The Role of the Anthropocentric Approach in Linguistics and Translation Theory

Madina Shavkatovna Bakhriddinova

*Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Senior Lecturer at the
Department of Theoretical Aspects of the English Language*
madyabahriddinova@gmail.com

Abstract. *This article analyzes the significance of the anthropocentric approach in linguistics and translation theory. The research emphasizes the central role of the human factor cognitive, emotional, and cultural experience in language understanding and translation processes. The anthropocentric perspective views language as a product of human cognition and treats translation as a complex activity that ensures semantic and pragmatic equivalence in intercultural communication. The study demonstrates the practical relevance of this approach in translation through theoretical arguments and illustrative examples.*

Key words: *anthropocentrism, translation theory, linguistic cognition, cultural equivalence, semantic correspondence, pragmatics, human factor.*

Introduction

In recent years, anthropocentric approach in the subjects of linguist and translation theory is becoming one of the topical issues. Based on this approach, a person and his thinking, feelings, socio-cultural experience are taken as a central object in learning the language. In the formation and development of this concept, modern directions such as cognitive linguistics, paralinguistics, disc class analysis, and have similar role in internal cremation. The language according to anthropocentric approach is not only the perception of communication, but a perception of human thinking, worldview, and social activities, the vial of cultural experience. Therefore, in linguistic research, language phenomena are interpreted on the human center: the content, applicability and function of language units is explained on the basis of an experiment formed in human consciousness.[1]

As part of the translation theory, the importance of anthropocentric approach is growing. Translation requires not only to seek cultural, social and psychological contexts, but also to ensure the meaning, taking into account cultural, social and psychological contexts. In this process, an interpreter will become a key mediator as a human: it combines the thinking, culture and communicative needs of two languages. In particular, anthropocentric approach requires special attention in the translation of language units with national and cultural components. Because the correct and accurate translation of these units provides the information behind them, emotional background and social code transmission.

Structuralist and formalistic approaches have been held in linguistics for many years. These approaches saw the language as an internal system and did not pay enough attention to humanistic aspects. Anthropocentric approach shows the formation of this shortcoming, which is a direct

---

[1] *Kubryakova E. S. Yazyk i znanie: na puti polucheniya znaniy o yazyke: chasti rechi s kognitivnoy tochki zreniya. – Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskoy kul'tury, 2004. – 560 s.*

connection between the language and thinking, based on the human experience of the language. From this point of view, man has a central role in the study of semantic aspects of linguistic units, and the knowledge, value, emotional and sorting differences depicts by language should be analyzed.[2]

Until today's globalization and intercultural communication communication translation is only a cultural bridge, not a communicative tool. Therefore, the translator will become an intermediary between the mediator between two languages not only, but two cultures and two thinking. In such a complex process, anthropocentric approach allows the translation not only linguistic but also cultural and psychological aspects. In this approach, during the translation, the spiritual, secure, symposial layers lying behind the words are identified and clearly reflected.

In this article, anthropocentric approach is analyzed in the theory of linguistics and translation, its main theoretic principles, semantic and pragmatic aspects, practical manuals in the translation process.[3] The purpose of the study is to analyze linguistic units based on anthropocentric units and to reveal its place in translation practice. The reflection of the human factor in the translation of the language and translation is focused on issues such as the translation of cultural codes, semantic equivalent criteria on anthropocentric criteria. Thus, the importance of translation approaches is opened on a scientific basis.

Methodology

In this study, linguistic units and reflection features in their translation are studied on the basis of anthropocentric approach. As the object of research is semantically related to language units, directly related to human units and their translation, which is semantic, pragmatic and cultural transformation.[4] Treating in the human center through an anthropocentric view in linguistics requires not only the formal signs, but also to identify formal marks, but also to identify formal marks, but also cognitive, cultural and academic content. Accordingly, the content of linguistic units is explained in terms of human experience.

The analysis was selected from artistic, journalistic and scientific texts in English and Uzbek. These texts include lexical units, cognitive metaphoremes, cognitive metaphase, accessions and phraseological units, which reflect interstate communication, and the reimbursement of appraisals and phraseological units, and what semantic shifts were learned in their translation.[5] Pregenital inscriptions in the process of translation were explained on the basis of an anthropocentric approach, cultural inconsistencies. This approach, in turn, shows the interpreter's need to take into account the interpreter freedom, communication context, a cultural foundation and the approximate audience.

The main methods used in the study are desertic-linguistic analysis, complex (comparative) analysis and contextual analysis methods. The semantical burden, stylistic features of linguistic units are identified through a desertic-linguistic analysis. The complex analysis allows you to identify text bag, pillared and differences, analyze semantic-theory shifts that have emerged in translation. With the help of contextual analysis, the role of units on the general content and communicative function is determined. These techniques complement each other within an anthropocentric approach and allow to deepen the human factor's impact on linguistic processes.

In the study, in particular, the theory of the semantic universities, the concept of the Semantic Universalities of P. Vezhbitskaya, based on the concept of the Semantic Universal. With the help of the theoretical views, the internal structure of semantic units was reasonably explained in the internality process, and how its translation will change and its cultural characteristics were reasonable.

In general, these methodological approaches have been complexify revealed to the reflection of the human minds, which interprets in human mind and the impact of cultural and national components in

[2] Abdullayeva G. A. *Til va tafakkur: lingvistik konsepsiyalar*. – Toshkent: Fan, 2019. – 224 b.

[3] *Zikriyayeva M. Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. – Toshkent: Turon-Iqbol, 2020. – 198 b.*

[4] *Arutyunova N. D. Diskurs i ego interpretatsiya. – Moskva: Nauka, 2002. – 312 s.*

[5] *Sharipov O. Lingvistik pragmatika asoslari. – Samarqand: SamDU nashriyoti, 2021. – 176 b.*

its translation. This will serve to scientifically justify the practical significance within the field of the Anthropos enter approach to the list of linguistic and translation.

Results

The results of the study have shown that linguistic units in language and their manifestations are formed directly to the human factor. According to the texts analyzed, words and phrases that are especially semantically as signatory, emotional, cultural, cultural and conceptual load are interpreted not by ordinary formal cozied, but on the basis of human experience, cultural imagination, and moral criteria. For example, concepts such as English language or privacy are translated as "freedom" or "personality", but expand or expands their semantic burden depending on the cultural and social context. This situation is directly related to a person's worldview and social role.

In analytical texts, anthropocentric features were mainly shown in the following forms: First, to act in the selection of language units of the translator, taking into account the subjective position and cultural composition; Second, attempting to maintain the cultural consolations of units translated or delivery in an alternative form; Third, ensuring semantically severe, metaphorical or assessing expressions by adaptation to human experience. In such cases, the translation is not a simple language change, but becomes a process of meaning, culture and context change.

The importance of anthropocentric approach in the example of freeze, metaphors and other figurative expression. For example, if the English language phrase is translated directly, its original meaning disappears. However, on the basis of anthropocentric approach, the interpreter will choose equivalents associated with human experience, such as "dying", "lives." This ensures not only semantic match, but also the preservation of stylistically, emotional and cultural convening.

In addition, according to the study, according to the study, the continuity of meaning in the translation is more effective on the basis of an anthropocentric approach. The interpretation of linguistic units, not only form, but also to the consolidation of the semantic-inthronized layer allows you to reflect the true nature of the text more complete. For example, the English language phrase is translated directly in the form of "time flies" directly, contradicts the cultural adoption in the Uzbek language. But if this phrase is given in anthropocentric interpretation in the form of "time", it is compatible with human experience and provides communicative concords in communication.

Another important result is in translation in translation, the attitude toward human beech worldview, that is, formed according to how it is called the values of language. The word stubborn is often gives a negative meaning, but the words "diligent" or "perseverance" or "persistent" can be made from the context. In such cases, the translator analyzes the cognitive grounds that refer to the human thinking, not the semantic conversion.

Also, on the basis of anthropocentric approach, the genre, audience and communication of the text is also playing an important role in selecting language units. The reader, the auditory or the audience, is serving as one of the main factors for the translator. This means that anthropocentric approach requires a strategic approach to the translation, that is, adapting a strategic approach, that is, based on not only language but also by human factor.

Based on the above facts and analysis, it can be said that in the translation, not only semantical accuracy, but also one of the necessary approaches to ensure communicable solution, such as communicative success, cultural fitness and pragmatic pursuits. This shows that in the theory of linguistic and translation, a human factor is becoming more important.

Discussion

The analysis shows that the anthropocentric approach allows Linguodental and translation processes not only within the language system, but in the context of human thinking, experience and cultural values. In translation activities, the exchange of language units is simply lead to the structural matching basis, leads to loss of content, cultural uncertainties or communications. Therefore, through an anthropocentric approach, the cognitive foundations of language units, pragmatic target, the calculating tone, and cultural unit will be taken into account.

In modern theory of modern translation, this approach is based on many researchers. In particular, P. Ny mark translates the equivalence of equivalence alone, but also the need to have a seceding and emotional level. This idea fully confirms anthropocentric approach, as every language unit has layers of meaning related to man's moral, cultural and aesthetic values. Therefore, the translator must rely on the width of its cultural sensitivity and thinking in the transplantation of this convening content. J. Lakoff and M. Johnson is also inextricably linked with an anthropocentric approach: they believe that language is a means of human experience, which means that the metaphor understands how human experience understands the world.[6] In the translation, the correct interpretation of these metaphors will be accomplished through the correct understanding of the person's cognitive model.

As determined in the results of the study, phraseological units, sarcastically expression, appraisal words and cultural words require an anthropocentric approach in translation. Such units should be translated by an interpreter not only by selecting lexical equivalents, but also to the main information burden, the cultural code, the cultural code. For example, although the phrase "stone heart", which occurs in English is characterized by Cold-Hearted in English, in accordance with the communication context of this translation, which cannot be properly assessed without considering factors such as it used. This means that the translation process in anthropocentric approach is based on contextual compatibility, cultural adaptation and psychological adaptation.

In addition, this approach imposes the translator not only to language, but also the need to also learn the cognitive and psychological system of a person. The interpreter shall choose the contents of the existing worldviews in two languages, the diversity of cultural values, the appropriate strategy, realizing communicative stereotypes. Only then will the translation, not only within the linguistics, but in the system of cognitive, cultural and psychological pet lines. This turns the translation into a high level of communications.

The basics of anthropocentric approach is also based on solid scientific evidence. L. The concept of semantic universities developed by Vezhbitskaya allows to interpret language units through universal codes of human experience. According to this concept, the main semantic units available in any language - "Want", "Want", "feel", "good", "good" reflect the general experience of mankind. In the translation, it is the most important task of the anthropocentric approach to the universal essence of these units.

The anthropocentric approach is based on the view of the language as a product of human activities as a product of human activity and reflection, this approach encourages translator's work to understand the semantic and cultural responsibility of the translator. Translation is now not only exchanging formal codes, but also the art of passing human experience, worldview, feelings and values in accordance with new language and culture. Therefore, anthropocentric approach serves as an important and necessary methodological framework in the language and translation, especially in cases where inter-siza-interconnected communications and pragmatic differences.

Conclusion

It is possible that the above analysis can conclude that the anthropocentric approach allows the human factor in the fields of linguistics and translation theory, its thinking, its feelings, and values to the center deep and comprehensively. This approach illuminates the semantics semi-informed units based on human experience, the interpretation of their meaning in the culture and regulative context, as a complex socio-friendly system.

In the process of translation, the importance of anthropocentric approach is even stronger. Because the translation is not a formal match between two languages, but the process of ensuring semantic compliance between two cultures, two thinking, two emotional system. In this process, the translator acts based on human cognitive experience, emotional, cultural knowledge and communicative strategy. It is these aspects that proves the need for the translation activities of anthropocentric approach. The correct interpretation of semantic, assailants and pragmatic aspects of the units translated is carried out only with a central analysis.

---

[6] *Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p.*

The results of the study showed that in the translation is an effective tool in the translation in identifying cultural codes, adequately transmitting in the context of communication context. This approach increases the cultural and accusatory responsibility of translators, that is, the translator is simply forms as a cultural and semantic intermediary, not the codes. As a result, translation text is approached not only linguistically, but also psychological, socioecological and cognitive, but also in both psychological, sociological and cognitive.

The scientific-practical value of anthropocentric approach is that it turns the translation process into a highly level of creative intellectual and intellectual activities of simple technical surgery. The analysis based on this approach can be widely used in the creation of automatic translation systems based on the basis of automatic translation, as well as optimizing agricultural communications on artificial intelligence. Because the language is unresolved from human experience, and the translation is needed as a complex communicative activity that can be copied from one culture to another.

In general, anthropocentric approach has become an integral part of the modern scientific parading, in the theory of linguistics and translation. It connects the language with man, and translator into a departure of human thinking and intercultural relations. Therefore, the establishment of this approach in future linguistic and translation studies is incredibly important not only scientific accuracy but also the view of practical relief.

References

1. *Abdullayev G. A. Til va tafakkur: lingvistik konsepsiyalar. – Toshkent: Fan, 2019. – 224 b.*

2. *Zikriyayeva M. Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. – Toshkent: Turon-Iqbol, 2020. – 198 b.*

3. *Kubryakova E. S. Yazyk i znanie: na puti polucheniya znaniy o yazyke: chasti rechi s kognitivnoy tochki zreniya. – Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskoy kul'tury, 2004. – 560 s.*

4. *Arutyunova N. D. Diskurs i ego interpretatsiya. – Moskva: Nauka, 2002. – 312 s.*

5. *Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p.*

6. *Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. – London: Prentice Hall, 1988. – 292 p.*

7. *Hatim B., Mason I. Discourse and the Translator. – London: Longman, 1990. – 248 p.*

8. *Komissarov V. N. Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty). – Moskva: Visshaya shkola, 1990. – 253 s.*

9. *Sharipov O. Lingvistik pragmatika asoslari. – Samarqand: SamDU nashriyoti, 2021. – 176 b.*

10. *Chomsky N. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. – Cambridge: MIT Press, 1965. – 251 p.*