

## THE IMPORTANCE OF ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

**M.Ch.Chutpulatov**

Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs of UzSWLU

**Abstract.** The term anthropocentrism has become one of the frequently used notions in linguistic investigations in recent years. Besides being widely used terms in different scientific disciplines, it is an indispensable notion of linguistics at present time. This article discusses a few words about the use and importance of anthropocentric paradigm in modern linguistic disciplines.

**Key words:** anthropocentrism, concept, language, culture, human, anthropocentric, theocentrism, subjectivism, cosmocentrism, Universe, national-cultural aspect

The term anthropocentrism became widespread in the 20th century in disciplines ranging from philosophy and linguistics to ecology. Anthropocentrism is one of the oldest concepts in the system of Western philosophical and ideological concepts. The view of man as the center of the universe, the head, the dominion over all animals and creatures, whose life is equal only to his own, dates back to Greek philosophy and was finally fully formed in the Renaissance.

Anthropocentrism as a special principle of research consists in studying the objects of science in accordance with their role for human-beings, as well as their purpose and function in their life. Thus, this testifies to the desire of researchers to put man in the foreground. Language has always been considered as one of the most important characteristics of people. The problems of “language and culture”, “language and human” have always taken central position in linguistic investigations. Understanding the need to study language and human as a whole, that is, “speaking human”, made linguists to pay serious attention to all aspects of this complex problem.

It should be noted that, unlike Eastern philosophy, where human has never been central object to the surrounding world, but is presented as a part of nature, anthropocentrism is traditionally considered a phenomenon closely related to Western European philosophical thinking. I.A. Svitin emphasizes that in the Eastern philosophical tradition, there are ideas about the perfection of nature, in which man is not opposed to nature, but harmoniously follows it. Since nature, in its perfection, is seen as beyond human control and human in it is not the center of the universe, Eastern philosophy is not anthropocentric or partially anthropocentric.

If this situation is considered exclusively through the prism of the European anthropocentric doctrine of the New Age and without comparison with the conclusions of the study of the philosophy of the Islamic world, then it is natural that this view of I.A. Svitinn is logical. Since anthropocentrism in European philosophical thought was

distinguished from or opposed to theocentrism in certain periods of history, Eastern anthropocentrism has always operated within the framework of theocentrism: in the Christian doctrine, God created human in His own image and likeness; in the Islamic doctrine, Allah Almighty does not have a specific form to resemble something or someone, but He assigned a special place to man among all living beings, endowed him with speech, and thereby exalted him. Thus, the consistent theocentrism of Islamic philosophy includes both anthropocentrism and cosmocentrism<sup>i</sup>.

*So, according to the Western philosophical and ideological tradition, the idea of human as the center of the universe originated in Ancient Greece; V.I. Samokhvalova describes this period as a “childhood stage” that encompasses “the egoism and maximalism characteristic of one’s age” Figure 1<sup>ii</sup>. This separation of human – being from the natural world, parallel to natural and cosmic phenomena, made it possible to perceive human as a rational and social being and to determine the logical order of things through the relationship of individual life to the life of society.*

The huge engineering tasks of ancient Rome - the construction of palaces, forums, aqueducts, roads and bridges - required the purchase of a large number of building materials: wood, stone, clay, brick, tiles, lime, sand, metal, etc.; this naturally led to the need to develop wild areas that had not yet been touched by man and to occupy new territories. Thus, as many domestic and foreign researchers have noted, in ancient times a consumer attitude towards nature began to take root. V.I. Samokhvalova describes this stage of worldview as “the stage of collectively declared general anthropocentrism”<sup>iii</sup>.

The anthropocentrism of the Renaissance turns into subjectivism, characteristic of the Reformation of the 17th and 18th centuries - this (subjectivism) is a concept introduced by Rene Descartes, which means a turn to the subject, that is, a view of the human mind as primary information. The main requirement of subjectivism is that philosophical concepts originated from the subject, and then the reality surrounding it is the form, content or result of the creation of consciousness. At the heart of this is not just the principle of thinking, but the subjective experimental activity of thinking, from which the thinker cannot be separated. The idea of romantic attitude to nature to an attitude based on a rational calculation of technical use is put forward. Thus, as secularization deepens, anthropocentrism, freed from religious shackles, takes on the form of open opposition to theocentrism and becomes the dominant ideology in Western European epistemology. This form of it is called as “despotic anthropocentrism.”<sup>iv</sup>

Anthropocentrism, which focuses on individual material success, becomes the leading ideology in Western philosophical and worldview concepts in the 20th century. V.I. Samokhvalova and A.V. Vershkov argue that since European civilizations are younger than those of the East, anthropocentrism is considered a European model of

understanding the world, characterized by the enthusiastic view of one's own strengths and capabilities characteristic of young people, this youthful sense of life, confidence in one's own power, which embodies the active character of European culture, activity towards the world, and support for it by the traditional Christian beliefs of Catholics and Protestants<sup>v</sup>.

The development of the exact sciences in the 20th and 21st centuries shows that human is not considered the center of space on the scale of the Universe, but interest in anthropocentrism arose in a number of philosophical concepts of the 20th century. Among them, one can note such teachings as phenomenology, personalism, existentialism, philosophical anthropology, which are widespread in the West. It should be noted that the essence of the term anthropocentrism, which we are considering within the framework of this study, is deliberately simplified. Considering that, in addition to anthropocentrism, various other cultural-ideological paradigms and philosophical teachings belonging to various philosophical schools that dominated at certain periods in each cultural and historical era have been formed, it is impossible to talk about the classification of theories of anthropocentrism, but rather to highlight the specific features within the theory. For example, G.V. Makukha notes that while the Renaissance was dominated by an anthropocentric cultural and ideological paradigm, European philosophy also contained philosophical teachings based on discourses that were not only anthropocentric, but also cosmocentric and centered on nature<sup>vi</sup>.

Language cannot exist without human and outside of culture; language and culture are inseparable phenomena. Language is a means of expressing human thought, a means of communication, a form of thinking, a manifestation of concrete human life activity, which, in turn, is a real part of language. The anthropocentric approach in linguistics has led to the emergence of new linguistic disciplines such as cognitive linguistics, linguopolitics, linguopersonology, linguocultural studies, text linguistics, pragmatics (linguopragmatics) and communicative linguistics. The anthropocentric aspect is characteristic of many modern studies devoted to the problems of language and thinking, modern oral speech, communicative linguistics, cognitive linguistics, various directions of studying the linguistic representation of the world, linguistic and cultural studies, etc.

Thus, the recognition of the legitimacy of the principle of anthropocentrism in linguistics creates the need to study language in a broad socio-cultural context. In this regard, the need to study language phenomena in close connection with human communicative activity poses new tasks for linguistics. For the effective establishment of intercultural contacts, not only universal linguistic, but also cultural skills and abilities are necessary, since people speaking different languages see the world differently. Human thinking stands between the real world and language; the word reflects not the object or phenomenon of the surrounding world itself, but how a person

sees it through the prism of his national-specific picture of the world, which exists in his consciousness and is determined by his culture. After all, the consciousness of each person is formed both under the influence of his individual experience and as a result of communication, which serves to assimilate the experience of previous generations, and this leads to the manifestation of two aspects in anthropocentrism - universal and national-cultural aspects. Based on the above, it can be said that the essence of anthropocentrism in the science of language is now succinctly expressed in the popular expression “human is in the world of language, language is in the world of human”. Such a concept of language research also includes culture. Therefore, language research based on an anthropocentric approach is the study of the triad “man-language-culture”.

### References:

1. <https://old.bigenc.ru/philosophy/text/702474>
2. Svitin I. A. Cognitive potential of the principle of anthropocentrism // Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, cultural studies and art criticism. Theoretical and practical issues. - Tambov: Gramota, 2016. No. 1 (63). p. 154. (Свитин И. А. Познавательный потенциал принципа антропоцентризма // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. - Тамбов: Грамота, 2016. № 1 (63). С. 154).
3. Magomedov K.M. Islam: theocentrism vs anthropocentrism? // Islamic studies. 2018. - Vol. 9. -#3.- p.33 (Магомедов К.М. Ислам: теоцентризм vs антропоцентризм? // Исламоведение. 2018. - Т. 9. - № 3. - С. 33.)
4. Samokhvalova V.I. Human and the World: Problems of Anthropocentrism // Philosophical Sciences. - 1992.- No. 3. p. 162. (Самохвалова В.И. Человек и мир: проблемы антропоцентризма // Философские науки. - 1992.- №3.- С.162. ) ibid Samokhvalova V.I. opp.cit.. p.150
5. Samokhvalova V.I. Human and the World: Problems of Anthropocentrism // Philosophical Sciences. - 1992.- No. 3. p. 161.; Vershkov A.V. Anthropocentrism and modernity // Actual problems of humanitarian and natural sciences – 2014, No. 5-1, pp. 309-315.
6. Makukha G.V. The essence and existence of man in the philosophy of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance // Culture of the peoples of the Black Sea region. 2010. No. 187. P. 131-140. ( Макуха Г.В. Сущность и существование человека в философии Средневековья и Возрождения // Культура народов Причерноморья. 2010. № 187. С. 131-140.)