

## BASIC CONCEPTS AND FIELD OF RESEARCH OF MODERN HERMENEVTICS

**Xo‘janiyozov Abdulla Ravshan o‘g‘li**

*Magistr of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages*

### ARTICLE INFO.

***Kalit so'zlar:***

Comprehension, explanation,  
interpretation, destruction,  
deconstruction, reconstruction,  
hermeneutics, text, meaning,  
language, semiotics, sign.

### Annotation

The "understanding apparatus" of any science and any research is formed by basic concepts. It's easier to figure out what's going on with the help of "comprehension apparatus". In hermeneutic research, these terms (text, comprehension, explanation) are completely different from what they are. With the formation of hermeneutics, its scientific apparatus is also expanding. In this paper, we aim to classify hermeneutic terms and categorize them into functional, conceptual, and conceptual categories.

<http://www.gospodarkainnowacje.pl/> © 2022 LWAB.

Understanding is the process of understanding and creating meaning as a condition for the universal assimilation of reality, which does not fall within the subject-object realm of knowledge, but leads to the need for understanding. It should be noted that understanding is the main category of hermeneutics. After all, hermeneutics is the "art of understanding" [1. 704] is proof of this. The categorical status of understanding is related to the views of F. Schleiermacher. According to Schleiermacher, comprehension restores the original meaning expressed in the text. [2. 23]

Although the concept is well known and understood, it is important in hermeneutics. Understanding can also be synonymous with knowing. What does it mean when a person says, "Did I understand that?" The answer to this question is: "When we hear (read, see) new information, we realize that this innovation is related to a certain aspect of the existing skills in our knowledge system, and we accept it." As we have seen, understanding is not just about gaining knowledge, it is about accepting it in terms of the past and the future.

Hermeneutic understanding, in contrast to social understanding, focuses on understanding the author's original purpose in relation to the text. In our opinion, comprehension is the art of perceiving the signals transmitted from one mind to another through the external line - actions (gestures, speech). Representatives of the epistemological approach recognize comprehension as an important form of knowledge, a completed goal, and at the same time the result of the subject's conscious activity. In the context of the existence of understanding, researchers see it as an existing set of new knowledge and consciousness. There are also definitions that understanding is understood as an intellectual-psychological process that represents an object in reality or another person in the form of an experience.

In order to form a complete definition of understanding, it is necessary to focus on all the core features of this phenomenon: understanding is an important type of understanding that underlies all intellectual

processes; comprehension is the addition of new knowledge to the content of the mind; comprehension - always evokes a new qualitative view of the subject and enriches knowledge. These two aspects are the onto-gnoseological aspect of understanding. Comprehension is a state of mind (that is, it is a state of mind). The existential-psychological aspect of understanding is surrounded by emotions, in which the experiences of the understanding subject are of great importance. The hermeneutic aspect of understanding is the result of extracting and interpreting the content from the whole meaning of the text.

It is impossible to understand without evaluation. [3. 84] This is an axiological aspect of understanding. Understanding is the basis of a person's conscious decision-making. It is praxiological for a person to perceive the phenomena of existence, himself, others, and the world in his activity (actions) with a holistic personal understanding. Thus, Comprehension is a phenomenon of consciousness, which represents an integral situation, passes through a specific state of mind and experience, and on this basis means the assessment of a particular phenomenon, the acquisition of its essence, which leads to conscious decision-making.

The above is a multidimensional and universal understanding. These two qualities show that understanding can be applied not only to the communicative field, but also to all cognitive processes of human existence. The next term, which is opposed by most authors, is explanation. Explanation is a logical-methodological expression of the essence of any object, event, event, action. The research scope of the explanation covers all areas of human activity. Interpretation is carried out in collaborative activities (with the participation of the commentator-receiver) in individual, trial, polylogic forms. Explanation has now risen to the level of a special research problem of philosophy and theology and is being studied by experts. In particular, modern epistemology focuses on scientific explanation. In this case, the explanation must first meet two requirements: 1) adequacy - the argumentative (descriptive) description of the explanation must be directly related to the object, event, reality, action being explained; 2) direct or indirect dependence.

Explanation occurs in both theoretical and empirical stages in the formation of scientific knowledge. Methods of explanation such as causal deterministic, genetic, structural, linguistic, teleological-intensive, functional dependence are used in the process of scientific knowledge. In the natural sciences, the causal-deterministic method is superior in its ability to reveal the coordination, conditionality, and interdependence of things and events. The more complete and in-depth the explanation of the conditionality, the greater the value of the explanation. Unlike the natural sciences, the explanation of social processes is more complex. This is because of the dynamic, unstable and probable significance of events.

The deductive-nomological model in the analysis of social phenomena has been positively accepted by most scholars. This model is widely used in modern methodology of scientific knowledge. In this case, the event being explained is linked to a specific law, and the explanation is to derive the event from specific laws. In the deductive-nomological model of interpretation, the object or event being studied must correspond to at least one of the laws. This model describes the end result, not the explanatory process in scientific knowledge. For example, according to this model proposed by K.G. Gempel, let E be an event that needs to be explained. [4. 16-31] Why did E happen? To answer this, we cite other events and situations E1, .... En, and obtain one or more general laws L1, ... Ln. These are the laws (L1, ... Ln) and the above evidence (E1, .... En). On this basis, E continues in a logical sequence. In this formal description proposed by Gempel, it is called E-explanandum or explicandum. The object of explanation is called explanation or explication, and they act as a source or law for explaining the process. L1, ... Ln summarizes the laws of expansion and expansion.

Explanation and explanandum are interrelated. In the humanities, the method of rational explanation is used. In explaining the activities of a particular historical person, the researcher is required to identify the reasons for the specific activities of the historical person and to indicate that the activities (actions)

were reasonable based on these reasons. The teleological or intensive form of interpretation covers a relatively wide area. The focus is not on the rational purpose of the activity, but on the subjective intentions and goals of the historical figure whose activities are being studied.

Despite the research, there are the following difficulties in the field of scientific explanation:

- 1) the fact that the objects have different socio-cultural characteristics, the diversity of their periods of occurrence, as well as the fact that they belong to different types and norms of rationality;
- 2) inability to fully rationalize human behavior. Therefore, in explaining natural and social phenomena, it is advisable to use methods and approaches in harmony, not in isolation. In hermeneutics, in addition to understanding and explaining, interpretation is also important. Interpretation (Latin *interpretatio* - explanation, interpretation) is a cognitive process aimed at knowing the essence of a concept or element through their object form, ornaments. The problem of interpretation is one of the fundamental problems of epistemology, science methodology, logic, philosophy of language, semiotics and other sciences, and is of particular importance in hermeneutics. Today, in the humanities as well as in the natural sciences, interpretation is used as a material verification that verifies the compatibility of scientific theory with ontological reality. Theory and reality are not always explained in the same language, there can be more than one theory for a single event. Interpretation allows comparisons to be made in terms of the application of scientific theory.

Interpretation in the field of logic is the process of justifying the structure of logical devices. In the socio-humanitarian field, however, interpretation represents the verbal structure of concepts. The methodological development of interpretation in the humanities can be expressed in the following way:

- 1) interpretation - a field of study that focuses on the study of artistic allegories and classical heritage in the culture of antiquity;
- 2) interpretation - a field that represents the content of symbols in religious texts, which is the basis of medieval Christian culture - exegetics;
- 3) Interpretation is the main problem of hermeneutics formed on the basis of exegetic tradition, the field of study of the formation of understanding and meaning. The interpretive process, according to Schleiermacher, is to create the conditions for understanding the rational content of a particular text. [5. 114] Any written document is an expression of a language of two natures, i.e., on the one hand, it is part of a common language system, and on the other hand, it is the product of the creation of a separate, individual individual. Interpretation, therefore, has a dual task: that is, to interpret the essence of the unique (single) subjectivity of the language expressed as an element of a particular language system, and at the same time in the content of the text. The first part of the task is an "objective" (or grammatical) interpretation, and the second is a "technical" (or psychological) interpretation. While grammatical interpretation analyzes text as part of a particular lexical system, psychological interpretation explores the individual way of using a combination of meanings and phrases that cannot be identified in a lexical system. Some philosophers and source scholars add a historical interpretation to the above two approaches. In particular, P. Riker is an important approach to the study of historical interpretation of the features associated with the creation of the text, [6. 68].

Dilthey explains the interpretation by the fact that the text appears in two stages: first, the individual-psychological state of the author of the text under the influence of semantic and axiological traditions combined with the cultural-historical process in which he lives; second, the content that the interpreter adds to the information provided based on personal experience. Dilthey's approach to interpretation is very similar to the phenomenon of hermeneutic understanding. Because in both cases there is a re-creation of meaning. A similar interpretation of the processes of understanding and interpretation can be seen in the views of G. Rickert, a representative of the Baden neo-Kant school. G. Rickert emphasizes the value of the result of the activity understood, emphasizing that interpretation is an axiological process.

The interpretation of the interpretation in relation to the author's biography (G. Mish) also provides a complete expression of the content. In a biographical approach, the author's biography is first studied and the text is interpreted on this basis. The main issue in the interpretation is the study, preservation and delivery of the objective content of the text. However, given that any text is from the past, it is unlikely that the interpreter will understand the content exactly as it was at the time of creation. Historical, ideographic, system-structural methods of interpretation in the humanities are also used in the interpretation of texts. Unlike classical paradigms, postmodern understanding has a new meaning. There are two main differences: the first is the polyvalence of the text. If the classical approach focuses on knowing the structure of the text, its objective content, the postmodern paradigm focuses on the anti-structural state of the text. It uses the principles of destruction (meaning branching), deconstruction (meaning reorganization) and reconstruction (meaning centralization) to interpret the meaning of the text.

### **Bibliography**

1. Гадамер Х.Г. Истина и метод. Основы философской герменевтики. –М.: Прогресс, 1988. -704 с.
2. Шлейермахер Ф. Герменевтика. – СПб.: Европейский дом, 2004. –С. 23
3. Бахтин М.М. Всемирная энциклопедия. Философия. –М.: Современный литератор, 2001. –С. 84
4. Гемпел К.Г. Логика объяснения. -М.: АГРАФ, 1998.-С.16-31.
5. Шлейермахер Ф. Герменевтика. – СПб.: Европейский дом, 2004. –С. 114
6. Рикер П. Конфликт интерпретаций. Очерк о герменевтике. –М.: АСТ, 1995. –С. 68