Anthropocentric Aspects of Phraseology

Sultonova Oisha Ilkhomjon qizi
Master's student at National University of Uzbekistan

Abstract: Language and the human spirit are interrelated. Language is a process that determines a person's mental attitude towards the world. The study of phraseologisms based on the principle of "Man in Language" led to the development of a new direction - anthropocentric phraseology. This article explores the anthropocentric aspect of phraseology.

Key words: anthropocentrism, anthropocentric paradigm, language and man, anthropocentric phraseological units, phraseological fund.

INTRODUCTION

In linguistics, the study of the relationship between language and man has led to the emergence of a new direction. This is an anthropocentric paradigm. The origins of anthropocentrism go back to ideas about the interdependence of language and the human spirit. These ideas were first put forward by the German scientist, philosopher and linguist Wilhelm Humboldt.

Anthropocentrism ("atropos" from the Greek word - man; Latin "centrum" - center) was formed as a direction that aims to approach language and its phenomena from the perspective of the human factor. The main problem of the scientific direction of anthropocentrism is the quality of the center of the human universe. In anthropocentric scientific research, a person and everything related to him: society, nature, culture, knowledge, etc. are considered in close connection with each other. Phraseological units are language tools that embody the logical reflection of the world in the human mind. Phraseological units give attributes to objects related to the image of the world, mean the entire descriptive situation, evaluate it and react to it. This confirms the idea that phraseological units are mainly aimed at describing a person and his activities with their semantics. Anthropocentric phraseological units are a kind of comprehensive core and form the basis of the phraseological fund.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

Today, the anthropocentric approach in linguistics is gaining popularity and has attracted the attention of many scholars as an object of study. In particular, B.A. Serebrennikov, L.V. Shcherba, Y.N. Stepanov, N. Khomsky, I.R. Galperin, N.I. Karaulov, N.I. Dzhinkin, A.A. Leontiev, Y. Lakoff, T.A. Dyck, E. Roche, V.P. Belyanin, V.Z. Demyankov, V.A. Maslova, T.M. Dridze, K.F. Sedov, A. Nurmonov, N.M. Makhmudov, E.A. Begmatov, Sh. Safarov, S. Boimirzaeva, I. Azimova, the language system is studied on the principles of anthropocentrism.

In the process of studying this topic, we used the following methods: synchronic method, description method, observation method, comparative method.

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

The third macroparadigm in the history of linguistics is the anthropocentric paradigm. This paradigm organizes language not as a dry structure, but as an open system based on lively dialogue and communication, which analyzes it in an integral relationship with other systems - society, man, culture, psyche, etc. is a collection of ideas and teachings. Baudouin de Courtenay

wrote in his youth about the need to learn language in relation to people. The scientist says that language exists only in individual brains, hearts, and psyches of individuals.

In the system-structural paradigm, the core of the language was consistently organized, and now the problem of researching its periphery, that is, the relationship of the language with other areas, has been investigated. Researches on language and thought, language and psychology, language and society, language and culture, language and mentality, language and computer have been carried out. In the process of illuminating these relations, "man" is in the center, he acts as a kind of "golden bridge". In this respect, this paradigm is called "anthropocentric paradigm". Based on this paradigm, various new disciplines have emerged in linguistics: mentalinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmalinguistics, computer linguistics, etc. Therefore, the anthropocentric paradigm is divided into different miniparadigms: cognitive paradigm; ethnolinguistic paradigm; sociolinguistic paradigm; psycholinguistic paradigm; neurolinguistic paradigm; linguoculturological paradigm; pragmatic paradigm.

One of the important aspects of contemporary linguistics is anthropocentrism and another is polyparadigmism. No single paradigm can provide a perfect basis for the study of covering all aspects of the colorful and idiosyncratic linguistic phenomenon. In this case, existing paradigms complement each other, cooperate with each other; scientific analysis is carried out simultaneously on the basis of different paradigms; aspects such as static and dynamic, formal and functional, semasiological and onomasiological, cognitive and pragmatic are used in language research.[1;72]

A. M. Heidegger, one of the leading thinkers of our time, called language the "house of being". Because of this, linguistics has a leading methodological position in any system of social sciences, without which it is impossible to study culture. In this work, language is interpreted not only as a means of expressing the inner world of modern nations, but also as a means of expressing the worldview, society and the world of the people of the ancient world. The spiritual world and concepts of the ancestors have reached today through proverbs, sayings, expressions, metaphors, and cultural symbols.

The idea of looking at language from an anthropocentric point of view is now generally accepted positively: in many linguistic institutions, about man imagination is done naturally and correctly. Why is special attention paid to the world of expressions – phraseologisms, metaphors, and symbols? This is because they are about the nation's mentality (mentality) and culture is a valuable source of information. They are preserved unchanged in myths, legends, traditions. Below, in the interpretations of expressions, the culture, customs , and lifestyles of the two languages are compared with each other based on anthropocentric approach to the linguocultural analysis of the phrases of English and uzbek peoples' languages. Their simililarities are identified and differences are distinguished accordingly to its naming of the situation which show the language units and culture closeness to each other in some respect or vice versa. For example:

English	Uzbek	Definition
A party animal	To'ychigul	someone who likes to attend parties often
Down-to-earth	Yulduzlik kasaliga uchramangan	someone who is practical and close to reality, who accepts other people as equals
Golden boy	Tilla odam	a winning person that everyone is fond of
Big mouth	Og'zi bo'sh	someone who is not able to keep a secret
Daydreamer	Ko'knori hayol	someone who is having dreamlike thoughts when they should be focusing on the present
Laid-back	Boqibeg'am	a relaxed person who doesn't get stressed or upset easily
Lamebrain	Tovuqmiyya	a foolish person, a slow thinker
Cold fish	Toshbag'ir	someone who has very little emotions, who is regarded as hard-hearted and unfeeling
Lone wolf/lone bird	Yakkamoxov/odamovi	someone who prefers his own company and does not like socialising

Russian linguist B. A. Larin said, "As the light in the morning is reflected in the dew drops, the expressions reflect the people's worldview, social system, it reflects the ideology of its time," he said. The secrets of language remain one of the main secrets of humanity. Because in the narrations, when the Creator called man a "scholar" and commanded the angels to bow to him, he taught Adam's knowledge of names. He meant that he knew ("Qisasi Rabguzi"). If we can discover the secrets of language, the treasure of many centuries and lost knowledge will be opened. Our goal is to help you see the cultural "color" that the language unit represents. This symbol allows you to connect the internal structure of the language to its external form.[2;4]

The idea of looking at language from an anthropocentric point of view is common nowadays is being accepted positively by: about a person in many language institutions imagination is done naturally and correctly. This scientific approach (field) has been studied for centuries in foreign linguistics. Although it is being developed, it is setting new tasks in learning the language in relation to new methods of description, language units, concepts and rules requires new perspectives.

The work "Structure of Scientific Revolutions" by T.Kun (1962, Russian translation "Struktura nauchnyh revolyutsiy", 1977) raised the issue of considering the approach for researchers as a proportional model of posing problems and solving them. T. Kun suggests to look at this direction as a separate scientific field. He should have certain knowledge and methods describing the object of research (that is, language). It is known that "viewpoints in linguistics (and social sciences in general) do not work interchangeably, but they are built on top of each other and exist side by side within the same issue, interestingly in mutual dichotomy (contradiction)". Traditionally, there are three different approaches in science: comparative-historical, system-structural, and finally, anthropocentric.[2;5] The comparative-historical method is the first scientific approach in linguistics the comparative-historical method was the first special method of language research. XIX century the science of linguistics was completely subordinated to this method. System-structure and in the approach, the main attention was focused on the subject, thing, name, and word. Even in the third millennium, it is possible to study the language from this point of view, there are many researchers. Textbooks, scientific literature, academic grammars, various references were created as a result of this theory. Fundamental research in this direction is not only the present day, it will also be a valuable resource for future linguist researchers with a different approach. Anthropocentric theory is the study of the object of research in the subject, in other words, language is analyzed in man, and man in language. According to I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, "language exists only in the mind, soul, and heart of a single person, and this person forms a language community." The idea of learning the language from an anthropocentric point of view is modern is the main direction in linguistics. Nowadays, the goal of linguistic analysis is not to study the manifestation of different language systems. Language is a complex event. As E. Benvenist noted, "Language is so unique that it can be evaluated as consisting of several structures. Each of them can serve as a basis for the emergence of general linguistics". In his work entitled "Language and Thought", Serebrennikov scientifically substantiated the need to study language depending on the human factor. V. M. Alpatov's works play a significant role in the widespread use of the "anthropocentric approach" in linguistics.[10;13] In particular, he writes in his work "On anthropocentric and system-centric approaches to language" that "... only the anthropocentric approach is historically primary". Linguistics has an anthropocentric principle called "Language and Man". As language and man are studied in close connection with each other, it is proportional that phraseological units are formed through the human factor. It can be said that this was clearly seen when we studied phraseological units in our previous articles.

CONCLUSION

The anthropocentric approach to language is becoming a relevant and important issue of today's Linguistics. In anthropocentric scientific research, a person and everything related to him: society, nature, culture, knowledge, etc. are considered in close connection with each other. Phraseological units are also units that should be studied primarily anthropocentrically. This is because they are

about the nation's mentality (mentality) and culture is a valuable source of information. They are in myths, legends, traditions will be kept unchanged. That is why phraseologisms are considered as objects of the anthropocentric approach.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. O'zbek tilshunosligining dolzarb muommolari. Educational methodological book. Samarkand 2021

2. Darvishov I.O'. Lingvokulturologiyadan maruzalar matni. Namangan-2012

3. V.V Vorobyov "Linguoculturology: Theory and methods", Academy 2008

4. Смирницкий. А.И. Лексикология английского языка: Издательство

5. литературы на иностранных языках, - Москва, 1956. -260 с.

6. Mamatov, A. "LINGUOCULTURAL STUDY OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS" 2021 https://ruslit.jdpu.uz/index.php/fll/article/view/654

7. Sultonova O.I. LINGUOCULTURAL ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS. 280–284. (2023) https://journal.imras.org/index.php/sps/article/view/189

8. Xudoyberganova D. Matnning antroposentrik tadqiqi (Monografiya). – Toshkent, 2013.

9. Rahmatullaev Sh. O'zbek Tilining Frazeologik Lug'ati. - Toshkent Qomuslar Bosh Tahririyati, L992.- 806 B.

10. Shamsutdinov M.S. Frazeologik birliklarning shakl va ma'no munosabati. Master's diss. 2019

11. Sharipova M.U. Ingliz va O'zbek tilliari frazeologizmlarining qiyosiy tadqiqi: Antroposentrik va Aksiologik yondashuv. Master's diss. 2022.

12. Suyunova Z. Ingliz va O'zbek tillaridagi antroposentrik maqollarda gender talqini. www.pedagoglar.uz Volume-24, Issue-2, December – 2022

13. https://www.englishlessonviaskype.com/idioms-describing-character-and-personality