

Pindus

Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT



CiteFactor
Academic Scientific Journals



WorldCat®



INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER



Dimensions

PKP|INDEX



Google
Scholar



ISSN 2792-1883

IMPACT FACTOR:

6.823

SJIF : 5.686

**Open access and double-blind
peer-reviewed electron journal**

www.literature.academicjournal.io





Table of Content - Volume 3 No 8 (Aug 2023)

No	Paper Title	Author Name	Page No
1	Corpus Linguistics in Analyzing Film Discourse: A Diachronic Perspective	Erkaeva Dilnoza Bakhtiyorovna	1-6
2	Child as “Dramatic Character” in Modern Dramas	Mavlyanova Nigina Erkinovna	7-9
3	Challenges with Understanding English Idioms, Idiomatic Phrases and Ways to Overcome Them	Khakimova Dilshoda Oybek qizi	10-13
4	Importance of the Anthropocentric Paradigm in Modern Linguistics	Abdulloeva Kamola	14-16
5	Comparative Discourse on English and Uzbek Characters	Mukhammedova Khulkar	17-21
6	The Functions of Family Stories in Louise Erdrich's Novel “The Plague of Doves”	Nilufar Mukhammedova	22-27
7	Gender, Identity and the Manifestos of Liberation in Chimamanda Adichie’s Dear Ijeawele	Kufre A. Akpan, Monica Udoette	28-37
8	Pedagogical-Psychological Characteristics of Learning from Ancestors' Heritage on the Basis of Education	Siddikova Zulfia	38-41

Importance of the Anthropocentric Paradigm in Modern Linguistics

Abdulloeva Kamola

A post-graduate student in Tashkent state university of uzbek language and literature named after Alisher Navai

Abstract: Today, the issue of scientific paradigms is one of the most actual problems in the framework of studies of the main linguistic principles. In particular, experts focus on innovations in the study of paradigms in the development of linguistics, and also propose various terminological changes. The problem of scientific paradigm is widely discussed in linguistic literary studies.

Keywords: anthropocentric paradigm, cognitive linguistics, scientific paradigm, unifying paradigm.

The process of globalization today has covered all spheres of human life, and the process of interaction of cultures and interest in intercultural relations among representatives of different disciplines has arisen. In the conditions of globalization, it is common to observe intercultural relations. During the analysis of intercultural communication, its cultural and anthropological aspects should be analyzed at the same level as linguistic features. Nowadays, cognitive linguistics, cognitive psychology, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, ethno psychology, ethno psycholinguistics, linguistic culture, etc. study the problems of intercultural communication [Potebnya, Boldrev, Ashurova, Safarov, Dzhusupov, Galiyeva, Normurodova].

Researchers interpret the concept of a scientific paradigm in different ways, especially in terms of their names and quantities. In particular, in 1962, the American scientist T. Kuhn used the term "paradigm" as a model for describing scientific knowledge. According to Kukhareno's description, the concept of "paradigm" or in other words "paradigm of scientific knowledge" is interpreted as "a model for analyzing problems and solving them" [V. A. Kuharenko].

It is known that the comparative-historical paradigm is the first scientific paradigm in linguistics, and the comparative-historical method is considered the first special method of language research. The attention of linguists was focused on the word within the paradigm. Today, the language is studied within the framework of this scientific paradigm, including textbooks and academic developments on grammar, news publications are based on the methodology developed by the systemic-structural paradigm. The anthropocentric paradigm "directs the researcher's attention from the object of knowledge to the subject" [Maslova, 2004] , therefore, analyzes the person in the language and the language in the person. will be".

Recognizing the dominant status of the anthropocentric paradigm, linguists emphasize the existence of methodological principles of modern linguistics such as anthropocentrism, expansionism, functionalism, and explanatory [Kubryakova]. As mentioned above, anthropocentrism is considered as a methodological principle that proposes to study the "human factor" from the perspective of language. In this case, on the one hand, all the variety related to language-specific functions are inextricably linked with a person, his thoughts and experience, and on the other hand, language is considered a means of human consciousness, thinking and knowledge [Normurodova]. It should be noted that the principle of anthropocentrism really requires an interdisciplinary approach to study the human factor and its activities, which exist

outside of linguistics. The anthropocentric approach to the analysis of the literary text requires the interpretation of the person who transmits information as a creative image that forms and organizes the communicative process. In modern linguistics, the communicative theory specific to the text is formed on the basis of the theory of speech activity and is inextricably linked with the structural-structural, functional, cognitive and discursive approaches.

Expansionism refers to the use of information from other disciplines in order to solve this problem in a situation where it is difficult or impossible to solve a specific problem within one discipline. In fact, expansionism represents an interdisciplinary approach to language learning, which is characterized by the interaction of two or more disciplines, the use of information, the rules of science, concepts, methodological relations in identifying and solving problems of a particular science in another field. An interdisciplinary approach to the analysis of the literary text is of primary importance in our research work, and it is appropriate to clarify this problem in detail. Although there are several types of this process, what they all have in common is that it is based on the idea that two or more disciplines are interrelated, and that interdependence can range from the mere exchange of ideas to the formation of a new discipline can be differentiated up to mutual integration. It should be noted that some issues cannot be solved within one discipline, in particular, the problems of artistic speech are among them.

Interdisciplinarity in linguistics is always related to the nature of language, its appeal to man and all spheres of activity related to him. As mentioned above, this is not a mechanical interaction of different scientific fields, but it can be described as an interaction that contributes to the emergence of new disciplines (cognitive linguistics, neurolinguistics, linguopersonology, linguoculturalology, etc.) or new fields within linguistics (text linguistics, ethnolinguistics, discursive linguistics). The concept of interdisciplinarity is closely related to the concept of integration (integrity).

The anthropocentric approach to language focuses on the mental activity of the person, the semantic world, and reflects the importance and peculiarities of the nature of language and the person, analyzing the existing theories. Therefore, anthropocentrism as a leading branch of science reveals new features of language. The principle of anthropocentrism not only brought linguistics into the humanities, but it was able to change the subject of research and introduce new theories and ideas into the world of research that at first seemed insignificant. Thus, the principle of anthropocentrism served as a factor of significant changes in research in the field of linguistics. However, having general scientific and linguistic principles, anthropocentrism acquires practical importance not only in theoretical and generalization notes, but also in the solution of specific problems in language. Also, the anthropocentric approach puts new humanistic goals such as the importance of the problem in modern linguistics, finding its solution as a linguist.

It is known that the new anthropocentric paradigm has deep historical roots in science. According to V. von Humboldt, "the ultimate goal is not overlooked in language teaching and, together with all other factors, it serves the highest and most general goal of the aspirations of the human soul, the relationship of a person to himself and to the visible and hidden things around him. The ideas put forward by Humboldt were used in the scientific research of A. A. Potebnya. A. A. Potebnya proves his anthropocentric view as follows: "Indeed, language expands only in society, because a person is always a part of the whole that belongs to his tribe, people, humanity, that's why a person understands himself only by explaining his own and others' ideas [Potebnya, 1999].

The concept of anthropocentrism is one of the main principles of modern linguistics, including "anthropocentrism is the main field of science that includes the field of scientific objects. They are, first of all, their role for humanity, as well as the goals of a person in life and the development of a person's personality and it is classified according to the tasks of its improvement. In the analysis of

certain events, the person is in the main center, in this analysis it is explained by the determination of his success and final goals [Kubryakova, 1998] .

The emergence of the anthropocentric paradigm is associated with the efforts of linguists to study the nature of language in more detail. Although scientists have different opinions about the reasons for the emergence of the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics, the study of each of its peculiarities is one of the most urgent issues in linguistics. The purpose of this is to study these theories in depth and put them into practice. In world linguistics, the study of text based on the anthropocentric paradigm is often reflected in research in the fields of linguistic semantics, linguistic cognitology, psycholinguistics, cultural linguistics, and pragmatic linguistics.

Thus, although the principle of anthropocentrism is the leader among modern humanities, it is interpreted differently within the field of linguistics. Y.S. Kubryakova explains the human factor in language, which is considered a central issue in anthropological linguistics, as follows: "At first glance, the question of the role of the human factor in language may seem unimportant - everything that exists in language is created by a person, and language serves a person. But actually In fact, we are dealing with problems of incredible complexity, not only because everything is related to a person, but also because it is very difficult to reveal how important the existing issues in science are" [Kubryakova , 2004] .

In conclusion, it can be said that the anthropocentric paradigm gradually developed on the basis of modern linguistics. Anthropocentrism served as the main factor in the formation of non-traditional approaches to the description of separate language systems, language levels and units . Also, as a result of the introduction of the human factor into the field of linguistic research, along with the principles of modern science, the functional approach to language (principle of neofunctionalism) began to be studied as a separate feature. By the way, the problem of the paradigm of scientific knowledge in modern linguistics is still relevant due to its versatility and uncertainty. The anthropocentric paradigm is generally accepted as a unifying paradigm, although this issue, which is considered relevant in modern linguistics, has not been sufficiently studied in terms of general theory.

References:

1. Alefirenko, N. F. Problemy kognitivnoj lingvistiki. Nauchnaja monografija. Nitra: UKF, 2011. 216 s.
2. Karaulov, Yu.N. Russian language and linguistic personality / Yu.N. Karaulov. – M.: Publishing House LKI, 2010. – 264 p.
3. Kubryakova E.S. Language and knowledge. - M.: Ros. Academy of Sciences. Institute of Linguistics. - M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2004. -- 560 P. (Language. Semiotics. Culture).
4. Maslova, V.A. Modern linguistic approaches. KSR. Methodical recommendation / V.A. Maslova. – 2003. –37 p.
5. Maslova, V.A., (2004). Cognitive linguistics. Minsk: Tetra Systems, pp: 80
6. Кун Т.С. Структура научных революций / Пер. с англ. И.З. Налетова. – М.: Издательство “Прогресс”, 1977. – 605 с.
7. Кухаренко В.А. Интерпретация художественного текста. – М.: Просвещение, 1988. – С. 245