



COGNITIVE AND ANTHROPOCENTRIC ASPECTS OF MODERN DISCOURSE

Usnaddinova Dilobar Pulatkizi,
Teacher, Renaissance University of Education,
dilobarusnaddinova@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17933786>

Abstract. *The contemporary linguistic paradigm has undergone a profound transformation from structural to functional, cognitive, and anthropocentric orientations. Modern discourse analysis increasingly views language as a reflection of human cognition and experience. The anthropocentric approach positions the human being at the center of linguistic study, while cognitive linguistics focuses on the conceptual mechanisms underlying meaning construction. This article explores the cognitive and anthropocentric dimensions of modern discourse, analyzing their interdependence, theoretical foundations, and practical implications for communication, culture, and identity. By synthesizing recent research in linguistics, this study demonstrates how cognition and human-centered perspectives shape discourse in social, cultural, and technological contexts.*

Keywords: *Anthropocentric linguistics, cognitive discourse analysis, human-centered communication, conceptualization, language and cognition, linguistic worldview, functional-cognitive paradigm.*

In recent decades, linguistics has evolved from a focus on structural properties of language toward a more dynamic understanding of its cognitive and anthropocentric nature. Modern discourse is no longer treated as a static linguistic product but as a process of meaning construction shaped by the human mind, experience, and interaction. The anthropocentric paradigm places human consciousness, emotion, and intention at the center of linguistic analysis (Egizbaeva, Esimova, & Bekisheva, 2016). This shift reflects the broader epistemological tendency to understand language as a living system embedded in cognition, culture, and communication (Tyurkan, 2015).

As discourse has expanded to include social media, political rhetoric, digital storytelling, and intercultural communication, its cognitive and anthropocentric study has gained renewed importance. Understanding how individuals conceptualize, process, and express meaning in context allows researchers to bridge linguistic, cultural, and psychological dimensions of communication.

The Cognitive Paradigm in Linguistics

Cognitive linguistics regards language as part of human cognition — not a separate symbolic code but a reflection of how humans perceive and structure the world. Foundational scholars such as Lakoff and Johnson (2003) established the idea that metaphor and conceptualization are central to human thought. Contemporary scholars have extended these principles, emphasizing the cognitive processing of



discourse structures and conceptual frames (Tyurkan, 2015; Mukhtasar, 2021). Modern cognitive discourse analysis (CDA) integrates linguistic patterns with mental models, emphasizing how speakers and listeners co-construct meaning through shared cognitive schemas. This aligns with anthropocentric linguistics in its focus on the *human factor* as the dominant element in communication.

The Anthropocentric Paradigm

Anthropocentric linguistics views language as a human-centered system reflecting identity, culture, and values. As Lee, Tumanova, and Salkhanova (2016) argue, anthropocentrism reveals how speech acts embody human experience and worldview. Recent works (Khudoyberganova, 2021) demonstrate that linguistic structures are deeply rooted in cultural cognition, where meaning depends on personal and national mentalities. The anthropocentric paradigm highlights empathy, emotions, ethical norms, and social relationships in discourse, framing language as both a tool of communication and a mirror of human consciousness.

Cognitive and Anthropocentric Interrelation in Modern Discourse

Modern discourse is both *cognitively structured* and *anthropocentrically motivated*. Human cognition organizes the conceptual system through which meaning is produced, while anthropocentricity ensures that this meaning is embedded in personal, cultural, and social experiences. For instance, in digital discourse, users employ metaphor, irony, and multimodal signs (text, emoji, image) to express emotional and cognitive states. Studies published in *Cognition, Communication, Discourse* (2022–2024) reveal how online interactions reflect cognitive framing and anthropocentric tendencies, such as the expression of identity and empathy. Similarly, the study of idioms and proverbs — “anthropocentric phraseological units” — demonstrates how emotional, evaluative, and ethical values are encoded in language (Anthropocentric Phraseological Units..., 2025). These expressions reveal how cognition transforms human experience into linguistic form while preserving the cultural and moral worldview of a community.

Methodological Perspectives

The integration of cognitive and anthropocentric approaches requires interdisciplinary tools. Researchers combine **linguocognitive**, **sociolinguistic**, and **axiological** methods to study discourse as both a mental and cultural phenomenon (Egizbaeva et al., 2016).

Recent methodologies include:

- **Conceptual analysis**, to identify dominant frames and metaphors;
- **Discourse-cognitive modeling**, to represent mental structures in communication;



- **Corpus and multimodal analysis**, to examine digital and visual discourse (Tyurkan, 2015; Mukhtasar, 2021);
- **Ethnolinguistic interpretation**, to reveal cultural specifics of meaning (Khudoyberganova, 2021).

These methods reflect the holistic nature of modern linguistics, where cognition, language, and culture form an interconnected triad.

The anthropocentric turn in linguistics signifies a shift toward *understanding language as human experience*. This approach emphasizes empathy, intentionality, and social interaction as linguistic forces. Modern discourse analysis therefore examines how individuals encode their attitudes, emotions, and identities in communication (Lee et al., 2016). The cognitive dimension ensures that such analysis is grounded in mental representation and conceptualization. For instance, metaphorical expressions such as “time is money” or “the war on climate change” illustrate cognitive framing — yet they also carry anthropocentric meanings tied to human values and ethics.

The contemporary communicative environment — particularly social media and hybrid digital spaces — reinforces this dual nature. People constantly construct and perform identities through discourse, negotiating between cognitive schemas and human-centered intentions (Cognition, Communication, Discourse, 2023). This synthesis of cognition and anthropocentrism allows linguistics to explore not only *how* people speak but also *why* they speak as they do — revealing the deeper structure of human meaning-making.

Conclusion

Cognitive and anthropocentric approaches together provide a holistic understanding of modern discourse. Language is both a cognitive tool and an anthropological mirror — a medium through which humans interpret, evaluate, and transform the world. The interplay of mental processes, emotional expression, and cultural identity defines discourse as a living, dynamic system. It is crucial to continue to explore this intersection by integrating cognitive modeling, emotional linguistics, and cultural discourse studies. Such integration reflects not only the complexity of language but also the richness of the human mind that sustains it.

References

1. Egizbaeva, N. Zh., Esimova, Zh. D., & Bekisheva, R. M. (2016). *Anthropocentrism as a New Direction of Modern Linguistic Paradigm. Philology and Art*, 1(3), 101–108.
2. Khudoyberganova, D. S. (2021). *Formation of Linguocultural Direction in Uzbek Linguistics. International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 8(5), 208–216.
3. Lee, V. S., Tumanova, A. B., & Salkhanova, Z. H. (2016). *New Approaches to a Subject of Anthropocentric Linguistics. International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(10), 3312–3322.



4. Mukhtasar, J. A. (2021). *Scientific Views on the Development of the Anthropocentric Paradigm in Linguistics*. *JournalNX*, 7(4), 421–427.
5. *Anthropocentric Phraseological Units and Paremiological Units of Different Languages in the Aspect of Linguaxiology*. (2025). *Frontiers in Language Studies*, 3(1), 56–68.
6. *Cognition, Communication, Discourse* (Issues 2022–2024). Kharkiv National University Press.
7. Tyurkan (Belichenko), E. (2015). *Holistic Linguistics: Anthropocentric Foundations and the Functional-Cognitive Paradigm*. *Prague Journal of English Studies*, 4(1), 7–20.
8. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live By* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.