

Anthropocentrism Is An Important Paradigm In Linguistics

Prof. Dr. Mahmudov Nizamiddin Mamadalievich

Director of Institute of Uzbek language, literature and folklore under the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences

city Tashkent, Uzbekistan

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.12.10.2022.p13083

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.12.10.2022.p13083>

Paper Received Date: 24th September 2022

Paper Acceptance Date: 25th October 2022

Paper Publication Date: 30th October 2022

Abstract- The paper studies theoretical issues of anthropocentric paradigm of linguistics development as a special field of language science. The purpose of this study is to answer the question about language and culture, language and human, language and ethnos, which are impact on the semiotic system of language. The resource is the specific approaches to anthropological linguistics subject. As well as, the anthropocentric approach on linguistics in focused on the person as a subject of linguistic research that implements his communicative intentions in certain speech acts oriented to the and mental human activities. That is why it is possible to observe that in the history of world linguistics there have been various and different approaches to the phenomenon of language. So, it is better to research about it as a linguistic paradigm having its own background in linguistics and closely related to other related sciences, such as culture, history, psychology, sociology and other. Besides it, in this paper analyzed and introduced the terms concept, linguistic picture of the world and others.

Index Terms- anthropocentric paradigm, anthropocentric linguistics, linguoculturology, human, language, concept, linguistic picture of the world, speech, culture, history.

I. INTRODUCTION

Human language is extremely complex, extremely multifaceted, incredibly unique and regular phenomenon, which the human mind is often unable to imagine all its aspects as a whole and at once. That is why it is possible to observe that in the history of world linguistics there have been various and different approaches to the phenomenon of language. Of course, a certain aspect of the language was taken as a basis for these approaches, an attempt was made to reveal this aspect in depth, and all peculiarities related to the entire complex nature of the language were studied based on this aspect. It is enough to recall the many currents, such as psychologism, sociologism, naturalism, structuralism, aestheticism, formed in the history of linguistics. Naturally, none of the characteristics of these affix "isms" are alien to the essence of language, the presence of one of them in the essence of language does not negate the existence of the other. For

example, the presence of psychic (spiritual aspect) in the essence of language does not negate the presence of aesthetics (beauty, artistic-expressiveness) in it. Therefore, all these features should be taken into account when revealing the essence of the language. However, the experience of several centuries in the history of world linguistics shows that this is not an easy task, and the representatives of these currents also considered their chosen path to be the most appropriate way to study the language, and spent their whole lives on this path to clearly indicate the object of study and its essence. Of course, serious efforts to find ways to perfect the study of language are still going on, and with the unprecedented acceleration of human development, these efforts are gaining more speed and scope.

Today in science, in particular, in the science of linguistics, it was first put into practice by the American scientist T.Kun (in relation to physics) [13, p. 11] the term "paradigm" in the sense of "a holistic model of setting and solving a scientific problem recognized by experts, an overview of the object of science, a system of theoretical rules, methods" has become a tradition. Y.S.Stepanov based on the description of language in three dimensions in semiotics – semantics (the relationship of the sign with the concepts of the objects and objects it represents), syntax (the relationship of the signs with each other), pragmatics (the relationship of the sign with the person who uses the language) "paradigm" uses the term a little wider than this meaning, that is, as a concept related to the philosophy of language (views of language in connection with one or another philosophical movement), a way of thinking [24, p. 4-5] and devotes the entire monograph to a detailed study of the following three paradigms: 1. Semantic paradigm ("philosophy of names" as an expression of semantic approach to language). 2. Syntactic paradigm ("predicate philosophy" as an expression of syntactic approach to language). 3. Pragmatic paradigm ("philosophy of egocentric words" as an expression of pragmatic approach to language). Naturally, since a famous linguist understands a paradigm as a dominant view of language in a certain period in connection with a certain philosophical trend, for example, he analyzes the semantic paradigm from the earliest, antiquity, when such a paradigm was almost formed (at least, the debate about the correctness of names can be recalled).

It should be said that the third paradigm in this classification is particularly noteworthy. Y.S. Stepanov writes about this in particular: "The new paradigm of the philosophy of language is characterized by two absolute differences compared to the previous two paradigms: 1) the whole language is connected with the subject that uses it - "I"; 2) all concepts used for language description are relativized (attributed to a task): names, predicates, sentences – all of them, although different from each other, are considered as tasks" [24, p. 216]. The important thing is that in this paradigm, not only the language itself, but also the language user, the owner of the language is naturally part of the research object. As you can see, Y.S. Stepanov applies the concept of paradigm to the periods of linguistics from the earliest times to the present day. Most linguists tend to apply this concept to the history of the period after the 19th century, which is considered the date of formation of the science of linguistics in Europe. Although today there are different opinions about the number of paradigms in the science of linguistics, mainly it is customary to distinguish three paradigms, i.e. 1) comparative-historical, 2) system-structural and 3) anthropocentric paradigms [16, p. 5; 26, p. 144].

II. IDENTIFY, RESEARCH AND COLLECT IDEA

V.A. Maslova emphasizes that in linguistics one paradigm does not completely give way to another, these paradigms can live side by side at a certain moment, and briefly describes these paradigms as follows: Comparative-historical paradigm was the first scientific paradigm in linguistics, already, comparative-historical method was the first special method of language research. The whole XIX century passed under the rule of this method. In the system-structural paradigm, attention was focused on the subject, thing, name, so the focus was on the word. Even in the third millennium, language can be studied within the framework of the systemic-structural paradigm, because this paradigm still continues in linguistics, the number of its successors is quite large. The fundamental work created within this paradigm can serve as a valuable source of information not only for current researchers, but also for future generations of linguists conducting research in other paradigms. The anthropocentric paradigm is a shift of the researcher's attention from the object of knowledge to the subject, that is, the person is studied in the language and the language in the person. After these thoughts, V.A. Maslova rightly pointed out that "the idea of anthropocentricity of language is a key idea in modern linguistics. In our time, simply creating different descriptions of the language system cannot be the goal of linguistic analysis" [16, p. 5-6].

At this point, it should also be mentioned that it is not the right way to completely oppose one particular paradigm to another. For example, no matter how advanced and positive direction the system-structural paradigm is, it considers learning the language in an immanent state, that is, completely separated from the owner, as the basis of research. But some Uzbek linguists started to absolutize this paradigm, to announce it as the only correct way to learn the language, they presented it as an idea that rejects traditional linguistics, if not at all. However, traditional linguistics is not a science that is completely methodless, sloppy, and risky, so to speak, it is a strong science that synthesizes different paradigms, consciously advances different aspects of language, intelligently generalizes, and prepares the ground for

many directions. Traditional linguistics is concerned only with the practical, emotional-empirical description of language facts "given in direct observation", language phenomena "at the theoretical stage in a perceptual way" [14, p. 12] is not an outdated science next to structural linguistics. To be honest, in traditional Uzbek linguistics, there was a system-structural approach, that is, "research using the cognitive method at the theoretical stage", although not as a system.

The wise father of Uzbek linguists, Prof. Sh. Rakhmatullaev wrote in his time about incorrect interpretations in this regard: "F. de Saussure's teaching was already known as a direction of systematic-structural research of language phenomena, but to most national linguists, including Uzbek not applied to linguistics. The application of certain aspects of F. de Saussure's teaching to Uzbek linguistics began in the 90s of the 20th century with the initiative of Prof. Hamid Nematov... It is commendable to call Uzbek linguists to study language development in a systemic-structural direction. But it was not correct to assess the previous stage of development of Uzbek linguistics as a period of empirical study of the language, a period of inventorying language phenomena... It is not fair to discriminate that there was no system-structural study of the language in the previous stage of development of Uzbek linguistics. For example, Ayub Gulom's monograph "Determinants in Uzbek language" (T.: UzFan publishing house, 1941), created at the stage when the science of Uzbek linguistics was being formed, cannot be said to have been written in the direction of empiricism, inventory... In general, approaching the construction of the Uzbek language as a system, at the same time Uzbek There are many works written taking into account the national characteristics of the language" [21, p. 4]. To think that the great linguist A. Gulom, who had scientific debates, wrote letters, and had friendly relations with such linguists of the world, was not aware of the works of F. de Saussure or Baudouin de Courtenay or other linguists who made a turning point in the history of world linguistics is, at least, ignorant of scientific honesty. Therefore, it cannot be completely denied that there is a system-structural approach to a certain extent in the researches of A. Gulom and other famous Uzbek linguists, and fundamental theoretical ideas have been put forward.

As A. Nurmonov, explaining the essence and specific aspects of structural linguistics, rightly noted that studying the relationship between the structural units of the language is one of the important tasks of linguistics, but in this linguistics "the relationship between language and society, language and speaking person, language evolution, literary language and folk dialects A number of issues such as attitude, language and thinking, text linguistics, language aesthetics remain out of his view. At the same time, A. Nurmonov says that "traditional linguistics cannot be evaluated as "old, backward", and systematic linguistics as "new, advanced" linguistics" [19, p. 11-12].

III. IMPROVEMENT AS PER REVIEWER COMMENTS

It should be noted separately that language is a multitasking phenomenon, its integral essence cannot be defined based on one specific task, often, especially in systemic-structural linguistics, only the communicative function of language is relied on as a means of communication. In fact, in addition to the communicative task, "language performs a number of tasks such

as knowing the world, collecting and storing knowledge, conveying it to the next generations, reflecting spiritual relationships, and realizing the categories of beauty... Interpreting language only as a means of communication between people is the natural language of a person, which is nothing more than animating a complex and magnificent phenomenon, equating it with an artificial language (for example, Esperanto) that is completely similar to a specific national image or national-spiritual ground, equating it with a conditional "language" created for the purpose of regulating traffic" [14, p. 44].

That is why the formation of anthropocentrism as a separate paradigm in linguistics and the increasing number of researches in this direction in world linguistics is extremely gratifying. It should be said that anthropocentrism is not a concept or paradigm attributed by linguists only to the study of language, anthropocentrism is a phenomenon directly related to the essence of language. Russian linguist T.B.Radbil, explaining in detail that anthropocentrism is a fundamental, basic feature of language, cites Yu. S. Stepanov's words that "language is created in the human model, and this dimension is sealed in the structure of the language itself, and language should be studied accordingly" [20, p. 89]. Remembering countless metaphors in the language, it is easy to imagine that a person perceives the outside world with his own measure, his own example: *daraxtlar ko'z yosh to'kdi, mezonlar kezar, asablar tuproqqa cho'kkan edi tiz, ojiz jasorat, saratan mudraydi, hayratan lol qotgan ofiob, shu'lalar o'ynaydi, birovdan xijolat bo'lgan tol, yellar ham uyg'ondi ishqalab kaftin, maysa silkitadi bosh, hovliqma jilg'alar chopar, azaliy hukmini o'qidi hayot, bahor kelayotir, ivirsir bahor, gul o'qib turar bayt, maysa uyg'onar, yel kezar, uchqur zamon, nomard tabiat, uyg'onguvchi bog'lar, quyosh chekar oh, shamollar o'ynaydi, to'lqinlar qutursin, dono tabiat, qahqaha uradi qadim bu hayot* (А.Орипов). A person evaluates and names qualities and actions in the external world "through his own body", based on his own way of looking, as if relative to himself. It can be seen that the concept of man is at the basis of these metaphors, and it should be noted that it is extremely difficult to interpret their essence completely separate from man.

In accordance with such an objective nature of language, in the anthropocentric paradigm, man is given the main place, and language is the main element that makes up the human personality. Experts cite the famous Russian writer S. Dovlatov's wise saying that "language makes up 90 percent of a person's personality". As stated by V.A.Maslova, the human mind cannot be imagined outside of language and the ability to create and perceive speech. As he rightly pointed out, the directions of cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology (linguistic cultural studies) formed within the framework of this paradigm in modern linguistics in the following decades should be focused on the cultural factor in language and the linguistic factor in man. "Linguocultural science studies language as a cultural phenomenon. This is a unique way of seeing the world through the prism of a national language, in which language participates as an expression of a separate national mentality" [16, p. 8]. Today, linguoculturalism has been formed and is developing as a separate linguistic direction in Russian and other foreign linguistics, and has entered the system of philological higher education as an academic subject [6; 27; 5]. "The task was to describe and study the relationship between language and culture, language and ethnicity, language and

mentality" [5, p. 64] this trend is also prominent in Uzbek linguistics, especially in comparative research.

In almost all scientific research and educational literature devoted to linguistic culture, it is noted that the anthropocentric approach to language, although it appeared anew in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, has its roots in the famous ideas of the German scientist W. von Humboldt. Indeed, his "Language is the outward manifestation of the people's soul: the language of the people is its soul, and the soul of the people is its language, and nothing else can be imagined that corresponds to each other"; "Language diversity is not only due to differences in sounds and symbols, but also due to differences in the worldview itself"; "It can be considered universally recognized that different languages are the organs of the original thought and imagination of nations"; "Thinking is not only dependent on language in general, it is conditioned by each individual language to a certain extent"; "Language is the most convenient tool for creating character; the whole national character is imprinted only in language"; "The character of a nation can be known more easily by its language than by its morals, customs, and behavior" [7, p. 68-324], so to speak, the linguo-anthropological philosophy of Alloma found its open expression. These ideas of W. Humboldt were later developed and promoted by several scientists such as Y. L. Weisgerber, E. Sepir, B. Whorf, A. A. Potebnya. In today's world, the priority role of language in knowing the world, its active influence on real existence and consciousness, the main factor and main source in all mental and cognitive activity of a person is almost recognized, this fact is the solid foundation of an anthropocentric approach to language. Enlightener A. Avloni said without a doubt that "To lose the national language is to lose the soul of the nation" [1, p. 60] did not say.

Y.L.Weisgerber, who was one of the first to introduce the concept of "linguistic landscape of the world" to linguistics, said that "language gives its owner a general view of the world that is different from other languages", "the mother tongue and the mental formation of each person are closely related" and "that". For that reason, linguistics should study languages as a reflection of people's culture" [3, p. 120-173]. In linguistics, not only in linguistics, but also in the humanities in general, the "theory of linguistic relativity", that is, the Sepir-Whorf hypothesis, according to researchers, after 80 years of debate, strong and weak versions have been formed today, that is, the judgment in the strong version: language determines thinking; and the weak version of the sentence: language affects thinking [2]. As it can be seen, in both versions, the close connection between language and thinking is expressed. In any case, it is an obvious fact that language actively affects thinking, and thinking actively affects language. Already, this connection is recognized in many terms that are widely used today, such as "national consciousness", "national thinking", "national culture", "national spirituality", "national mentality", "national character".

The idea "Language is a mirror of culture" based on W.Humboldt has a very deep meaning. S.G.Ter-Minasova, who researched the place of language in intercultural communication, understood in language not only the real world around man, not only his lifestyle and conditions, but also the social self-awareness of the people, their mentality, national character, way of life, traditions, customs, says that it also reflects morals, value system, perception and vision of the world, language as a tool of culture

perfects the human personality [25, p. 15]. He writes: "Thus, language, thought and culture are so closely connected with each other that in practice they form a whole consisting of the same three elements, none of which can live (ie, exist) without the other two. All of them interact with the real world, contradict it, depend on it, reflect it and at the same time shape it" [25, p. 40] The anthropocentric paradigm is aimed at researching this system of problems in which man is at the center.

It should also be said that there are different views on naming this new paradigm. Some linguists prefer to call this paradigm the "cognitive paradigm". As V.A.Maslova rightly pointed out, "one cannot agree with this opinion, because cognitive linguistics is only one of the aspects of the problem of "a person in a language and a language in a person". The term "anthropocentric paradigm" is more appropriate because it includes not only cognitive linguistics, but also linguoculturalism, communicative linguistics, and ethnolinguistics" [15, p. 12].

Linguoculturology is the youngest direction that arose in the cooperation of linguistics and cultural studies, but in the priority of linguistics, therefore this new direction was born directly in the bosom of the science of language. In linguistic culture (both in cognitive linguistics and in general, in the anthropological paradigm), there are a number of basic concepts such as "linguistic landscape of the world", "linguistic person" (*yazykovaya lichnost*), "concept" [23, p. 64-72]. Despite the fact that a lot has been written about these concepts and, therefore, terms in linguistics, there is still no consensus on the interpretation of some of them. For example, there is almost a consensus in the use and interpretation of the term "national linguistic landscape of the world": "There are as many national linguistic landscapes of the world as there are languages, each of these languages reflects the unique results of the centuries-old work of the collective ethnic consciousness to understand and categorize human existence in the universe. makes" [11, p. 140]. But this cannot be said about the terms "linguistic person", "concept" [9, p. 24-32; 18, p. 452-454]. A. M. Nadyochkin points out that there is too much abstraction and variety in the scientific interpretations of the concept, and says that the theory of the concept needs serious methodological research. Uzbek linguist prof. Sh. Safarov, while talking about the concept, does not pay enough attention to its linguistic, cultural and ethno-national aspects [22, p. 17-18]. It is true that the concept is a meaningful, mental concept related to thinking, but it is quite controversial to consider it as a phenomenon completely free from national and cultural elements. S.G. Vorkachev, who created a number of works devoted to the study of this issue, even states that "the leading distinguishing feature of the linguistic concept is its ethnocultural character" [5, p. 76]. Among the many definitions given to the concept in Russian linguistics, the definition put forward by V.A.Maslova, in my opinion, reflects reality more clearly. According to him, the concept "is a semantic structure in which the linguistic and cultural identity is recorded and describes the owners of a certain ethnoculture in one way or another" [15, p. 50]. In linguistic and cultural studies, a lot of attention is paid to the problems of expression of the concept, when you get acquainted with the Internet materials, for example, you can see that this direction is extremely widespread in Russian linguistics, and it is difficult to enumerate the works in this regard. Even in recent years, a very large number of candidate's dissertations have been devoted to the linguistic and cultural research of the concept

in one or another language. For example, some of them: O.V.Golovan. "Semantic-associative structure of the concept of "voyna"" (2003); L.N.Venediktova "Koncept "voyna" in language painting (sopostavitelnoe issledovanie na materiale angliyskogo i russkogo yazykov)" (2004); Z.A.Motygullina. "The concept of "destiny" in Tatar and English language paintings" (2006); A.Sh.Vasilova. "Linguocultural concept "sagysh" (toska) and the Tatar language picture mira" (2006); L.H.Shayakhmetova. "Koncept "ut" i ego otrazhenie v lirike R. Minnullina" (2007); L.R.Garipova. "Kontsepty Tatarskoy yazykovoy kartinny mira: presenatsii v lekseme "dönya"" (2007) and others [8, p. 4]. There are many works of this type in other linguistics, as well as in Uzbek comparative linguistics. In any case, works like "Expression of such and such a concept in such and such a language" are increasing, and have even taken the form of a certain template. This type of work is, of course, very necessary, but it is better to avoid stereotypes.

When the main problem in linguoculturology is about the relationship between language and culture, it is necessary to correctly imagine the concept of culture. While Sh. Safarov thinks about the relationship between language and culture in linguistic culture, about "determinism, i.e. mutual dependence" between them, for some reason he includes "culture" in the expression of "speech culture" as part of culture in linguistic culture [22, p. 65], which is not appropriate at all. When speaking of language and culture, the problem called "speech culture" often comes to mind associatively, but this does not at all indicate the exact nature of the culture in the two places [10]. Language and culture are usually (*correctly*) meant to explain this or that culture through language or, conversely, to explain this or that language through the study of culture. (*speech culture*) means "a set of achievements of human society in production, social and spiritual-educational life (*cultural history, Uzbek culture*)". Therefore, the learning problems of speech culture are different, and the object of study of linguistic culture is completely different.

In general, the search for the most effective ways to perfectly study a complex phenomenon like language by the people of the world is a very positive and noble action. Naturally, it is difficult to get to the essence of this phenomenon by studying it only within one paradigm or direction. That's why V.N.Teliya, Yu.S.Stepanov, V.A.Maslova and many other linguists believe that linguistics is polyparadigmatic, that it is impossible to abandon the achievements of any paradigm or direction, that all problems in the language can be solved with a certain method or approach. they emphasize that it cannot be done, only their cooperation will lead to serious results [15, p. 18; 26, p. 146]. T.N.Khomutova writes that the judgments that language learning is on a cognitive basis are untrue: "Cognitive direction is not the only "base point" in language research, it is one of many directions that can be used in communicative, cultural, social, structural and so on. is one, they can give a true description and explanation of the language only when taken together" [26, p. 146].

IV. CONCLUSION

As mentioned, an anthropocentric paradigm was formed in linguistics in the following decades. With the formation of this new paradigm, almost all linguists began to search within this direction, and more and more new terms were coined. So to speak,

many of these terms are not free from abstraction, even confusion (for example, we have seen this case in the description of "concept"), many are redundant. Moreover, it is becoming a tradition for researchers to make unnecessary terms and use them unnecessarily. The following comments of the Russian linguist V.V.Krasnykh, who created serious research within this paradigm, are noteworthy: "In such cases, that is, when a direction begins to develop rapidly, as usually happens, a lot of extra "bubbles" and "bubbles" appear. I must note with regret that today "discourse", "concept", "cognitiveness", "linguistic personality", "mental-linguistic complex", "linguoculturalology", "ethnopsycholinguistics", "intercultural communication", ... have been introduced relatively recently. the terms "cognitive base" and "precedent phenomena" (precedentnyye phenomena), as well as a bunch of other terms of this "field" are heard at every step in the speech of scientists, ladies and gentlemen, like fashion accessories that cannot be entered into the society without wearing them. Moreover, most of the time, the use of these concepts does not justify itself (it is nothing more than following a fashion) and has no real connection to the subject the author is talking about" [12, p. 5]. It seems that one should not forget the standard when using terms in this direction as well.

In general, it can be said that linguists all over the world have always been looking for the best ways to study language. Serious successes have also been achieved in these processes. One such success so far is undoubtedly the emergence of the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics and its rapid development in various guises and directions.

REFERENCES

- [1] 1. Avloniy A. Tanlangan asarlar. 2-jild. Toshkent: Ma'naviyat, 1998.
- [2] 2. Buras M., Krongauz M. Jizn' i sud'ba gipotezi lingvisticheskoy otositel'nosti. "Nauka i jizn'", N8, 2011 / <http://elementy.ru/lib/431410>.
- [3] 3. Vaysgerber Y.L. Rodnoy yazik i formirovanie duxa. –M.: Yeditorial URSS, 2004.
- [4] 4. Vorkachev S.G. Lingvokul'turologiya, yazikovaya lichnost', konsept: stanovlenie antroposentricheskoy paradigmi v yazikoznanii // Filologicheskie nauki. 2001. №1. –S.64 – 72.
- [5] 5. Vorkachev S.G. Lingvokonseptologiya i mejkul'turnaya kommunikasiya: istoki i seli // Filologicheskie nauki. 2005. № 4. -S. 76.
- [6] 6. Vorob'ev V.V. Lingvokul'turologiya (teoriya i metodi). - M. : Izd-vo Ros. un-ta drujbi narodov, 1997.
- [7] 7. Gumbol'dt V. Izbrannie trudi po yazikoznaniyu. –M.: Progress, 1984.

- [8] 8. Ziatdinova G.I. Konsept "sugish (voyna)" v tatarskoy yazikovoy kartine mira: Avtoref. diss. kand. nauk. –Kazan', 2009.
- [9] 9. Ivansova Ye.V. O termine «yazikovaya lichnost'»: istoki, problemi, perspektivi ispol'zovaniya / Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filologiya. N4 (12). 2010. – S.24 – 32.
- [10] 10. Kasevich V.B. Yazik i kul'tura / files.zipsites.ru/
- [11] 11. Kornilov O.A. Yazikovie kartini mira kak proizvodnie nasional'nix mentalitetov. –M.: CheRo, 2003.
- [12] 12. Krasnix V.V. Tochki nad i ili mnogotochie?.. (k voprosu o sovremennoy nauchnoy paradigme) / Yazik, sozanie, kommunikasiya. Vipusk 16. –M.: Makspress, 2001. – S.5.
- [13] 13. Kun T. Struktura nauchnix revolyusiy. – M., 1977.
- [14] 14. Qurbonova M.M. Hozirgi zamon o'zbek tili. –Toshkent, 2002.
- [15] 15. Maslova V.A. Kognitivnaya lingvistika. –Minsk: TetraSistems, 2008.
- [16] 16. Maslova V.A. Lingvokul'turologiya. –M.: Academia, 2001.
- [17] 17. Mahmudov N. Ma'rifat manzillari. –Toshkent: Ma'naviyat, 1999.
- [18] 18. Nadyojkin A.M. "Zakat" konsepti // Vestnik Nijegorodskogo universiteta im. N.I.Lobachevskogo. N6 (2). 2011. – S.452 – 454.
- [19] 19. Nurmonov A. Struktur tilshunoslik: ildizlari va yo'nalishlari. –Andijon, 2006.
- [20] 20. Radbil' T.B. Osnovi izucheniya yazikovogo mentaliteta. –M.: Flinta: Nauka, 2009.
- [21] 21. Rahmatullaev Sh. Sistem tilshunoslik asoslari. –Toshkent: Universitet, 2007.
- [22] 22. Safarov Sh. Kognitiv tilshunoslik. – Jizzax: Sangzor, 2006.
- [23] 23. Svetonosova T.A. Kognitivnaya lingvistika i lingvokul'turologiya: cherti i razlichiya // Filologicheskie nauki v MGIMO. Sbornik nauch. trudov. N27 (42). – M.: MGIMO-Universitet, 2007. –S.39 – 46.
- [24] 24. Stepanov Yu.S. V trexmernom prostranstve yazika. Semioticheskie problemi lingvistiki, filosofii, iskusstva. – M.: Nauka, 1985.
- [25] 25. Ter-Minasova S.G. Yazik i mejkul'turnaya kommunikasiya. –M.: Slovo/ Slovo, 2000.
- [26] 26. Xomutova T.N. Nauchnie paradigmi v lingvistike / Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo un-ta. 2009. N35 (173). Filologiya. Iskusstvovedenie. Vip. 37. –S.144.
- [27] 27. Xrolenko A.T. Osnovi lingvokul'turologii. 5-izd. –M.: Flinta: Nauka, 2009. Alefirenko N.F. Lingvokul'turologiya. Sennostno-smislovoe prostranstvo yazika. –M.: Flinta: Nauka, 2010.

AUTHORS

First Author – Prof. Dr. Mahmudov Nizamiddin Mamadalievich, Director of Institute of Uzbek language, literature and folklore under the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, city Tashkent, Uzbekistan