

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal
Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2025 Issue: 05 Volume: 145

Received: 22.05.2025
Accepted/Published: 30.05.2025 <https://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



Nargizaxon Maxammadjon qizi Nurdinbayeva
Namangan State University
Doctoral student

THE FORMATION OF THE ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM IN LINGUISTICS

Abstract: The article examines the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm, which is currently rapidly developing in modern linguistics, characterized by research on the relationship between humans and language, culture, society, and nature within the framework of linguocultural studies, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and linguopragmatics, and the attitude of the speaker of the language to language-related issues.

Key words: paradigm, anthropocentric paradigm, language, culture, human.

Language: English

Citation: Nurdinbayeva, N.M. (2025). The formation of the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 05 (145), 264-267.

Soi: <https://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-05-145-31> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2025.05.145.31>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

Language is the main tool for a person to live, think, convey his feelings and ideas to others, communicate with members of society, and leave the cultural and scientific heritage left by his ancestors to the future. Language has been directly related to culture for centuries and is nourished by it from the same root. The daily lifestyle, history, and mentality of each nation are reflected in language and culture. At the beginning of the 21st century, a huge change and radical renewal took place in the development of social and humanitarian sciences. The human factor began to dominate in the phenomena related to language in the field of linguistics, which is distinguished by its polyparadigmality. The concept of the “owner of the language” in language began to emerge, aspects of the human mind that were previously hidden from science. These phenomena gave rise to integration in the field of sciences, that is, mutual cooperation and rapprochement, and the emergence of new directions. Now language is understood as a gift that actively acts in the entire practical and spiritual life of a person, bringing the individual to humanity. Now the essence of language has moved to being determined based on the functions that a person performs in the relationship of a person with being, with a person with a person [1, p. 12].

Methods

The formation of the anthropocentric paradigm gave rise to a new era in linguistics, new tasks in the study of language, the focus on the human factor as a key concept, and new approaches to the use of unique methods and techniques in its description. The article used linguistic analysis, comparison, integrative, observation, and descriptive analysis methods. Since this study is essentially dedicated to the description of the paradigm that analyzes humans and their personal relationships in linguistics, descriptive, contextual, and component methods were also used in the analysis process.

Results

The anthropocentric paradigm is a change and redirection of researchers' interests from the object to the subject, that is, the analysis of a person in language, and language in a person. In the words of I.A. Bodeun de Courtenay, “language exists only in the individual brains, hearts and psyches of individuals that make up the language community [2, p. 6]. A person is the main center of language and culture, the basis that shapes it. Language and culture are mechanisms that reflect, collect, name, describe, form a repository of information about human

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

activity, ideas and views, national and cultural heritage, and pass it on to future generations.

The formation of the anthropocentric paradigm gave rise to a new era in linguistics, new tasks in the study of language, the focus on the human factor as a key concept, and new approaches to the use of unique methods and techniques in its description. In particular, new areas were formed from the integration of linguistics with a number of disciplines, and as a result of mutual cooperation, many terms were mastered and analyzed as an object of research. In linguistics, the text began to be viewed not only as a set of semantically and syntactically connected sentences, but also as a form of communication with social value, a mental device that reflects the knowledge, linguistic thinking, national psychology and mentality of speakers of a particular language [3, p. 13].

It has been more than a few centuries since the emergence of states and ancient cities in the world. The material and spiritual wealth created by mankind at that time, namely houses, tools, writing, coins, inscriptions containing a thousand-year history, reflected people's understanding of the environment and labor activities. People gave names to things and objects depending on the nature, structure, relief and location of the place where they lived.

In the process of studying the remains of ancient settlements, scientists have obtained a lot of information about farming, crafts, gardening, architecture, sculpture, historical campaigns and combat strategies, fortresses, palaces, road construction, ceramic, copper and iron products, libraries, temples, chronicles and works of art. In particular, ancient books such as "Pyramid Texts", "Book of the Dead", "Rigveda", "Avesta" tell about the history and science of human culture. In particular, cities, tools, coins, jewelry, and cave paintings preserve information about people's perceptions of the environment, religious beliefs, and rituals, and reveal the beginnings of culture and art. Jewelry, architectural styles, and inscriptions on coins can help us determine the times when the language, culture, and art of that era began to take shape.

In particular, writing is the highest manifestation and manifestation of spiritual culture. People painted images reflecting rituals, legends, myths, hunting and battle tactics on stone, bone, wood, porcelain, pottery, coins, boards and tree bark, covering them with wax, copper and animal skins, and recorded their descriptions.

The history of the ancient world, culture, lost urban civilizations, and means of human communication that have come down to us through writing serve to restore valuable information about them.

In ancient times, rulers ordered the drawing of state symbols on the clothes, helmets, weapons and flags of soldiers. These events indicate the beginning

of the emergence of semiotics. Gradually, world culture developed, leading to the emergence and rise of sciences.

Through cultural monuments, we witness the constant influence of culture on language, because human thinking, feelings of understanding the world, symbols, myths, and concepts related to faith are embodied in language. Ideas and concepts about existence do not arise spontaneously, but during human life. During their activities, a person collects information about the world around them and reflects this information in language, and culture is an integral part of this reality [4, p. 94].

Discussion

Language lives directly with its owner. If a language is separated from its owner, it becomes a dead language. Examples of this include ancient Persian, Latin, Sanskrit, Sumerian, and Hittite, but these dead languages play a key role in the restoration of ancient history and linguistics. Language reflects the development of society, the "spirit of the people" (W. von Humboldt), the unique intellectual abilities, ideas and views, moral standards and activities of its speakers.

The human factor is at the heart of language and culture. Both phenomena live, develop or completely disappear depending on man (dead languages existed until the collapse of the dominant era). The term "language owner" has not been studied for many periods with a separate approach. Only in the middle of the 19th century did the concept of culture begin to be used in a broader sense, that is, in relation to everything that has arisen as a result of human activity. In this case, the concept of culture acquires the meaning of "second nature" created by man, built on virgin nature [5, p. 15].

Language, in relation to culture, has the cumulative nature of accumulating and inheriting culture. According to Sepir, one of the main forms of culture preservation is proverbs, religious sayings, folk tales, genealogies. Differences in language indicate distinct differences in culture [6, p. 32].

Language, as a socio-cultural factor that shapes human experience, produces (develops) generally accepted, generally approved concepts, just like culture. After all, communication is ensured by the presence of mutually understandable concepts and their intelligibility to the participants of communication [7, p. 40].

At the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st centuries, political, economic, cultural and social changes in the world community, globalization processes accelerated, and a radical renewal took place in all areas of science. Now the "personal factor" has become the main trend, and the relationship between language and culture is studied through an anthropocentric paradigm. In particular, the issues of national character, national culture, national traditions

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

and values have become the object of study of linguistic and cultural studies.

In linguistics, language issues are analyzed on the basis of scientific approaches. Usually, such approaches are studied under the term “paradigm”. There are controversial discussions about the definition of this term.

Uzbek linguist A. Rahimov, in his article on the problems of studying language based on paradigms, explains the concept of “paradigm” as follows: “Paradigm is one of the basic concepts of philosophy of science and methodology, which (from the Greek meaning “sample”, “pattern”) is interpreted in the following meanings: 1) a concept expressing the relationship between the spiritual and material worlds; 2) a theory accepted as a model for solving scientific research problems. In the philosophy of science, the concept of “paradigm” was first used by G. Bergman in relation to the normativity of methodology.

F. de Saussure used paradigm as a linguistic term in relation to the system of word forms (variation or inflection), to the model of formation of grammatical forms. However, the widespread use of the term paradigm as a term in the philosophy of science is associated with the name of the American scientist T. Kuhn [8, p. 20].

In modern linguistics, 3 main types of paradigm are noted: comparative-historical, system-structural and anthropocentric paradigm.

In linguistics, comparative-historical, system-structural and anthropocentric paradigms are considered a systematic set of methods that study the principles of historical and descriptive analysis of language in their interrelationships. Currently, research is being conducted based on an anthropocentric approach.

V.A. Maslova emphasizes that in linguistics one paradigm does not completely give way to another, and at a certain point these paradigms can coexist [9, p. 4], and it is also currently being proven that each paradigm complements and creates a basis for the other, studying the language in different aspects and showing its development based on the laws of development.

In recent years, language, linguistic personality, and the factor of personality have taken on a central role in linguistic literature. In the literal sense, the “owner of language” has returned to linguistics. After all, in the development of a language, its owner plays an absolutely decisive role. A language is completely deprived of the opportunity to take steps towards perfection, completely independent of the will, beliefs and needs, intellectual and spiritual potential, thinking and imagination of its owner [10, p. 5].

In modern linguistics, the anthropocentric paradigm, which directly deals with these principles, has taken the lead in the scientific field.

The word anthropocentrism is explained in the book “New Encyclopedia of Philosophy” as follows:

a philosophical worldview, according to which man is the center of the universe and the ultimate goal of all knowledge and phenomena in the world. The history of the word is very ancient, and Protagoras’s saying “Man is the measure of all things” the famous phrase is the main content of anthropocentrism [11, p. 142].

The “Brief Explanatory Dictionary of Linguistic Terms” defines the term anthropocentrism as follows: “In linguistics: an approach to language from the point of view of the human factor; the main principle of studying language in such fields as linguoculturology, cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, ethnopsycholinguistics, intercultural communication, neurolinguistics [12, p. 21]”.

The anthropocentric paradigm is a set of teachings and methods that study language not only as a structure, but also as an open system based on communication, studying it in connection with other systems such as society, man, culture, psyche, and is aimed at analyzing man within language or language within man [12, p. 21-22].

The third macroparadigm in the history of linguistics is the anthropocentric paradigm (communicative or nominative-pragmatic paradigm). This paradigm is a set of views, ideas and teachings that study language not as a dry structure, but as an open system based on live dialogue and communication, analyze it in its integral connection with other systems - society, man, culture, psyche, etc., and are aimed at analyzing man within language or language within man [8, p. 23-24].

According to prof. A. Nurmonov, the development of such linguistics coincided with the period called the discursive turn in the humanities in the world. The introduction of the category of “language person” into the scientific paradigm of linguistics led to the assimilation of concepts such as person, consciousness, thinking, activity, behavior, situation, which were previously excluded from linguistics, but were widely used in disciplines close to linguistics [13, p. 53]. Now, in the neolinguistics or anthropocentric paradigm, the relationship between language and its owner is studied from a psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmalinguistic and linguocultural perspective.

However, none of them can be studied correctly and completely in isolation from the “owner of the language”. Because in every speech act, the trace of the speaker is noticeable. In order to overcome this limited aspect of structural linguistics, anthropolinguistics has begun to develop. Anthropolinguistics is considered by world linguists as a new era of linguistics and is recognized as including areas that study the internal structure of language in relation to the speaker and listener, such as linguistic semantics, pragmatics, and cognitive linguistics [14, p. 40]. Modern linguistics is distinguished by the characteristic of viewing any linguistic phenomenon as the result of the activity of

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

its subject. In this sense, modern areas can provide certain conclusions about some aspect of the language subject through the analysis of language/speech phenomena [15, p. 15].

In world linguistics, the study of the language system in relation to the individual is mainly reflected in research on linguistic semantics, cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmatic linguistics, and linguoculturology. In particular, the language system in relation to the individual factor was studied in the works of such linguists as V. von Humboldt, L. Weisgerber, E. Sapir, B. L. Whorf, A. A. Potebnya, J. Lakoff, M. Johnson, T. A. Van Dyck, U. Cheif, N. Chomsky, E. Rosh, Yu. N. Stepanov, L. V. Shcherba, A. A. Leontiev, N. I. Jinkin, Y. S. Kubryakova, V. Z. Demyankov, V. A. Maslova, N. I. Karaulov, F. K. Sedov [16, p. 4].

Speaking about the main directions and principles of modern linguistics, V.A. Maslova emphasizes that in language research, integrativeness,

anthropocentrism, communicativeness, dialogicity, discursiveness, and cultural orientation are now an interest in in-depth knowledge of language.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it can be said that the anthropocentric paradigm brings man to the fore. And language is its main, decisive feature. Human intelligence, like man himself, cannot be imagined without language, without the ability to speak. If language had not taken over all thought processes, if it had not been possible to create a new mental space in it, a person would not have been able to move beyond the role of a direct observer. The text created by a person reflects human thinking, character, reveals new worlds, revealing the dynamics of thinking and its methods of imagination through language, and such an approach to language is promising today [17, p. 16].

References:

1. Odilov, Y. (2024). Tilning shaxs va jamiyat munosabatidagi vazifalari. *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, Toshkent, 2024. № 3, p. 12.
2. Maslova, V.A. (2001). *Lingvokulturologiya. Uchebnoye posobiye dlya studentov visshix uchebnix zavedeniy*. (p.6). Moskva.
3. Xudoyberganova, D. (2015). *O'zbek tilidagi badiiy matnlarning antropotsentrik talqini*: Filol. fan. d-ri. diss. (p.13). Toshkent.
4. Usmonov, F. (2015). Til va tafakkur munosabati va tilshunoslikda antropotsentrizm tamoyili xususida. *Ilmiy xabarnoma ADU*, 2015. №2, p. 94.
5. Abdullayev, M., Umarov, E., Ochildiyev, A., Yo'ldoshev, A., & Abdullayev, A. (2006). *Madaniyatshunoslik asoslari*. (Oliy o'quv yurtlari uchun qo'llanma). (p.15). Toshkent.
6. Xudoyberganova, Z.N., & Mamarajabov, B.B. (2016). Til va madaniyat: o'zaro munosabat va o'zaro ta'sir masalasi. *Zamonaviy ta'lim / sovremennoye obrazovaniye*, 2016. №1, p. 32.
7. Maxmaraimova, Sh.T. (2017). *Lingvokulturologiya*. (p.40). Toshkent: Cho'lpon nomidagi nashriyot-matbaa ijodiy uyi.
8. Rahimov, A. (2012). Tilni paradigmalar asosida o'rganish muammolari. *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, Toshkent, 2012. № 2, p. 20.
9. Mahmudov, N. (2012). Tilning mukammal tadqiqi yo'llarini izlab. *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, Toshkent, 2012. № 5, p. 4.
10. Mahmudov, N. (2015). O'zbek tili lug'at boyligi rivojida faollashgan jarayonlar. *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, Toshkent, 2015. № 5, p. 5.
11. (2010). *Novaya filosofskaya ensiklopediya. V chetirex tomax*. (p.142). Moskva: Misl, 1-tom.
12. Xudoyberganova, D. (n.d.). *Lingvokulturologiya terminlarining qisqacha izohli lug'ati*. (p.21). Toshkent: Turon zamin ziyo.
13. Nurmonov, A. (2008). Lingvistik ta'limotning yangi bosqichi. *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, Toshkent, 2008. № 6, p. 53.
14. Nurmonov, A. (2012). *Tanlangan asarlar. 3 jildlik*. (p.40). Toshkent: Akademnashr, 3-j.
15. Usmanov, F. (2024). *Lingvomadaniyatshunoslik: milliy qadriyatlar va lisoniy shaxs*. *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, Toshkent, 2024. № 2, p. 15.
16. Xudoyberganova, D. (2013). *Matnning antropotsentrik tadqiqi*. Monografiya, (p.4). Toshkent: Fan.
17. Maslova, V.A. (2018). *Osnovi sovremennoy lingvistiki: kurs leksiy*. (p.16). Vitebsk: VGU imeni P.M. Masherova.