

THE PLACE OF INTERPRETATION OF THE NEW PARADIGM OF KNOWLEDGE

Zafar Tillaev Akmalovich

Teacher, Termez State Pedagogical Institute

A B S T R A C T	K E Y W O R D S
The demand for different aspects of interpretation in research practice is largely due to the change in scientific paradigms in linguistics - systemocentric to anthropocentric. The concept of interpretation, by its definition, is oriented but on anthropocentrism in language learning, since the interpretation in any interpretation of it is inseparable from the interpreter, in the role of which Only a person can perform. And the essence of anthropocentrism as the basic principle of linguistic research is that “scientific objects are studied primarily by their role for humans, according to their purpose in his life, according to their functions for the development the development of the human personality and its improvement a person becomes is a starting point in the analysis of certain phenomena, he is involved in this analysis, defining its prospects and ultimate goals.	interpretation, paradigm, linguistics, analysis, polyparadigmatic approach.

The emergence of the anthropocentric paradigm and its development in linguistics in the late XX - early XXI centuries. it was natural and determined by the progressive development of linguistics, for the language itself is anthropocentric in nature and essence: a person imprinted in the language your physical appearance, your inner states, your emotions, your intellect, its attitude to the objective and non-objective world, kind their relationship to a collective of people and another person. As a result, the focus of the researcher is the subject is revealed, the person in the language and the language in the person are analyzed. By this, along with the study and description of the level-by-level structure of the language, underlying the systemic-structural approach to language and defining who brought the description of nuclear language means to the fore the study of the linguistic abilities of a native speaker, his knowledge, fixed in the language and determining socio-cultural and communicative-discursive competence of a person. And this is already a third there was an appeal to interdisciplinary connections, to areas of knowledge, which lie at the junction of linguistics with cognitology, psychology, cultural studies, etc. The focus is on the human experience, its reflection and interpretation, relationship and interaction different types of knowledge, the conjugation of individual characteristics consciousness,

psyche, culture and human behavior with appropriate collective representations in different fields of knowledge. Occurred the most important switch of attention of researchers from static the results of the structural-semantic (system-structural) description language on results that are a consequence of dynamic descriptions of language processes, more focused on functional and activity capabilities of a native speaker. Ultimately, anthropocentrism began to be recognized as the main the principle of modern linguistics who led the formation and development of a new scientific paradigm - anthropocentric (anthropological) at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries. This was made possible, according to V.N. Telia, "thanks to the change in the static view of the world as an Availability of elements, particles, etc. sui generis, for consideration by the world buildings as a dynamic system unfolding around a person "Atomic facts", i.e. events and phenomena that have absorbed the elementary essences as subject variables inwardly"[2].

Naturally, the new paradigm does not cancel the previous one, but is actively used using her achievements, makes you pay attention to those aspects languages, which in the system-centric (system-structural) paradigm did not become the object of deep and purposeful language research. But, nevertheless, they were nuclear bases in learning a language, referring to them to one degree or another always is present (for example, the study of the internal structure of the language, its level new organization, reliance on form in the study of semantics, etc.). Teaching assuming that each paradigm embodies the time-specific existence of scientific knowledge, it is natural that none of them able to embrace all knowledge. Therefore, each of the existing paradigm contains that one and only thing that defines it isolation and implementation in research. However, none of them can cover all aspects of learning and describing a language. So now began to talk about a polyparadigmatic approach to linguistic phenomena, which allows you to combine knowledge of different approaches and disciplines. So the current era of language learning is the era of interdisciplinary the way to the description of the language, the era of consideration of relationships and interactions the implications of the results obtained in them with a general consistent approach de. He assumes that the focus should be on the subject, the person century as a linguistic personality in the dialectical unity of its structural levels.

Process is most closely related to the host language in terms of its reflection of the dynamic processes of conceptualization and categorization, which find its expression in language, is an interpretation. As A.G. Dement'yeva, "interpretation is cognitive process and at the same time the result in establishing the meaning of speech and/or non-verbal actions. As in the analysis of cognitive activity, we can talk about the subject, objects, procedure, goals, result max, material and interpretation tools" [3]. At this approach "we are talking about a person - not just a passive reference linguistic expressions, but their active interpreter, do not just carry language, but - above all and most importantly - the bearer of a certain conceptual system, on the basis of which he understands the language, learns the world and communicates with other native speakers"[4]. Therefore, the interpretive approach is interested in in describing and explaining the structures of human experience that has subjective nature, correlated with the objective state of affairs. In this case, the language reflects not so much the properties of the extra-linguistic world, how much is the way this world is given to man, the relationship of man to the world[5]. In addition, the interpretation, representing purposeful cognitive activity, consists in establishing and/or maintaining harmony in the interpreter's world, which can express huddle in awareness of the properties of the context of speech and in the placement of results such awareness into the space of the interpreter's inner world[6].

At present, the theory of interpretation has a definite methodological base. "Interpretation, behind which the subject always stands, setting and reading meanings, putting forward subject hypotheses, combines the elements of the existential approach, assuming both the possession of inner freedom and the rootedness in culture and society, as well as actually cognitive"[7;67]. As noted above, the methodology in this case is understood as widespread, since it includes not only the teaching of the method, but and the doctrine of the principles of language research, which are based on one or a different philosophy and determine the direction of research, are the basis for research techniques and techniques. The main conceptual principle laid down in linguistic theory interpretation, anthropocentrism can be considered as the main principle all studies (cognitology, psycholinguistics, ethnolinguistics, cultural linguistics, etc.), in which a person is recognized as a "modus existence of language", and reality itself is open to infinite interpretations. In this case, "a person constructs from himself the known world, measures it with its strength, perceives, shapes, evaluates, and the value of the world is rooted in our interpretation. In tolerant activity permeates our entire life"[8;48].

The need for interpretation as a special methodological procedure arises when in science they are isolated as an object of study following questions of various types of human activities in connection with his participation in communication, in the transfer of personal and collective experience in communication based on linguistic values and traditions.

As a philosophical component of the theory of interpretation of phenomena the recognition that the most important result of cognitive activity is the formation of a system of knowledge about cognitive world, providing understanding of people in communication and from one generation to another in the format of knowledge, objectified in one way or another of reflection. One of the main assets objectification of knowledge is language. It is he who provides fixation knowledge about the world in linguistic signs, represented primarily by words, the reflective nature of which is recognized by most scientists.

In the philosophy of knowledge and in the theory of knowledge itself as an independent it is customary for a modern science to consider the reflective essence of cognitive as a methodological one within the most widespread abstract-epistemological or rational scientific paradigms. However, nowadays it is becoming more and more obvious the fact that "the cognitive process is not limited to reflective procedures and the result itself - knowledge as an image of the cognized - is often achieved by other in nature means or in close intercourse action with them"[9:107]. So, according to L.A. Mikesheva, from the standpoint of the philosophy of knowledge fundamental, along with reflection it presents representation, convention and interpretation. Therefore, no desire of researchers to take into account, in particular, the unity of zealous and interpretive moments. "Recognition of the fundamental the nature of the interpretative activity of the subject of understanding, intolerant, cognizing - one of the main features of the new paradigm we are cognition"- existential-anthropological[10].

This is quite natural and naturally correlates with the treatment to language as an interpreting factor in cognition in the aspect of the ongoing change of linguistic scientific paradigms - system-centered to anthropocentric.

As it is known, the knowledge of the world cannot be subjective, because since it is closely related to consciousness, which is recognized by most of scientists as an inherent property of a highly organized matter - the brain. It is important to take into account that "the subject of knowledge first and foremost, it is a subject interpreting, since its existence and activities are not simply unfolding in objective reality, but in the world of the images he created, he knows and symbolic forms inherent in the very structure

of human life” [11]. With the help of language, a person manages to express the results of cognition and with its help carry out the transfer of semi-knowledge of the world to other members of society in the process of their social but cultural interaction. In this regard, the inclusion interpretation function among the main functions of the language, along with communicative and cognitive. According to N.N. Boldyrev, “any human linguistic activity is associated with interpretation, and linguistic interpretation appears as a type of cognitive activity, a process and the results of man's understanding and explanation of the world and himself in this the world” [12;204]. Moreover, the interpretation is inconceivable without its connection with the consciousness of the subject, since the cognitive activity of a person century is based on the understanding of the world and language (as a specific object of this world) with the help of the human brain, which is able to emit and form such operational units of knowledge as concepts, which are then incorporated into another the most important process of human consciousness is categorization [13;56].

Speaking about the relationship between the concepts of “consciousness” and “cognition”, we note following. Cognition as a reflective process is the main type of consciousness. Along with it, other types of cognition are possible, associated with consciousness and are processes, the purpose of which is not so much to reflect the world in concepts and images as to comprehend the already known world from certain positions - by interpretation as a way of the world being in consciousness. Thus, the world is becoming in consciousness in two hypostases of cognition - as a reflected system centric world based on the rational-rational way his awareness, and as an existential-anthropological world, lagging in the awareness of his being and perception, a significant role in interpretations. What unites them is such a procedure as a convention. So synthesis of reflection and interpretation as universal and fundamental mental properties of cognition (consciousness) provides a person in his life the inactivity of the usefulness of communication based on the convention. At the same time, according to Donald Davidson, interpretation is a conventional core of linguistic communication [14;45]. And then he makes the following conclusion: “the convention is not a condition the existence of language. In fact, language is a condition for developing conventions” [15].

In our opinion, this conclusion is quite applicable for the relationship and the interaction of language with other components of knowledge: language is a condition for generating reflection and interpretation. It is the language that provides ensures the communicative relevance of processes and results reflections, interpretations and conventions. These results are most complete presented in such a linguistic unit as a word. It is this that trains makes the concept (primarily its conceptual type) accessible to operate them in the process of communication. It is the word that defines mental vocabulary of a person, represented in the dictionary of one or a different language. It is the word that turns out to be the linguistic unit that determines the specifics of human communication, in contrast to communication cations of animals.

As a result, we have the following perception of the word. From one side, the word acts as an instrument of cognition, being a condition for work of knowledge, and from the other side, it is the result of knowledge, in which certain knowledge about the world is concentrated (reflective, interpreted and conventional in there, as a rule, unity). Knowledge the same about the world lie at the basis of human cognitive activity, which focused on establishing the cognitive significance of linguistic expressions, its informativeness.

Used Literature:

1. Кубрякова Е.С. Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. М.: РАН ИЯ, 1997. С. 212.
2. Телия В.Н. Метафоризация и её роль в создании языковой картины мира / Телия В.Н. // Роль человеческого фактора в языке. Язык и картина мира. М, Наука.–1988. С. 173-203.
3. Дементьева А.Г. Когнитивные основы формирования переносных значений фитонимов (на материале английского, русского и французского языков): дис. канд. филол. наук. Тамбов, 2012
4. Роль человеческого фактора в языке: Язык и картина мира / Б.А. Серебренников, Е.С. Кубрякова, В.И. Постовалова и др. М.: Наука, 1988.
5. Микешина Л.А. Философия познания: Проблемы эпистемологии гуманитарного знания. М., 2008.
6. Болдырев Н.Н., Панасенко Л.А. Когнитивная основа лексических категорий и их интерпретирующий потенциал // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. 2013. № 2. С. 5.
7. Шарандин А.Л. Оппозитивные отношения в системе знаний // Когнитивные исследования языка. 2008. № 3. С. 75-89.
8. Cited from: Lakoff G. Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What categories reveal about the mind. Chicago, London: University Press, 1987. P. 229.
9. Cited from: Lakoff G. Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What categories reveal about the mind. Chicago, London: University Press, 1987. P. 223.
10. M.I.Murodova Evelyn Waugh's satirical skills. Science and Education 3 (6), pp.1436-1439.
11. .M.I.Murodova E.Waugh and Abdulla Kahhor's creative work. Archive of Conferences, 71-72.
12. Tillaev Zafar. The interrelation of time and tense in English Grammar. EPRA International Journal of Research & Development (IJRD). Volume 7 Issue 5 May 2022. pp.48-52.