

Anthropocentric Paradigm: Problems, Basic Concepts and Provisions

Tuxtakhodjayeva Nargiza Akmalovna, Khojjeva Zarina Bakhtiyarovna
PhD, Tashkent International University of financial management and technology,
Uzbekistan, Tashkent

Abstract: In the article, the author examines the most significant provisions of the scientific paradigm, the problems of the anthropocentric paradigm, the key concepts of interdisciplinarity and textocentrism.

Keywords: paradigm, anthropocentric paradigm, comparative historical paradigm, systemic structural paradigm, interdisciplinarity, textocentrism.

In contemporary linguistics, there is a growing interest in the concept of paradigm, particularly focusing on the anthropocentric paradigm. This surge in interest is driven by the emergence of new ideas, concepts, and methodologies in linguistics. Understanding these requires delving into “not just the foundational principles of individual schools of thought, but also the overarching strategic directions shaping modern linguistics” [1, c.17].

The term "scientific paradigm" was introduced by American scholar Thomas Kuhn in his work "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions." Kuhn defines a scientific paradigm as a widely accepted scientific achievement that serves as a model for problem-solving within a scientific community over a certain period of time» [19, c.17]. According to Kuhn, the history of linguistics, like other sciences, undergoes a series of paradigm shifts through scientific revolutions. This sequential transition from one paradigm to another, catalyzed by revolutions, is a typical pattern in the advancement of mature sciences [19, c.37].

E.S. Kubryakova proposes that paradigms emerge due to the distinct approaches taken by various scientific communities. Each community develops its own research programs, starting points, and specific goals, which are then integrated to address overarching issues in language studies [18, c. 9]. Developing T. Kuhn's ideas about scientific revolutions, Kubryakova sees these revolutions as marked by the rejection of previous knowledge sets, the resolution of anomalies, and the identification of gaps in existing frameworks. This critical assessment leads to the abandonment of earlier scientific assumptions [18, c.6]. Kubryakova's interpretation of paradigms and scientific revolutions, rooted in Kuhn's ideas, has stimulated a significant body of research exploring the concept of scientific paradigms, their methodological underpinnings, initial concepts, and research methodologies.

In contemporary linguistics, there's a significant ongoing debate surrounding the definition of paradigms, leading to considerable variation in terminology and quantitative composition. Different scholars offer diverse perspectives on this matter.

D. Shifrin, an American researcher, distinguishes between formal and functional paradigms. In the formal paradigm, emphasis is placed on autonomy, focusing on the internal organization of language systems. Conversely, the functional paradigm prioritizes the functions of language, suggesting that these functions influence the internal structure of language systems [29, p.20-43].

E.S. Kubryakova, on the other hand, identifies traditional, generative, cognitive, and communicative paradigms. Later, she combines the cognitive and communicative paradigms to propose the cognitive-discursive paradigm. In this paradigm, language is viewed as a cognitive process occurring within communicative activities, which shapes specific cognitive structures and mechanisms in the human brain [17, c.406]. A key aspect of this paradigm is the recognition that a thorough understanding of language and linguistic phenomena necessitates analyzing them within two intersecting systems: cognition and communication [17, c.325].

We believe that introducing a cognitive paradigm is entirely justified and enhances the thoroughness and accuracy of studying the subject matter. In relation to a literary text, considering its communicative, discursive, and cognitive functions is essential for a comprehensive analysis.

V.A. Maslova, echoing the views of numerous researchers, identifies three primary scientific paradigms: comparative-historical, systemic-structural, and anthropocentric [20, c.7]. The comparative-historical paradigm, regarded as the initial scientific framework, focuses on issues such as language origins, proto-language reconstruction, language relationship establishment, and the description of linguistic evolution over time and space. It led to the development of comparative historical grammars and dictionaries [22, c.8].

In line with the systemic-structural paradigm, scholars concentrate on the contemporary state of language, examining it synchronically. This approach, influenced by F. de Saussure, emphasizes studying language as an independent system with its own internal laws [22, c.8]. This paradigm remains relevant, with many contemporary researchers operating within its framework.

Yu.N. Karaulov outlines historical, psychological, system-structural, and social scientific linguistic paradigms [13, c.14]. However, V.A. Maslova's concept of identifying three main paradigms – comparative - historical, systemic-structural, and anthropocentric appears to be the most suitable, aligning well with modern linguistic trends.

In the early 21st century, linguistics is characterized by an active exploration of novel avenues for advancing the study of language. A significant shift in perspective is evident with the emergence of the anthropocentric approach, driven by the recognition that language, being a human creation, cannot be fully grasped or elucidated without considering its relationship with its creators and users [14, c.6].

The roots of the anthropocentric paradigm can be traced back to the ideas of influential scholars such as W. von Humboldt, E. Benveniste, and I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay.

W. von Humboldt emphasized that human beings achieve personhood through language, which serves as the medium for their deepest capacities and creative faculties. He viewed language as a bridge between the external world of phenomena and the internal realm of human consciousness, essential for the development of spiritual faculties and the shaping of worldviews [11, c. 314].

Similarly, E. Benveniste highlighted the inseparable connection between language and personhood, asserting that language is inherent to the very definition of being human [6, c.293]. According to I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, language exists solely within the individual minds and psyches of members of a linguistic community» [7, c.71].

Overall, these perspectives underscore the fundamental role of language in shaping human identity and consciousness, laying the groundwork for the anthropocentric paradigm in contemporary linguistics.

In contemporary linguistics, the anthropocentric paradigm has been extensively explored by Russian scholars such as Yu. S. Stepanov, N.D. Arutyunova, E.S. Kubryakova, R.M. Frumkina, V.N. Teliya, A.A. Ufimtseva, B.A. Serebrennikov, and S.V. Grinev-Grinevich. Uzbek linguists such as Sh. S. Safarov, D.U. Ashurova, D.S. Khudoyberganova, N.M. Dzhusupov, M.R. Galieva, and R.U. Majidova have also investigated the concept of anthropocentrism in their works.

Yu.S. Stepanov advocates for anthropocentrism as a fundamental principle in modern linguistics. He asserts that linguistics should be viewed as "the science of language in man and of man in language," emphasizing that language is constructed according to human standards, which are reflected in its organization [25, c.15].

N.D. Arutyunova discusses the anthropocentric nature of language, highlighting how human physical attributes, internal states, emotions, intellect, and social relationships are embedded within language [3, c.3].

E.S. Kubryakova's perspective on anthropocentrism is noteworthy. She argues that scientific objects should be studied primarily based on their significance for human beings, their role in human life, and their contribution to personal development and improvement. Kubryakova emphasizes that the focus of analysis should always be on humans, who determine the ultimate goals and prospects of scientific research. In essence, the anthropocentric approach places humans at the forefront of all theoretical considerations in scientific inquiry, shaping the specific perspectives adopted in research [16, c.212].

According to M.V. Pimenova, the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics is primarily concerned with studying the human element within language. Rather than focusing on linguistic forms, attention is directed towards content and practical application, emphasizing the understanding of language as it is used in human activities [22, c.10].

V.A. Maslova posits that from an anthropocentric standpoint, individuals perceive the world through self-awareness and their theoretical and practical engagement within it. This awareness of oneself as the measure of all things enables humans to construct an anthropometric order of things, which is deemed worthy of scientific inquiry. This internal order, residing within human consciousness, shapes one's spiritual essence, motives, and value hierarchy. Maslova suggests that understanding these aspects is achievable through the study of individuals' speech patterns, particularly those expressions they frequently employ and deeply empathize with [20, c.7].

In S.V. Grinev-Grinevich's work "Fundamentals of Anthropolinguistics," the focus shifts towards the linguistic dimensions of human evolution, particularly anthropogenesis [10, c.5]. Anthropolinguistics aims to reconstruct the evolution of human thought through its manifestation in language, primarily through vocabulary evolution. Grinev-Grinevich identifies lexical systems, particularly terminology, as the object of study, highlighting their role in reflecting the evolution of scientific knowledge systems.

The anthropocentric paradigm in modern linguistics is underpinned by various methodological principles, including interdisciplinarity, functionalism, explanatoryness, semantic centrism, and textocentrism. For the purpose of our research, we will focus on interdisciplinarity and textocentrism.

D.W. Ashurova's article "Interdisciplinarity as the basic principle of modern linguistics" offers a comprehensive exploration of interdisciplinarity, defining it as the interaction between two or more disciplines. Ashurova emphasizes that this interaction can range from a simple exchange of ideas to the mutual integration of concepts, methodologies, and research methods. Furthermore, Ashurova highlights that interdisciplinarity isn't merely the mechanical transfer of concepts between sciences but rather a fruitful collaboration that leads to the formulation and resolution of new problems. This collaborative approach has given rise to new fields such as linguoculturology, cognitive linguistics, and sociolinguistics, which integrate concepts from various disciplines like ethnolinguistics, cultural studies, and regional linguistics [4, c.6].

Interdisciplinarity, therefore, emerges as a fundamental methodological principle of the anthropocentric paradigm, allowing for the examination of language from diverse scientific perspectives.

Another relevant principle within the anthropocentric paradigm is textocentrism, which prioritizes the study of linguistic units within texts. Given that our research focuses on literary texts, textocentrism becomes particularly pertinent. M.V. Pimenova underscores the significance

of this principle by asserting that a text cannot be studied in isolation from its creator and intended audience [22, с.13]. Pimenova suggests that texts, being creations of individuals, reflect human thought processes, depict worldviews, and capture the dynamics of thought using linguistic tools.

Thus, textocentrism exemplifies the anthropocentric paradigm by highlighting the centrality of human agency in the analysis of texts and their linguistic elements.

The advancement of the anthropocentric approach has sparked heightened interest among scholars in the analysis of literary texts, emphasizing the significance of the "human factor." The inherent connection between literary texts and human beings underscores their anthropocentric nature, as these texts primarily aim to explore the inner world of individuals. M.M. Bakhtin's perspective is intriguing in this regard, as he suggests that every person, by virtue of their human uniqueness, expresses themselves and essentially creates a text, even if only in a potential sense [5, с. 301].

Within the framework of the anthropocentric approach, literary texts are examined with consideration given to the author, the characters within the text, and the readers [27, с.176-179]. In essence, the anthropocentricity of literary texts lies in their creation by individuals, their focus on human subjects, and their intended audience. Moreover, the cultural dimension of literary texts further underscores their anthropocentric nature, as these texts serve as reflections of the traditions, mindset, and cultural heritage of a particular society. N.S. Bolotnova's perspective is pertinent here, suggesting that texts carry the cultural imprint of a society at a particular historical stage, embodying the traditions, values, and unique personality of the author [8, с.15-16].

In summary, contemporary linguistics exhibits a polyparadigmatic nature, but the anthropocentric paradigm holds a dominant position. This paradigm underscores the importance of the human element in language, which is particularly pertinent in the analysis of literary texts when considering the interplay between the author, the text itself, and the reader.

Reference:

1. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Современные проблемы науки о языке. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2005. – 416 с.
2. Арутюнова Н.Д. Вступление // Логический анализ языка. Образ человека в культуре и языке / Отв. ред. Н.Д. Арутюнова, И.Б. Левонтина. М.: Индрик, 1999. – С. 3–10.
3. Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека. – М.: Языки русской культуры, 1999. – 896 с.
4. Ашурова Д.У. Междисциплинарность как основной принцип современной лингвистики. Хорижий филология: тил, таълим, адабиёт. Илмий услубий журнал. – Самарқанд: 2015, №3(56). – С.5 -11
5. Бахтин М.М. Эстетика словесного творчества. 2 - е изд. – М.: Искусство, 1986. – 444 с.
6. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. – М.: Прогресс, 1974. – 446 с.
7. Бо - дуэна де Куртенэ И.А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию: в 2-х томах. – М.: Изд-во Академии наук СССР, 1963. – 391 с.
8. Болотнова Н.С. Филологический анализ текста. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2009. – 520 с.
9. Галиева М.Р. Вербализация концептосферы Word/Сўз/Слово в английской, узбекской и русской языковых картинах мирах: дисс. ...кан. филол. наук. –Т.: 2010. – 178 с.
10. Гринев-Гриневиц С.В. Основы антрополингвистики. – М.: Академия, 2008. – 128 с.
11. Гумбольдт В. Избранные труды по языкознанию: Пер. с нем. / Общ. ред. Г.В. Рамишвили; Послесл. А.В. Гулыги и В.А. Звегинцева. – М.: ОАО ИГ Прогресс, 1984. – 400 с.

12. Джусупов Н.М. Когнитивная стилистика: современное состояние и актуальные вопросы исследования /Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. – 2011. – N 3. – С. 65 - 76
13. Караулов Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность / отв. ред. Д. Н. Шмелев. – М.: Наука, 1987. – 261 с.
14. Кравченко А.В. Язык и восприятие: Когнитивные аспекты языковой категоризации. – Иркутск: ИГУ, 1996. – 160 с.
15. Кубрякова Е.С. Парадигмы научного знания в лингвистике и ее современный статус. Серия литературы и языка, 1994. – Т.53. №2. – С. 3-16
16. Кубрякова Е.С. Эволюция лингвистических идей во второй половине XX века (опыт парадигмального анализа) // Язык и наука конца XX века / под ред. Ю.С. Степанова. – М.: Российский государственный гуманитарный университет, 1995. – 432 с.
17. Кубрякова Е.С. Язык и знание: на пути получения знаний о языке: части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира. М.: 2004. – 560 с.
18. Кубрякова Е.С., Лузина Л.Г. и др. Парадигмы научного знания в современной лингвистике. Сб. науч. трудов / РАН. ИНИОН. М.: 2008. – 184 с.
19. Кун Т. Структура научных революций. М.: ООО Издательство АСТ, 2003. – 605 с.
20. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. – М.: Академия, 2001 – 208 с.
21. Маслова В.А. Современные направления в лингвистике. – М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2008 – 272 с.
22. Пименова М.В. Кондратьева О.Н. Концептуальные исследования. Введение: учебное пособие. – М.: Флинта, 2011. – 176 с.
23. Сафаров Ш.С. Когнитив тилшунуслик. – Самарқанд: Сангзор нашриёти, 2006. – 92 б.
24. Степанов Ю.С. Изменчивый «образ языка» в науке XX века // Язык и наука конца XX века / под ред. Ю. С. Степанова. – М.: изд-во РГГУ, 1995. – С. 7 – 34
25. Степанов Ю.С. Эмиль Бенвенист и лингвистика на пути преобразования / вступ. ст. // Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. – М.: УРСС, 2002. – С. 5-16
26. Хожиева З.Б. Лингвокультурный анализ художественного текста //Academic research in educational sciences. – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 5. – С. 420 - 427.
27. Хожиева З. Б. Когнитивная метафора в художественном тексте //NovaInfo. Ru. – 2019. – №. 102. – С. 40-41.
28. Хожиева З. Б. Проблема языковой картины мира в современной лингвистике //Вестник Московского университета. Серия 22. Теория перевода. – 2014. – №. 1. – С. 189-195.