQOTLAR ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 3(5), 24-27.
14. Зокиров, М., & Исомиддинов, Ф. (2021). БИЛИНГВ НУТҚИДА ФОНЕТИК ИНТЕРФЕРЕНЦИЯНИНГ НАМОЁН БЎЛИШИ ХУСУСИДА. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, (6), 26-26.

15. Zokirov, M. (2023). On the Terminological Apparatus of Language Contacts in Modern Linguistics. *American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education* (2993-2769), 1(6), 69-73.
16. Zokirov, M. T. (2023). Linguistic Abilities and Their Neuropsychological Support. *American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education* (2993-2769), 1(8), 59-62.
17. Бердиалиев, А., & Зокиров, М. (2019). ЛИНГВИСТИК ИНТЕРФЕРЕНЦИЯ ВА УНИНГ ЎЗБЕК-ТОЖИК ТИЛЛАРИ КОНТАКТИГА АЛОҚАСИ. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, (6), 21-21.
18. Umarjonova, G. (2023). GLEICHWERTIGKEIT DER SOMATISCHEN PHRASEOLOGIE MIT DER SPRACHE DES KOMPONENTENHANDBUCHS IN DEUTSCH UND USBEK. *International Bulletin of Applied Science and Technology*, 3(5), 56-61.
19. Умаржонова, Г. (2023). НЕМИС ВА ЎЗБЕК ТИЛЛАРИДА СОМАТИК ФРАЗЕОЛОГИК БИРЛИКЛАРНИНГ ЭКВИВАЛЕНТЛИК ХОДИСАСИ (“HAND–ҚЎЛ” КОМПОНЕНТИ МИСОЛИДА). *Евразийский журнал академических исследований*, 3(5), 44-49.
20. Арслозода, А. Р., & Умаржонова, Г. М. (2023). ИНГЛИЗ ТИЛИ АСОСИДА НЕМИС ТИЛИГА ЎҚИТИШНИНГ АЙРИМ ХУСУСИЯТЛАРИ ҲАҚИДА. *Евразийский журнал социальных наук, философии и культуры*, 3(4), 184-188.
21. Умаржонова, Г. М. (2021). On the issues of the study of the functional content of phraseological units with the components “hand “–“қўл” in the contemporary German and Uzbek languages. *ИнКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ, ИСКУССТВОВЕДЕНИЕ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ: СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ВЗГЛЯДЫ И НАУЧНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ*, 66-70.
22. Umarjonova, G. (2019). On the issues of the study of the functional content of phraseological units with the components “hand “–“қўл” in the contemporary German and Uzbek languages. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, 2(4), 145-148.
23. Umarjonova, G. M. (2023). CLASSIFICATION OF GERMAN LINGUISTS BY PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS. *Open Access Repository*, 4(2), 595-600.
24. Умаржонова, Г. М. (2023). Фразеологизмлар луғатини яратишнинг назарий тамойиллари. *Barqarorlik va yetakchi tadqiqotlar onlayn ilmiy jurnali*, 3(2), 447-450.
25. Umarjonova, G. M. (2023). Cognitive Linguistics and its Basic Concepts in the Study of Somatic Phraseological Units. *American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education* (2993-2769), 1(8), 72-77.
26. Умаржонова, Г. (2019). ЗАМОНАВИЙ НЕМИС ВА ЎЗБЕК ТИЛЛАРИДА “HAND “–“ҚЎЛ” ФРАЗЕОЛОГИК БИРЛИКЛАР ФУНКЦИОНАЛ МАЗМУНИНИНГ ТАДҚИҚИ МАСАЛАСИ. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, (4), 33-33.
27. Умаржонова, Г. М. (2021). ТИЛЛАРДА СОМАТИК СЎЗЛАР ИШТИРОКИДАГИ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЗМЛАРНИНГ ШАКЛЛАНИШИ. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, (3), 43-43.
28. Umarjonova, G. (2021). Тилларда соматик сўзлар иштирокидаги фразеологизмларнинг шаклланиши (The formation of fraseological inits with somatic words in languages (Based on the words" hand", " қўл...) ФарДУ. *ИЛМИЙ ХАБАРЛАР-НАУЧНЫЙ ВЕСТНИК. ФерГУ*, 239-241.
29. Умаржонова, Г. М. (2021). Фразеологизмларда “қўл” соматизми “меҳнат воситаси” сифатида. *Ин культурология, искусствоведение и филология: современные взгляды и научные исследования* (pp. 66-70).

30. Umarjonova, G. (2021). Semantic classification of the phraseological units with the component “hand-қўл” in german and uzbek languages. *THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCE Учредители: Теоретическая и прикладная наука*, 11, 676-679.
31. Umarjonova, G. (2022). Functional content of phraseological units with the component “hand “-“қўл” in german and uzbek. *Oriental Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(04), 84-92.
32. Mukhtorovna, U. G. (2022). Somatic Phraseologies with “Hand””–“QOL” Component, Expressing Diligence in German and Uzbek Languages. *International Journal of Culture and Modernity*, 14, 68-71.