



---

# THE NOTION OF "CONCEPT" IN LINGUISTICS AND ITS ROLE IN THE PRINCIPLES OF ANTHROPOCENTRISM AND LINGUO- CULTURAL STUDIES

Khushmanova Shakhnoza Ibragimovna

Senior Teacher, University of Economics and Pedagogy

Karshi, Kashkadarya, Uzbekistan

tel:+99899 662 75 53;

e-mail:et4831425@gmail.com;

---

## Abstract

The article attempts to examine the structurally ambivalent concept of "concept" in the field of linguistics, and particularly its role in the large subject of anthropocentrism and study of linguoculture. Concepts form the basis of cognitive and semantic units for us human beings and give us the ability to categorize and communicate the real world. At its most extreme, an anthropocentric approach sees people as the makers of meaning. It is concerned with the integration of physical experience and socio-cultural interaction.

**Keywords:** Concept, linguistics, anthropocentrism, linguo-cultural studies, Uzbek language, semantics, cognition, culture

## 1. Introduction

While language is underpinned by semantic and cognitive linguistic meanings, the study naturally faces the core concept of "meaning." Words give rise to meaning, calling forth mental representations in the form of concepts, which enable one to sort out the world.

“One must determine the meaning of these words by reference to their contexts,” Lyons (1977) writes. This notion is all but universal in academia; its faces vary according to the discipline from which it is viewed: philosopher, anthropologist, cognitive science student.



In research on concepts within Uzbek linguistics, the works of Abdullayev (2010) and Rakhmonov (2014) have won great support as attention is given to the relationship between language, culture, and cognition. Concepts such as mehmon (guest), xonadon (household), and do'stlik (friendship) reflect cultural expressions that go far beyond the words themselves. Therefore, concepts function as a bridge between the form of a language, its individual perspectival style, and collective thought processes.

This paper uses two main methods of exposition to probe the 'concept' theory-the anthropocentric perspective, that is, language and meaning originate in human experience (Sharifian, 2017; Islomov, 2012), and linguistic-cultural studies in which language becomes a storehouse for cultural data and worldview (Wierzbicka, 1997; Juraev, 2018).

From the theoretical frontiers of international scholarship down to concrete evidence provided in Uzbek data on concepts, we see how concepts achieve reflection with broader society and interpersonal interaction.

## **2. Theoretical Background: Defining "Concept"**

### **1.Philosophical and Linguistic Foundations**

The term "concept" traditionally designates a mental representation or category, encompassing objects, events, or ideas with shared attributes. Philosophers such as Kant regarded concepts as necessary for organizing sensory input into coherent knowledge (Yusupova, 2011). Linguistically, concepts correspond to semantic contents of words and phrases (Lyons, 1977; Abdullayev, 2010).

In cognitive linguistics, concepts are seen as dynamic mental constructs structured by frames, schemas, and image schemas (Lakoff, 1987; Fauconnier, 1994). These define experiential patterns forming the basis for understanding and producing meaning. Uzbek scholars like Tursunov (2017) stress the psychological reality of concepts, emphasizing that they are culturally and socially shaped.



---

## **2.Characteristics and Types of Concepts**

Concepts possess several key characteristics:

- Abstraction: They generalize over instances (e.g., \*daraxt\* [tree] covers multiple species).
- Hierarchical organization: Concepts develop taxonomies from superordinate (hayvon — animal) to basic (it — dog) to subordinate (ov iti — hunting dog) levels (Rosch, 1978; Rakhmonov, 2014).
- Context dependency: Meaning boundaries shift with situational contexts (Croft & Cruse, 2004).

Concepts can be classified as:

- Concrete: Tangible objects, e.g., kitob (book).
- Abstract: Intangible ideas such as do'stlik (friendship), halollik (honesty).
- Cultural: Socially and culturally loaded meanings, central in linguo-cultural studies, e.g., xonadon (family household) in Uzbek culture (Juraev, 2018).

## **3. Anthropocentrism and the Centrality of the Human in Meaning-Making**

### **1. The Anthropocentric Paradigm**

Anthropocentrism holds that human experience, cognition, and values constitute the core of linguistic meaning (Sharifian, 2017; Islomov, 2012). Linguistic semantics cannot be divorced from the embodied human subject, who both produces and interprets language within socio-cultural contexts.

This paradigm contends that conceptual categories arise from embodied experience and social realities rather than existing as disembodied abstractions. As Abdullayev (2010) observes in Uzbek semantics, the meaning of concepts is deeply intertwined with everyday human activities and social interactions.

### **2. Uzbek Anthropocentric Conceptualization**

Uzbek examples showcase how cultural experiences shape concepts:

- Mehmon (guest) connotes not merely a visitor but an embodiment of Uzbek hospitality, respect, and social reciprocity (Rakhmonov, 2014).
- Ota (father) transcends biological relation, incorporating authority, protection, and moral expectations (Xudoyberdiyev, 2019).



- 
- Qishloq (village) is more than a location; it symbolizes community traditions, collective identity, and shared memory (Islomov, 2012).
  - The conceptualization of “til” (language) embodies national pride and cultural continuity (Juraev, 2018).

These demonstrate how linguistic meaning is grounded in human-centered lived reality reflecting social structures and values.

#### **4. Linguo-Cultural Studies: Language as Cultural Repository**

##### **1. Cultural Embeddedness of Concepts**

Linguo-cultural studies posit that language preserves and conveys a community’s conceptual world—a system of shared knowledge, values, and modes of thought (Wierzbicka, 1997; Juraev, 2018). Concepts here act as carriers of culture, embedding social norms and collective identity.

##### **2. Uzbek Linguo-Cultural Concepts**

In Uzbek culture, certain concepts are rich with historically and socially grounded meanings:

- Xonadon (household) references not only a dwelling but a network of kinship, authority, inheritance traditions, and honor relations (Rakhmonov, 2014).
- Ramazon (Ramadan) encompasses religious practices, communal charity, spiritual renewal, and societal rhythms of life (Tursunov, 2017).
- Do‘stlik (friendship) expresses profound social trust and loyalty, often highlighted in proverbs:

“Do‘stlik - olov kabi, yonmasa, soviydi.” (“Friendship is like fire; if it doesn’t burn, it cools down.”) — capturing the cultural imperative of active maintenance (Xudoyberdiyev, 2019).

Conceptual complexes, such as the triad of “mehmon”, “xushmuomala” (hospitality), and “hurmat” (respect), regulate social behavior towards guests, illustrating cultural logic in linguistic conceptualization.



---

## **5. Interaction of Language, Concept, and Culture**

### **1. Conceptual Transfer and Adaptation**

Languages frequently borrow lexical items that bring new conceptual content. Uzbek has integrated numerous borrowings from Arabic, Persian, and Russian, each influencing local conceptual frameworks (Ergashev, 2015). For example:

- Arabic-origin “adab” (etiquette, morals) denotes refined social manners and ethical behavior contextualized within Uzbek culture.

### **2. Translation and Conceptual Challenges**

Literal translation of culturally grounded concepts risks loss or distortion of critical semantic and pragmatic content. For instance, Uzbek “ishonch” (trust) entails communal expectation and relational nuances often untranslatable directly into English (Islomov, 2012).

Therefore, cross-cultural communication mandates awareness of these conceptual particularities to avoid misunderstandings and promote mutual respect.

## **6. Implications for Linguistics, Language Teaching, and Cross-Cultural Communication**

### **1. Enriching Semantic Theory**

Incorporating anthropocentric and linguo-cultural perspectives deepens semantic theory by revealing how cognitive and cultural layers intertwine in meaning (Sharifian, 2017; Abdullayev, 2010).

### **2. Language Teaching and Conceptual Competence**

Teaching target language concepts packed with cultural knowledge (e.g., Uzbek “xonadon” or “do‘stlik”) enhances learners’ communicative competence and intercultural sensitivity (Juraev, 2018).

### **3. Translation and Intercultural Understanding**

Professionals engaged in translation must cultivate conceptual awareness to preserve meaning beyond lexical equivalence (Islomov, 2012).



---

#### **4 .Facilitating Cross-Cultural Dialogue**

Awareness of diverse conceptual systems fosters genuine intercultural dialogue and mutual appreciation, crucial in globalized contexts (Wierzbicka, 1997).

#### **7. Conclusion**

The notion of "concept" is fundamental in linking language, thought, and culture. Through the dual lenses of anthropocentrism and linguo-cultural studies, this article has shown how conceptual systems emerge from human experience and cultural heritage. Uzbek linguistic-cultural examples such as “mehmon”, “xonadon”, and “do‘stlik” powerfully illustrate this intricate relationship.

An integrative approach to concepts enriches theoretical linguistics and enhances practical applications in language education, translation, and intercultural communication. Understanding concepts as embedded in cognition and culture is vital for fostering meaningful communication across languages and societies.

#### **References:**

- 1.Abdullayev, R. M. (2010). Til va madaniyat: Semantik va madaniy o‘zaro aloqalar. Toshkent: Fan. — 120 bet.
- 2.Ergashev, D. A. (2015). Madaniyat va til tushunchalari. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy Universiteti Nashriyoti. — 98 bet.
- 3.Islomov, N. T. (2012). “Linhvistik antropotsentrizm va uning o‘zbek tili konseptlariga ta’siri.” O‘zbek Tili va Adabiyoti, 3, 45-54. (10 bet).
- 4.Juraev, S. X. (2018). Lingvokulturologiya asoslari. Samarqand: SamDU Nashriyoti. — 145 bet.
- 5.Lakoff, G. (1987). Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind. University of Chicago Press. — 512 bet.
- 6.Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics (Vols. 1 & 2). Cambridge University Press. — 730 bet.
- 7.Rakhmonov, B. K. (2014). “O‘zbek madaniy lingvistik konseptlari: Xonadon va mehmon tushunchalari.” Tilshunoslik Problemlari, 2, 32–40. (9 bet).
- 8.Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.), Cognition and Categorization (pp. 27–48). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. — 22 bet.





- 
- 9.Sharifian, F. (2017). Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language. John Benjamins Publishing Company. — 245 bet.
- 10.Tursunov, M. M. (2017). Semantik va madaniy tafakkur. Toshkent: Sharq. — 138 bet.
- 11.Wierzbicka, A. (1997). Understanding Cultures Through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese. Oxford University Press. — 290 bet.
- 12.Xudoyberdiyev, P. S. (2019). “Do‘stlik tushunchasining o‘zbek tilidagi madaniy konteksti.” O‘zbek Tili va Usmoniy Madaniyat, 5, 56-63. (8 bet).
- 13.Yusupova, G. A. (2011). Konsept va madaniyat: Til va tafakkur. Toshkent: Milliy Nashriyot. — 105 bet.