

## **Paradigms of Knowledge in Modern Linguistics**

**Otaxonova Hilola Ahmadjon kizi**

Uzbekistan State World Languages University,  
Department of theoretical aspects of the English language N2

**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.

### **INTRODUCTION**

According to many linguists, the first truly scientific paradigm appeared in linguistics at the beginning of the 19th century, so the concept of a paradigm applicable only to linguistics of the 19th–20th centuries and subsequent centuries. Traditionally, three scientific paradigms are distinguished: comparative historical, system-structural and anthropocentric. “The comparative historical paradigm was the first paradigm in linguistics, for the comparative historical method was the first special language research method. The entire 19th century passed under the auspices this paradigm. Under the systemic-structural paradigm, attention was focused on an object, thing, name, so the focus was word,” writes V. A. Maslova [1, p. 61].

The system-structural paradigm appears in the 20s of the 20th century. The formation of this paradigm is associated with the ideas of Ferdinand de Saussure. The main attention of linguists is directed to the characteristics language systems, the specifics of their units and levels, general and different in organizing systems of different languages. The question of the nature of the modern scientific paradigm is complex due to its versatility. Firstly, in modern linguistics the understanding of language is preserved as a systemic-structural formation.

Secondly, there is a transition from descriptivism to generativism. Representatives of generative linguistics are trying to reveal the generative the power of language, which determines the diverse possibilities of use language system [2, p. 275].

Thirdly, the defining feature of modern linguistic paradigm is, on the one hand, anthropocentrism, that is, the orientation on a person, and, on the other hand, the influence of extralinguistic factors on the speaker. Within this paradigm, they are developing such areas in linguistics as psycholinguistics, communicative linguistics, cognitive linguistics, discursive linguistics, pragmalinguistics, sociolinguistics, semiotics, etc. [2, p. 278].

### **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

The scientific paradigm is a set of fundamental achievements in the given field of science that set common standards, examples of scientific knowledge, problems and methods of their study and are recognized for a certain time by the scientific community as the basis for its future activity. When a new paradigm is created, the old schools gradually disappear [3]. Often, when creating a

new paradigm, new journals arise, demands for new courses in universities, and the new paradigm is strengthened if it resolves issues of science better than the old ones.

Integrity dictates the study of language in the unity of its statics and dynamics, the language system and language activity, the study of language in synchrony and diachrony on the basis of combining semasiological-onomasiological, synchronous-diachronic and cognitive approaches. Integrativity of linguistic knowledge is a consequence of the scientific principles of expansionism, anthropocentrism, explanation, functionalism, cognitivism. E.Kubryakova singles out the following four principled attitudes for all schools and trends that are attributed to the modern linguistic paradigm: – expansionism, manifested in the emergence of linguistics in connection with other sciences, as well as in the integration of several related sciences and the enlargement of a separate large science.

The concept of expansionism as a certain period in the formation of a scientific discipline – as opposed to reductionism – was first put forward at the XIV International Linguistic Congress in Berlin in 1987 with reference to the linguistics of the text. The principle of expansionism is manifested in the form of synthesis of various sciences, an active dialogue of linguistics with other sciences – philosophy, logic, semiotics, psychology, history, culturology, neurophysiology, etc. Expansionism in linguistics is the influence of sciences on linguistics, and on the other – the influence of linguistics on others science. This principle is defined as "the invasion of the linguistic branch of knowledge of other sciences." Expansionism is the opposition to the prevailing desire in the glossematics to isolate linguistics from other sciences, except semiotics and mathematics.

## RESULTS

Today, without any expansionism in the form of integrating linguistics and other branches of knowledge, no new linguistic theory is possible anthropocentrism, according to which scientific objects are studied in terms of their role for man, while anthropocentrism can take in different linguistic directions not identical forms. The principle of anthropocentrism the position according to which the basic functions of language as a semiological system are formed in an elementary form in the direct act of utterance and communication of two people – partners in the dialogue. The term anthropocentrism means that functions represent at the starting point a distraction, an abstraction of some aspects or qualities of a person as active, cognizing and transforming the objective world of the subject. Its main properties are the importance of modern scientific research for humans and their interpretation from the standpoint of man.

At present, two global problems of studying the human factor in the language are formulated. One of them was formulated as a circle of questions about the effect that the developed natural language has on the behavior and thinking of man, and what gives in this respect the existence of a certain picture of the world in man. The other was formulated as a circle of questions about how a person influences the language used by him, what is the measure of his possible influence on him, which areas are open to his lingual-creative activity and generally depend on the "human factor" (deixis, modality, expressive aspects of language, word formation, etc.)[3]. A person who has grown up in one or another linguistic environment perceives the latter as part of the very nature of things that always remain at the level of background phenomena. Such anthropocentrism of the language proceeds from the language itself and is thus generalized, abstract, whether it is the influence of a cultural code or language stereotypes.

Apparently, the anthropocentrism of the language should be derived not only from the language or its products, but also from the availability of subjects – users of the language, their states – mental or physical; functionalism (or neofunctionalism), in which the central problem of science is the study of the functions of the object of research, its purpose. The principle of functionalism dictates, firstly, the consideration of the language in terms of the functions it performs, and secondly, its study as a functioning mechanism, ie, as speech activity and as a text-discourse. This principle gave birth to various theories united in the framework of functional linguistics, which marked the transition from structuralism to functionalism. In the process of linguistic

research, all laws and mechanisms of the functioning of the language in its interaction with the person who knows the world should be "thoroughly studied and fully disclosed".

## **DISCUSSION**

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 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].

## **CONCLUSION**

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.

## REFERENCES

1. Zhanpeisova NM Actual problems of Russian linguistics: Proc. allowance for magistr.filol. specialty. Aktobe: AU S.Baisheva, 2012.- 189 p.
2. 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 / Ed. Yu.S. Stepanova .- Moscow: The Russian state. University, 1995.- p. 149-
3. Kuhn T. Structure of scientific revolutions. – Moscow: Progress, 1977. – 288 p.
4. Kubryakova E.S. The initial stages of the development of cognitivism: linguistics – psychology – cognitive science // Questions of linguistics.- 1994.-№4.-C.3-15.
5. Alpatov V.M. On the Anthropocentric and Semantic-Centric Approach to Language // Questions of Linguistics.- – No. 3.- P. 15-26.
6. Kravchenko A.V. Questions of Cognitive Linguistics / / Language picture of the world: linguistic and cultural aspects.- Biysk: BSU, 1998.- t. 1.- C. 260
7. Popova E.A. Man as the fundamental value of modern linguistics // Philological sciences. No. 3. P.69-77
8. Demyankov V.Z. Fundamentals of the theory of interpretation and its applications in computational linguistics. – Moscow: Izd-vo Mosk. University, 1985. – 76 p.