

THE ROLE OF A LANGUAGE IN THE LIGHT OF ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8052424>

Mirjalilova Madina Jamshid qizi

madino4ka0993@mail.ru

Uzbek state world languages university

Abstract

The article informs about the role of a language in the period of anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics. Firstly, a brief description of the concept of paradigm is given with the focus on the anthropocentric one. Afterwards, the main approaches to language learning and discourse analysis that emerged as a result of paradigm shift are described.

The interpretation of the concept of "scientific paradigm" contains an indication that we are talking about the "peak achievement", about the model of how to deal with a certain problem. In this sense, this term began to be used more and more often at the border of the 19th and 20th centuries. However, his finest hour struck in the middle of the 20th century, when it became clear that the human factor cannot be dismissed even in the so-called "exact" sciences. Moreover, at the same time, this term received a new, "Kunian" meaning, which does not coincide with either the etymological or the meanings that have been registered in Western European and Russian languages for many centuries. It was at this time that the scientific paradigm began to be called "scientific achievements recognized by all, which for a certain time provide the scientific community with a model for posing problems and solving them" [1].

Language has always been recognized as the brightest defining characteristic of an ethnos. The problem of "language and culture", "language and man" was one of the central ones in linguistics of the 19th century and was considered in the works of W. von Humboldt, E. Benveniste, A.A. Potebni and other scientists. However, in the first half of the XX century, it was relegated to the background, and language began to be considered "in itself and for itself." As Yu. K. Voloshin rightly notes, "for many decades, linguists have been studying the "silent man" (the language was, as it were, by itself, and man by himself) [2]. Awareness of the need to study a language and a person in a complex way, i.e. "talking man", prompted researchers to pay serious attention to all aspects of this complex

problem"). Thus, the idea of the anthropocentricity of language is the key one in modern linguistics.

The anthropocentric paradigm of linguistics of the 20th century is divided into four interrelated, but nevertheless different directions: 1) explores language as a "mirror" of a person, the concept of a linguistic picture of the world is basic for it, and the main task is to study how a person reflects himself in language; 2) communicative linguistics, it is characterized by an interest in a person, primarily in his relation to the process of communication; 3) the direction studies, resorting to the data of other sciences, the role of language in cognitive processes and cognitive organization of a person; 4) without its own name, it is aimed at finding out how language exists in the person himself [3]. S.G. Vasilyeva proposes to call this section of linguistics intra-subject linguistics or the theory of a native speaker. I. A. Bedouin de Courtenay is recognized as its founder, who believed that "language exists only in the souls, only in the psyche of individuals or individuals that make up a given linguistic society.

Thus, the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm led to "a turn of linguistic problems towards a person and his place in culture, because in the center of attention of culture and cultural tradition is the linguistic personality in all its diversity [4]: L-physical, L-social, L-intellectual, L-emotional, L-linguistic. Culture has a communicative activity, value and symbolic nature. Language is not only intimately connected with it: it "grows into it, develops in it, and expresses it." After all, as you know, "all the subtleties of the culture of the people are reflected in their language, which is specific and unique, because. fixes the world and the person in it in different ways. Yu.K. Voloshin notes that "culture itself is often mute, and in these cases it cannot do without language".

The idea of the relationship between these two concepts was reflected in linguoculturology - a science that arose at the intersection of linguistics and cultural studies and explores "manifestations of the culture of the people that are reflected and fixed in the language." The basis of the conceptual apparatus of this science is the terms "linguistic personality" and "concept". Currently, there are various approaches to the study of linguistic personality. First of all, this term is understood as a person as a native speaker, taken from the side of his ability to speech activity - essentially a speech personality.

In the twentieth century different "images of language" have developed: language as the language of an individual, language as a member of a family of languages, language as a structure, language as a system, language as a type and

character, computer revolution and computer approach to language, language as a space of thought and as a house of spirit.

In the 1980s discourse analysis is viewed as description of patterns in language implementations used by people to communicate meanings and intentions, associated with a variety of operations and scientific disciplines [5]:

1. Sociolinguistics, which deals with the structure of social interaction as manifested in conversation, gives a "grounded" generalization because it is based on real-life examples of language in use - usually working with transcribed data of oral speech.

2. Psycholinguistics, in connection with the real understanding of speech.

3. Philosophy of the language, as well as formal models, where semantic relations between pairs of sentences and their syntactic realizations are considered. It also discusses the relationship between meanings and possible worlds: to what extent the sentences used give propositions to which the values "true" or "false" can be assigned. The coarsening here is that it considers archetypal speakers addressing archetypal listeners within a (minimally specified) archetypal context.

4. Computational linguistics, dealing with the construction of discourse processing models.

However, it is limited to texts of finite length, often very short and taken within shortened contexts. In this variety, two types of analysis models are distinguished:

1. Formal models - in them the semantic qualities of linguistic forms are not taken into account, they are also abstracted from the historical aspects of the language. These include the following areas: the theory of speech acts, the analysis of conversation (ethnomethodology) and the ethnography of speech. These models are aimed at describing communicative competence. Formal theories of discourse consider the forms of existence of spoken language from the point of view of human interaction in the sociological aspect. The subject of analysis is the transcription of sequences of speech interactions. The units under investigation lie above the supply level; for example, these units include speech acts, communication moves, and exchange of remarks.

2. A meaningful analysis of discourse is completely focused on the semantic and historical planes, both in theoretical and practical terms. An example is M. Foucault's approach. Such an analysis is aimed at explaining the phenomena of speech activity. The research material is drawn from history, from written monuments.

The history of language theories shows that linguistics is one of those disciplines in which the emergence of a new theory, new ideas does not cause collapses and a radical revision of old data. This process can therefore be seen as the development of paradigms rather than just "ideas and methods". From the standpoint of anthropocentric 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, hierarchy of values.

THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. Арутюнова, Н.Д. Язык и мир человека / Н.Д. Арутюнова. – М., 1998.
2. Гируцкий, А.А. О ведущих тенденциях в языкознании XXI века / А.А. Гируцкий // Языкознание: взгляд в будущее. – Калининград, 2002.
3. Розенталь, Д.Э. Словарь-справочник лингвистических терминов / Д.Э. Розенталь, М.А. Теленкова, – 2001.
4. Ashurova D.U., Galieva M.R. Stylistics of Literary Text. – Tashkent: Turon-Iqbol, 2016. – 272 p.
5. Телия В. Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. –М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1996. – 288 с.
6. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. – М.: Изд.центр академия, 2007.