

ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM IS THE NEOBRANCH OF MODERN LINGUISTICS

Askarova Manzura Bakhtiyor Qizi

ORCID: 0000-0001-5880-5758, Uzbekistan, Namangan State University,
Basic doctoral student of the department of Uzbek language and literature

Email: asqarovam53@gmail.com, Tel: 998974676063

Annotation

The article explains that the concept of paradigm, their types, anthropocentric paradigm is one of the neo-fields of modern linguistics.

Keywords: paradigm, comparative-historical, system-structural and anthropocentric paradigm, neolinguistics, modern linguistics, etc.

Nowadays, linguistics around the world has been experiencing another scientific revolution, which, first of all, is associated with the crisis of the new scientific paradigm that defines both the issues under study and the methods and techniques used to solve specific linguistic problems. Paradigm (lat. *parádeigma* – *παράδειγμα*, English- paradigm, german- Paradigma - example) as a methodological concept, it was introduced into scientific use by the American philosopher Thomas Kuhn in the last quarter of the 20th century. In his book "Structure of Scientific Revolutions" published in 1962, the scientist used this term to explain "leaps" in science. It is known that in linguistics (in social sciences in general) paradigms do not replace each other, but one complements the other, and at the same time one coexists without paying attention to the other. Traditionally, the scientific paradigm is divided into three types: comparative-historical, system-structural and anthropocentric. The new - anthropocentric - linguistic paradigm recognizes as axiomatic the assertion that it is impossible to study a language outside a person and that the problem of the unity of thinking and language / speech cannot be solved if the question of the unity of cognitive and affective-motivational in the activity of a linguistic personality is not resolved. [1,p.356]. In the science of language, three scientific paradigms are traditionally distinguished: comparatively historical (characteristic of the linguistics of the 19th century and based on the comparative historical method), systemic-structural (the focus of which is the word) and anthropocentric, "returning to man the status of" the measure of all things " and returning it to the center of the universe." Thus, the idea of the anthropocentricity of language is the key one in modern linguistics. From the standpoint of this paradigm, a person cognizes the world "through awareness of himself, his theoretical and objective activity in it", and this gives him the right to "create in his mind an anthropocentric order of things", which determines his "spiritual essence, the motives of his actions, the hierarchy of values » Anthropocentric paradigm of linguistics of the twentieth century. is divided into four interconnected, but, nevertheless, different directions. The first direction explores language as a "mirror" of a person, the basic concept for it is the concept of

a linguistic picture of the world, and the main task is to study how a person reflects himself in language. The second direction is communicative linguistics, it is characterized by an interest in a person, primarily in his relation to the communication process. The third direction studies, using data from other sciences, the role of language in cognitive processes and human cognitive organization. The fourth direction of anthropocentric linguistics, without having its own name, is aimed at finding out how language exists in the person himself. According to the scientist, “each of them combines, although in different proportions, elements of formal description with functional explanations. But each of them represents a special model for describing the language and solving the main problems in its organization and functioning” [2, p. 190]. V.A. Maslova [3, p. 5] identifies three scientific paradigms: comparative-historical, system-structural and anthropocentric. The author of the article, following V.A. Maslova, adheres to this classification. As we know, the comparative-historical paradigm was the first scientific paradigm in linguistics, and the comparative-historical method was the first special method of language research. Within the framework of the system-structural paradigm, the attention of linguists was focused on the word. To date, the language continues to be studied within this scientific paradigm: textbooks and academic grammars, reference publications are based on the methodology developed by the system-structural paradigm. Anthropocentric paradigm, according to V.A. Maslova, “shifts interests of the researcher from the objects of knowledge on the subject” [3, p. 5], and thus examines man in language and language in man. I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay once noted that “language exists only in individual brains, only in souls, only in the psyche of individuals or of individuals that make up this linguistic society” [4, p. 71]. The anthropocentric orientation of linguistics was seen by V. Humboldt, who defined language as “the world lying between the world of external phenomena and the inner world of man” [5, p. 304]. As the leading principle of linguistics, anthropocentrism was recognized in the 90s of the 20th century, the essence of which is that “scientific objects are studied primarily by their role for a person, by their purpose in his life, by their functions for the development of human personality and its improvement. The anthropocentric view of language has led to the expansion of linguistics to other areas of human knowledge, resulting in psycho- and ethnolinguistics, socio- and paralinguistics, linguoculturology and pragmalinguistics, communicative and cognitive linguistics. From the point of view of the anthropocentric paradigm, a person learns the world through self awareness, defines his spiritual essence with the help of language, defines his actions, determines his place in language, culture, and society. From the standpoint of research, all this can be determined by studying a person's speech, or rather his language personality. At the same time, the new paradigm implies new attitudes and goals of language research, new key concepts and methods. The anthropocentric approach in linguistics and the expansionism of modern linguistics has led to a surprising situation when, on the one hand, linguistics turns to the study of facts not strictly linguistic, using the methodology of other human sciences – psychology, cultural

studies, political science, etc., and on the other hand, methodological failures or inaccuracies of research are justified by anthropocentrism.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

1. Лазариди М.И. Психические состояния в полевом описании: номинативно-функциональный аспект: Монография / М.И. Лазариди. Бишкек: Издательство МПСИ, 2011. 356 с.
2. Kubryakova, E.S. Evolution of linguistic ideas in the second half of the twentieth century / E.S. Kubryakova / Language and science of the late 20th century. – Moscow, 1995. – P. 144-234.
3. Maslova, V.A. Modern linguistic approaches. KSR. Methodical recommendation / V.A. Maslova. – 2003. –37 p.
4. Benveniste, E. General linguistics / E. Benveniste. – Moscow, 1974. – 448 p.
5. Humboldt, V. Selected works on linguistics / V. Humboldt. – М.: Progress, 1984. – 400 p.