



## ANTHROPOCENTRIC VIEWS IN THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF THE WORLD

*Ismoilova Zarina, Soliyeva Sarvara*

*ISFT, student*

*Munixon Maxkamova*

*Supervisor: ISFT, English teacher*

**Annotatsiya.** Ushbu maqolada olamning lisoniy manzarasini o'rganishda antropotsentrik yondashuvning roli va ahamiyatini ko'rsatilgan. Antropotsentrik qarash insonlarning tilni jamiyatda qanday idrok etishi, yaratishi va undan foydalanishiga asoslangan. Tadqiqotda til va dunyoqarash o'rtasidagi munosabat o'rganilib, til qay tariqa insonning idrok va tajribasi asosida shakllanishi ko'rsatilgan.

**Kalit so'zlar:** Antropotsentrizm, lisoniy manzara, dunyoqarash, kognitsiya, til idroki, sotsiolingvistika, semantik tuzilmalar.

**Abstract.** This article explores the role and significance of anthropocentric approaches within the linguistic landscape of the world. Anthropocentric perspectives focus on how humans perceive, create, and use language within society. The research delves into the relationship between language and worldview, highlighting how language shapes and is shaped by human cognition and experience.

**Key words:** Anthropocentrism, linguistic landscape, language worldview, cognition, language perception, sociolinguistics, semantic structures.

**Аннотация.** В данной статье исследуется роль и значение антропоцентрического подхода в изучении языковой картины мира. Антропоцентрический взгляд фокусирует внимание на том, как люди воспринимают, создают и используют язык в обществе. В исследовании рассматриваются взаимосвязь между языком и мировоззрением, подчёркивая, как язык формирует и сам формируется человеческим сознанием и опытом.

**Ключевые слова:** Антропоцентризм, языковая картина, мировоззрение, когниция, восприятие языка, социолингвистика, семантические структуры.

### Introduction

In recent years, linguistics has increasingly focused on the central role of humans in the creation and use of language. This anthropocentric view holds that language is not merely a passive tool of communication but an active medium through which humans construct their understanding of the world. According to linguistic anthropologists, the way individuals use language reflects their unique cognitive and social experiences, which in turn shape the broader linguistic landscape [1]. This paper examines how anthropocentrism informs the development of linguistic landscapes and explores the ways in which language is used to mediate human experience in the world.

Anthropocentrism is the philosophical perspective that places humans at the center of understanding the world. In linguistics, this manifests in the theory that language is a product of human cognition and is

used to structure human experience. According to Whorfian theories of linguistic relativity, the structure of a language influences the way its speakers perceive reality [2]. In this sense, language acts as a filter, shaping not only how people communicate but also how they experience the world around them. For instance, languages differ in how they categorize colors, spatial relations, and temporal concepts, which suggests that speakers of different languages may have distinct cognitive experiences of the same phenomena [3]. Thus, anthropocentric approaches argue that language is not only a reflection of the external world but a tool through which humans interpret and give meaning to that world.

The linguistic landscape of a society is intricately tied to its cultural worldview. The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis posits that language shapes thought and, consequently, how people interpret reality. This hypothesis underlines the anthropocentric nature of linguistic processes, where human perception is seen as the foundation for language and communication. From an anthropocentric viewpoint, language not only represents the external world but also encodes the cultural and cognitive frameworks through which individuals perceive their environment. This dynamic is evident in how different cultures use language to categorize and describe phenomena in ways that reflect their unique values and worldviews [1]. For example, in some Indigenous languages, the concept of time may be more fluid, emphasizing cyclical or event-based understandings of temporality, rather than linear timeframes common in Western languages [4]. Such linguistic differences reflect deeper cultural variations in how humans relate to the world around them. Through anthropocentric lenses, language becomes more than a communicative tool—it is a window into the cognitive processes and cultural narratives that guide human existence.

The term “linguistic landscape” traditionally refers to the visible language in public spaces, such as signage, advertisements, and street names. However, in a broader sense, the linguistic landscape includes the variety of ways language is used in different social and cultural contexts to reflect and construct reality. The anthropocentric perspective views the linguistic landscape as a cultural artifact, shaped by human actions and perceptions [5]. Gorter’s interpretation of the linguistic landscape expands its meaning beyond visible signs to include how language, influenced by human actions and perceptions, shapes and reflects reality. His anthropocentric view underscores the idea that language actively constructs cultural and social identities, showing its deep connection to how humans experience and understand the world. In multilingual societies, the linguistic landscape often reflects power dynamics, social hierarchies, and cultural identities. For example, the dominance of a particular language on public signs may signify the cultural and political power of its speakers, while the presence of minority languages can be an indicator of cultural diversity or resistance [6]. This anthropocentric focus on how humans shape and are shaped by their linguistic environment highlights the reciprocal relationship between language and social identity. Moreover, the way humans modify their linguistic landscape, such as the introduction of bilingual signage or the promotion of endangered languages, reflects anthropocentric efforts to preserve cultural heritage and maintain linguistic diversity. These actions emphasize the role of humans not just as users of language, but as agents of linguistic change who actively participate in shaping their communicative environments.

Language plays a crucial role in mediating human experience, shaping how people interpret their interactions with the world and others. According to Vygotskian theories of sociocultural development, language serves as a primary tool through which individuals internalize and process their social experiences [7]. This suggests that language is not only a reflection of individual cognition but also a key medium through which societal norms and values are transmitted. For instance, anthropocentric approaches to language recognize that metaphors used in everyday speech are often grounded in bodily and sensory experiences. Cognitive linguists like Lakoff and Johnson [8] argue that metaphors are central to human thought and help individuals understand abstract concepts through more concrete, familiar experiences. Phrases like “grasping an idea” or “seeing the point” rely on physical metaphors to express cognitive actions, demonstrating the close relationship between language, the human body, and the mind.

This anthropocentric focus on the embodied nature of language reveals how deeply intertwined language is with human experience. It highlights that language is not a neutral medium but a tool that shapes how people perceive, interpret, and engage with the world around them. The principle of linguistic relativity, often associated with Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, supports the anthropocentric notion that language influences thought and shapes human perception. According to this theory, speakers of different languages experience the world in unique ways because their languages encode different categories of

meaning [2]. Anthropocentric perspectives on linguistic relativity emphasize that humans are not passive recipients of language but active creators of meaning. For example, in languages that have grammatical gender, speakers often attribute gendered characteristics to inanimate objects, which can affect their perceptions of those objects. In Spanish, the word for “sun” (el sol) is masculine, while in German, “sun” (die Sonne) is feminine. Studies have shown that speakers of these languages often describe the sun with characteristics traditionally associated with masculinity or femininity, demonstrating how language shapes thought at a fundamental level [9]. From an anthropocentric perspective, this phenomenon underscores the active role that humans play in constructing their understanding of the world through language. It also suggests that language is not simply a reflection of the external world but a cognitive tool that humans use to create and manipulate their reality.

Anthropocentric views of language emphasize its role in shaping personal and collective identity. Language is a primary means by which individuals express their identity and align themselves with particular social or cultural groups. For instance, the use of dialects or sociolects can signal belonging to a specific community, while language choice can reflect cultural pride or political resistance [10]. In multilingual contexts, language becomes a powerful tool for negotiating identity. Speakers often switch between languages or language varieties depending on the social context, a phenomenon known as code-switching. This linguistic flexibility allows individuals to navigate different social identities, aligning themselves with different cultural groups in different contexts. From an anthropocentric perspective, such linguistic behavior demonstrates how humans use language not only to communicate but to actively construct and perform their social identities.

### **Conclusion**

Anthropocentric approaches to language place humans at the center of linguistic analysis, recognizing that language is not just a passive tool for communication but an active medium through which humans construct their reality, shape their cognitive experiences, and express their identities. Through the lens of anthropocentrism, language becomes more than a means of conveying information—it becomes a reflection of human thought, culture, and social interaction. This perspective highlights the intricate relationship between language, cognition, and worldview, demonstrating that the ways in which humans perceive and experience the world are deeply influenced by the languages they speak. In examining the role of language in shaping human experience, the concept of linguistic relativity underscores how speakers of different languages may conceptualize the world differently. Anthropocentric theories reveal that humans are not merely shaped by language but are active agents in using language to navigate and modify their environment, shaping both individual and collective identities. The flexibility and adaptability of language in multilingual contexts further emphasize the human capacity to use language as a tool for social negotiation and cultural expression. Ultimately, the anthropocentric view of language asserts that language is a uniquely human phenomenon, inseparable from the cognitive and cultural processes that define human existence. By understanding language through this lens, we gain insight into how humans use linguistic tools to interpret the world, construct meaning, and engage with others. Future research in linguistic anthropology and cognitive linguistics will continue to explore these dynamics, providing deeper insights into the profound connection between language, thought, and human experience.

### **References:**

1. Sapir E. The Status of Linguistics as a Science // *Language*, 1929. – № 5(4). – PP. 207-214.
2. Whorf B.L. *Language, thought, and reality: selected writings*. Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Cambridge, Mass., 1956.
3. Levinson S. C. *Space in Language and Cognition: Explorations in Cognitive Diversity*. – Cambridge University Press, 2003.
4. Evans N. Language and Time: The Multiple Dimensions of Temporal Expression in Indigenous Australian Languages // *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2015. – № 6. – PP. 1-15.
5. Gorter D. *Linguistic Landscape: A New Approach to Multilingualism* / *Multilingual Matters*, 2006. – PP. 233-245.
6. Landry R., Bourhis R. Y. Linguistic Landscape and Ethnolinguistic Vitality: An Empirical Study // *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 1997. – № 16 (1). – PP. 23–49.

7. Выготский Л.С. Мышление и речь. – М.-Л., 1934.
8. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. – University of Chicago Press, 1980.
9. Boroditsky L. Does Language Shape Thought? Mandarin and English Speakers' Conceptions of Time // Cognitive Psychology, 2001. – № 43(1). – PP. 1 –22.
10. Bucholtz M., Hall K. Identity and Interaction: A Sociocultural Linguistic Approach // Discourse Studies, 2005. – № 7 (4–5). – PP. 585–614.