

The Use Of The Term “Concept” In Anthropocentric Linguistics

Qurbonov Elmurod Botiraliyevich

Independent Researcher, Renaissance Educational University, Uzbekistan

Received: 22 October 2025; **Accepted:** 13 November 2025; **Published:** 19 December 2025

Abstract: This article discusses the formation of axiology on the basis of philosophy, its integration with issues of linguistics, and the emergence of axiolinguistics as a new field. Research related to axiolinguistics is described. Studies noting the development of axiolinguistics in Uzbek linguistics, the theory of axiolinguistics, and its key concepts are reviewed. The concept of value is defined as the main subject of axiolinguistics.

Keywords: Anthropocentric paradigm, concept, axiology, axiolinguistics, cognitive feature.

Introduction: In linguistics, the study of the language system from an anthropocentric point of view has mainly manifested itself in research related to linguistic semantics, cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmatic linguistics, and linguoculturology. In works created on the basis of the anthropocentric paradigm, the language system is examined in connection with the human factor. Although Uzbek linguists' research in linguistic semantics, pragmatics, and cognitive linguistics reflects tendencies of the anthropocentric approach, studies in this area are still not sufficiently developed. One of the first studies on the anthropocentric analysis of text in Uzbek linguistics was conducted by D. Khudoyberganova. This research served as a foundation for several subsequent works. Scholars express the following views on the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm: The anthropocentric paradigm emerged as a result of anti-positivist views that arose in response to studying language in an immanent manner, that is, separately from its owner (A. Nurmonov). Prof. Sh. Safarov explains the emergence of the anthropocentric paradigm as follows: “The systemic-structural paradigm sought to eliminate the ‘atomistic’ shortcomings of the comparative-historical paradigm, which had arisen earlier and which analyzed linguistic phenomena separately from one another. The main achievement of the systemic-structural approach was proving that language is a systemic phenomenon. However, it became clear that both paradigms had a common drawback: in these approaches, language became

detached from its owner — the human being. Attempts to eliminate this flaw led to the formation of pragmatic and cognitive linguistic paradigms” Prof. N. Mahmudov, discussing the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics, states: “In accordance with this objective characteristic of language, the anthropocentric paradigm places the human at the center, and language is considered a core element that shapes human personality”

According to researchers, cognitive, sociolinguistic, ethnolinguistic, psycholinguistic, neurolinguistic, pragmatic, and linguoculturological fields constitute the mini-paradigms included in the anthropocentric paradigm. For example, one of its leading branches, cognitive linguistics, is a field that studies language as a general cognitive mechanism. According to V. Z. Demyankov, cognitive linguistics studies the role of language structures in information processing from the standpoint of speech production and perception. In this process, the subjects who produce and perceive speech—the speaker and the listener—are viewed as systems that process information. The concept, a mental structure, plays an important role in the transition of information to the verbal stage. The term concept is frequently encountered in anthropocentric linguistics. While in linguistics until the 1980s it was used as a synonym for “notion,” its modern interpretation has gained broader meaning. N. Y. Shvedova notes that behind the concept lies a content that is perceived socially or subjectively, reflects an important material, intellectual, or spiritual aspect of

human life, has historical roots, and embodies the collective experience of a people. The term “concept” derives from the Latin *conceptus* (“notion”). A concept is two-sided: on one hand, culture enters a person’s mental world through concepts; on the other hand, a person enters culture and sometimes influences it through concepts. Preserving his or her own unique individual culture, a person refers to the culture of nations and the mental world of representatives of different peoples via concepts.

The notion of concept has also been explained by Uzbek linguists N. Mahmudov, Sh. Safarov, and A. E. Mamatov. The concept is a multifaceted and multilayered mental structure. It simultaneously represents psychological, cognitive-semantic, and linguocultural aspects. Hence, the fact that the concept is studied as an object of cognitive and linguoculturological research confirms its complex nature. Because of this, the classification of concepts into subjective, social, linguocultural, and artistic types by researchers may be regarded as approaches from different angles to a single essence. It is well-known that the language system is one of the multifaceted phenomena that combines all the qualities described above. Scholars emphasize that anthropocentric linguistics studies language not as a dry structure but as an open system based on living communication and interaction, analyzing it in close connection with other systems—society, human beings, culture, psychology—and focusing on the human within language or language within the human. In this context, the human is said to serve as a “golden bridge” revealing the interconnections between various spheres of social life. For example, in the anthropocentric analysis of text (particularly in linguistic personology and sociolinguistics), factors influencing a person’s speech are taken into account. Specialists studying texts must pay attention to the author and his or her characteristics, such as: age, gender, physical condition (healthy, ill, etc.), psychological state (dreamy, mentally ill), intellectual level (broad or narrow worldview), place of birth or long-term residence (city, village, mountains, desert, the USA, India, etc.), parents’ occupations (baker, artisan, entrepreneur, farmer, teacher, doctor, etc.), surrounding community (intellectuals, thieves, gossipers, etc.), foreign languages learned (English, Turkish, Russian, etc.), the society in which the person lives, social background (nobles, slaves, masters, etc.), nationality (Uzbek, Kazakh, Arab, Chinese, etc.). All this helps to understand the text more fully.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the anthropocentric analysis of text requires serious effort and responsibility from the

researcher. In modern linguistics, the study of the language system from an anthropocentric perspective is becoming increasingly prevalent. Today, research related to this paradigm—particularly in linguistic semantics, cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmalinguistics, and linguoculturology—is expanding both in content and scope.

REFERENCES

1. Askoldov S. A. Concept and Word // Russian Philology in the Structure of Text. Anthology. Moscow: Academia, 1997. pp. 260–290.
2. Mahmudov N. In Search of Ways to Perfectly Study Language // Uzbek Language and Literature. Tashkent, 2012. pp. 5–20.
3. Maslova V. A. Linguoculturology. Academia, 2001. pp. 200–210.
4. Khudoyberganova D. Anthropocentric Study of Text. Tashkent, 2013. pp. 11–55.
5. Tojiyeva G. Development of Spiritual-Educational Vocabulary of the Uzbek Language During the Independence Years. Samarkand, 2017.
6. Safarov Sh. Cognitive Linguistics. Jizzakh: Sangzor, 2006.