

THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE WITHIN THE MODERN PARADIGM OF LINGUISTICS

Kosimova Mushtariibegim Otabek kizi
Undergraduate, "Fergana State University",
Fergana, Republic of Uzbekistan

Mukhiddinov Anvar Gofurovich
Scientific Adviser, "Fergana State University",
Fergana, Republic of Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the concept of a paradigm and issues of language research within the framework of the modern linguistic paradigm, provides various systems of priority paradigms in linguistics, and explores the modern cognitive-discursive paradigm of linguistic knowledge.

Keywords : language as a sign system, scientific paradigm, cognitive-discursive paradigm, integral paradigm, linguistics.

Language is a system of signs of any physical nature that performs cognitive and communicative functions in the process of human activity. People can use various sign systems such as the telegraphic code, transcriptions, shorthand, tables, numbers, gestures, road signs, etc.

The study of sign systems is the subject of a special science - semiotics, which studies the emergence, structure and functioning of various sign systems that store and transmit information.

In different studies, the term paradigm receives a different interpretation and is used either in a broader or in a narrower sense, departing from the content that was given to it by T. Kuhn in his monograph on the structure of scientific revolutions [5]. It is also important that the clarified concept of the paradigm of knowledge can, in our opinion, form the basis of linguistic historiography and streamline the systematization of views on the language and the fruitfulness of certain approaches to its description, and ultimately contribute to the discovery and interpretation of new realities of the language.

The meaning of each new paradigm of knowledge in linguistics is determined for us by the discovery of properties, aspects, features of the language that escaped the attention of researchers for a certain time and were not fully understood, not described or explained by them.

The concept of "knowledge paradigm" introduced by T. Kuhn was rather primitive and was aimed primarily at explaining the causes of scientific revolutions as cardinal restructurings in the systems of scientific knowledge that determined the state of certain specific sciences and the level of their development. "Under the paradigms, T. Kuhn meant a scientific achievement recognized by all, which for a certain time gives the scientific community a model for posing problems and solving them" [5; eleven]. It is elementary that such a definition hides several relevant ideas: firstly, the paradigm is based on the results achieved in a certain science, secondly, on the idea of recognizing these results by a certain scientific community, thirdly, on

the idea of modeling problems and their solutions according to a certain model and, therefore, the idea of the existence of such models of modeling, etc.

Thus, the definition of the paradigm clearly did not include the innovative idea, so important for T. Kuhn himself, about the course of the development of science not at all through the accumulation and gradual cumulation of knowledge, but in the course of a leap, a break with previous traditions, a “ride into the unknown”. In this case, according to T. Kuhn, it is the change in existing views that “should be called a revolution”, from which it follows that only the emergence of a new paradigm and, in a sense, overcoming the errors of the old one, has a truly innovative character [5; 128].

The emergence of new paradigms is related to what was and is included in the area of prerequisite knowledge about the phenomena under consideration, and such knowledge, of course, is historically dependent and historically conditioned. This is all the more linguistics, with several millennia of experience in studying and describing a variety of languages and the deepest traditions of learning languages in different national schools and in different countries. It is interesting to point out that even in the scientific biographies of famous scientists of the past, their teachers and their original specialization in the course of their education were always taken into account; So, for L. Bloomfield, information was given that he started as a Germanist, for N. Chomsky - that political science was his primary area of interest, that knowledge of "exotic" languages played a major role in the formation of the concepts of R. Furs and B. Malinovsky.

If for the individual development of each scientist, his prerequisite knowledge, which gradually accumulates in him, plays such a significant role, then for a certain scientific community, the totality of this knowledge turns out to be the theoretical foundation on which the scientific paradigm that is then formed within it is built. At the same time, it becomes quite obvious which of the prerequisite knowledge gradually acquires a negative character, and which really continue to be among the fundamental information for a given science.

The concept of a paradigm was accepted by the Russian and foreign linguistic community with some marks, but nevertheless it was accepted so much that the meaning of this term has passed the stage of consistent expansion over the past two or three decades. For example, in the Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary, a paradigm is “in a broad sense, any class of linguistic units that are opposed to each other and at the same time united by the presence of a common feature or causing the same associations, most often a set of units connected by paradigmatic relations” [3; 366]. T. Kuhn has a system of scientific achievements that provide a model for posing problems and solving them. Also D.I. Rudenko notes that “a paradigm, defined in a broad sense, is interpreted as ... a dominant research approach to language, a cognitive perspective, a methodological orientation, a broad scientific trend (model), even a scientific “climate of opinion”” [6; 19]. Analyzing the problem of the paradigm in linguistic science, E.S. Kubryakova noted ten years ago that “the conceptual basis of this term is reduced not so much to the concept of a sample, but to the concept of a special association of units that exists due to the presence of a certain number of positions (slots) in each paradigm and a semantic label for each position” [4; 166].

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Kerimov T.Kh. Paradigm // Modern Philosophical Dictionary. - M. et al., 1996. - S. 357–358.
2. Kubryakova E.S. Paradigms of scientific knowledge in linguistics and its current status. - M., 1994. - No. 2. - S. 3-15.
3. Kubryakova E.S. Paradigm // Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. - M., 1990. - S. 366.
4. Kubryakova E.S. Evolution of linguistic ideas in the second half of the 20th century: (Experience of paradigm analysis) // Language and science of the end of the 20th century. - M., 1995. - S. 144-238.
5. Kuhn T. The structure of scientific revolutions. - M., 1977. - 300 p.
6. Rudenko D.I. Name in the paradigms of "philosophy of language". - Kharkov, 1990. - 299 p.