THE LANGUAGE'S NATURE, SOCIAL FUNCTION AND MECHANISMS OF ITS IMPACT

[1]Kendjaeva Zemfira Alimjanovna, [2]Mirzababaeva Kamola Uralovna, [3]Anvarova Sayyora Minavarjanovna, [4]Novik Ksenia Pavlovna, [5]Sharif Khurshidakhon Nurilla qizi

[1235]*Lecturer, English Language Department of Applied Disciplines№3, 3rd English Faculty, Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.*
[4]*Senior Lecturer, English Language Department of Applied Disciplines№3, 3rd English Faculty, Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.*

Abstract

The question of the essence of language, of course, is one of the most important issues of modern linguistics and all disciplines that are somehow connected with it. It is also of paramount importance for such a subject as the philosophy of language. However, in scientific circles, disputes on this issue are still ongoing. Therefore, this paper will consider several approaches, systems of views on the nature of language. The aim of the work is to introduce the nature, functions and structure of the language; lay the theoretical foundations for the study of other disciplines of the linguistic cycle; form understanding of the basic methods of linguistics; equip students with basic linguistic concepts and terms.

Keywords: Language's nature, social function, essence of language, modern linguistics, philosophy of language, approaches, systems of views.

INTRODUCTION

Language arises, develops and functions as social phenomenon. Its main purpose is to serve the needs of the human society and ensuring communication between members social collective, as well as the functioning the collective memory of this collective.

The idea of a connection between language and society arose long ago. More ancient Greek philosophers talked about social convention for naming things. attention to this problem intensified over time and gave rise to a new direction in linguistics - sociolinguistics, studying the impact of society on language, the role of language in society, as well as different language situations.

On the influence of language on the development of social relationship is evidenced primarily by the fact that language is one of the consolidating factors of education nation. It is,

on the one hand, a prerequisite and condition for its occurrence, and on the other hand, the result this process. Language plays a big role in educational and educational activities society, because is a tool and a means of transmission from generation to generation of knowledge, cultural, historical and other traditions.

Language (and especially its vocabulary) responds to the development of material culture (technology and technology) and the achievement of spiritual culture (scientific, artistic, mythological comprehension of the world, formation of new concepts).

The development of a naturalistic approach to language is associated with the name of the outstanding German researcher August Schleicher (1821-1868). Schleicher's naturalistic philosophy of language is most clearly set forth in such works as Darwin's Theory and the Science of Language, 1863, and The Significance of Language for the Natural

History of Man, 1865. According to the basic position of the naturalistic trend, linguistics is adjacent to the naturalistic sciences. The difference between the natural and historical sciences lies in whether the will of people can or cannot influence the object of science: the natural sciences are dominated by laws that do not depend on the will of people; in the historical sciences it is impossible to avoid subjectivism. In his work "Darwin's theory and the science of language," Sh. directly pointed out that "the laws established by Darwin for plant and animal species are applicable, at least in their main features, to the organisms of languages." The influence of Darwin's theory is most clearly manifested in the transfer by Schleicher of the position on the struggle for existence in the plant and animal world to the language is convinced that in the present period of the life of mankind, the winners in the struggle for existence are predominantly the languages of the Indo-Germanic tribe translates into languages the law of variability of species established by Darwin. In his opinion, those languages that, according to the expression of botanists and zoologists, would be species of the same genus, are recognized in linguistics as children of one common basic language, from which they originated by gradual change.

Schleicher also sees the closeness of language to natural organisms in the ability of language to evolve. In this regard, Schleicher states: "The life of a language does not differ significantly from the life of all other living organisms - plants and animals." Like these latter, it has a period of growth from the simplest structures to more complex forms, and a period of aging in which languages fall further and further from the highest stage of development they have reached and their forms suffer damage.

With all the shortcomings, the naturalistic direction in linguistics should be considered as a stage in the progressive movement of the science of language. The desire of representatives of this trend, in particular Schleicher, to apply the exact methods of the natural sciences to the study of language should be considered valuable. Erroneous in the concept of Schleicher. and his followers was a too straightforward transfer into the language of the laws inherent in biological organisms, which really grow, develop, and then become decrepit and die. Languages, of course, also arise, develop, and sometimes die. But this death is not biological, but socio-historical in nature. The language dies only with the disappearance of the society that speaks it, the collective of people.

However, despite the erroneous nature of the naturalistic concept in linguistics, one should always take into account the fact that the comparison of language with a living organism contributed to the establishment of a systematic view of language as an object with its own structure.

Another well-known point of view on the nature and essence of language is that language is a mental phenomenon. One of the most prominent representatives who represented the psychological point of view on language was Geiman Steinthal (1823-1899). Steinthal's psychological conception is presented most clearly and consistently in his work Grammar, Logic and Psychology, Their Principles and Relationships. Steinthal considered language to be a mental phenomenon that develops on the basis of the laws of psychology. He denied the role of thinking in the formation of language, attaching importance to the psyche. Schleicher's logic. completely excluded, arguing that "the categories of language and logic incompatible can also hardly be correlated with each other as the concept of a circle and red." Thus, Steinthal categorically denied the participation of thinking in the development of language. Steinthal focused all his attention on the individual act of speech, considering language as a phenomenon of a mental order.

Finally, there is a point of view that language is a social phenomenon. The language of an individual depends on the environment and is influenced by the speech of the collective. If small children fall into the conditions of life of animals, then they acquire the skills of animal life and lose everything human forever.

The Dane Helmsley in his book "Prolegomena to the Theory of Language" gives an exhaustive description of language as a phenomenon: "The language of human speech is an inexhaustible supply of various treasures. Language is inseparable from a person and follows him in all his actions. Language is a tool through which a person forms a thought and feelings,

moods, desires, will and activity. Language is an instrument through which a person influences people, and others influence him. Language is the primary and most necessary basis of human society. But it is also the final necessary support of the human person, the refuge of man in hours loneliness, when the mind enters into a struggle with life and the conflict is born by the monologue of a poet or thinker. But language is not an external phenomenon that only accompanies a person. It is deeply connected with the human mind. It is the wealth of memory inherited by the individual and the tribe. Language is so deeply rooted in personality, family, nation, humanity and life itself, that we sometimes cannot shrink from the question whether language is not just a reflection of phenomena, but their embodiment, the seed from which they grew. For these reasons, language has always attracted the attention of man, he was surprised, he was described in poetry and science. Science began to consider language as a sequence of sounds and expressive gestures, accessible to an exact physical and physiological description. Language is seen as a system of signs and as a stable entity used as a key to the system of human thought.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Language is considered as a system of signs. A sign can be defined as a kind of material unit that creates a language as a phenomenon.

With regard to language, the term sign can be defined by the following points:

1. The sign must be material, that is, it must be accessible to sensory perception, like any other thing.

2. The sign has no meaning, but is aimed at meaning, for this it exists.

3. The content of a sign does not coincide with its material characteristics, while the content of a thing is exhausted by its material characteristics.

4. The content of a sign is determined by its distinctive features, which are analytically distinguished and separated from non-distinctive ones.

In this part of this work, the author will also have to consider several views and approaches to the problem, since here, too, there are certain disagreements between scientists.

Language functions according to Buhler

The Austrian psychologist, philosopher and linguist Karl Buhler, describing in his book "Theory of Language" the various directions of the signs of the language, defines 3 main functions of the language:

1) the function of expression, or expressive function, when the state of the speaker is expressed.

2) The function of calling, addressing the listener, or appellative function.

3) The function of presentation, or representative, when one says or tells something to another,

Functions of the language according to the Reformed

There are other points of view on the functions performed by the language, for example, as Reformatsky A.A. understood them.

1) Nominative, that is, the words of the language can name things and phenomena of reality.

2) communicative; Suggestions serve this purpose.

3) Expressive, thanks to it the emotional state of the speaker is expressed.

Within the framework of the expressive function, one can also single out a deictic (pointing) function that combines some elements of the language with gestures.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

What are the grounds that allow us to single out language and speech as counter terms? The presence of a norm in a language makes it possible to define the difference between language and speech as the difference between a norm and a deviation from the norm. The basis of the norm of speech is an ethical principle. The very fact of distinguishing between what is within the norm is correct, and what is outside the norm is wrong, represents

the society's opinion about what is acceptable and what is unacceptable. The ethical principle makes it possible to separate what is approved and protected by society from what condemns and what society fights against.

The presence in the language of phenomena fixed by custom and deviating from custom, called usus, makes it possible to define the difference between language and speech as the difference between generally accepted, fixed in custom, common and not generally accepted, random, not common. From this point of view, language is what unites the speech of significant masses of people who form a given collective, that is, what is a custom, custom, common skills, what is characterized by wide distribution. Speech is that in which the speaking of individual individuals who form a given collective differs, that which is occasional, chance, incident, event, that which is characterized by low prevalence.

The concept of usage is fundamentally different from the concept of norm: usage is what is most common; a norm is something that is encouraged, supported, approved.

The norm is established by institutions or authorities and prescribed to society. Usus develops in the process of language development and is not prescribed by anyone.

The distribution of facts on these grounds is not always consistent. Facts that meet the norms and are encouraged by society may not be widely distributed. On the contrary, facts that are widely shared may not meet the requirements of the norm.

It follows from this that both of these grounds taken together cannot be used to oppose language and speech.

The ethical principle cannot be accepted as a basis for opposing language and speech, since it singles out what is encouraged and not encouraged by society; in such a case, speech would represent that which is condemned by society.

The principle of usage also cannot be accepted as an opposition between language and speech, since it distinguishes between what is consecrated by custom and what is not consecrated by custom; in this case, speech

would be something that is not fixed in custom, i.e., some deviations from custom.

Currently, the most popular view is that language and speech are different aspects of linguistic reality. This understanding of the relationship between language and speech was largely facilitated by the book of F, Saussure "Course in General Linguistics". The author claims that "language, isolated from speech, constitutes a subject accessible to isolated study." According to Saussure, language and speech are different subjects of different sciences. "The study of linguistic activity is divided into two parts: one of them has the subject of language ... the other ... individual speech activity, that is, speech."

Proposing to consider language and speech as different phenomena, which are subjects of different sciences, Saussure was forced to follow the line of searching for such features that are present in language and absent in speech.

1. As a basis for opposing language and speech, F. de Saussure put forward a different attitude towards development. Speech is characterized by evolution. Language also changes, but it does not contain the sources of the need for its development. Language development is determined by speech. "The phenomena of speech," says F. de Saussure, "determine the evolution of language."

According to this concept, all changes in the vocabulary and grammatical structure arise and are fixed in speech. Neoplasms that arise in speech break the existing system of language, modify it, and pass from speech to language. Thus, speech is the source of language development. Language is only a product of the development of speech.

In this concept, the opposition of language and speech is carried out on the basis of the difference between the product of development and the source of development: language is the product of development, speech is the source of development.

However, this basis for the opposition of language and speech cannot be accepted. If contradiction is recognized as a property of any object and the source of its development, then the difference between the product of development and the source of development

cannot be put forward as a basis for opposing language and speech; one cannot exclude contradictions from language if it is recognized as the subject of science. Otherwise, the science of language would be deprived of the opportunity to study the necessity and internal regularity of the development of language.

If the position that the language is characterized by internal laws of development is not rejected, then it is impossible to transfer the source of the development of the language from language to speech.

2. According to Saussure, in the processes of verbal communication, individuals "reproduce - of course, not quite the same, approximately - the same signs, connecting them with the same concepts." Consequently, in the processes of verbal communication there is something that is reproduced, and it must be different from what is produced in the same processes of verbal communication.

In the development of this concept, A. Smirnitsky proposed the difference between the reproduced and the produced as the basis for opposing the language of speech. According to A. Smirnitsky, language refers to that which has a ready character and is reproduced in the act of communication, and speech refers to that which does not have a ready character and is produced in the act of communication. According to this concept, words and word forms are units of language, and free phrases and sentences are units of speech.

"As units of the language, - says A. Smirnitsky, - free combinations of words, including sentences that occur in speech, cannot be singled out." Specific sentences and free combinations of words are works and are units of speech, not language. "A characteristic property of speech," says F. de Sosstor, "is the freedom of combinations." In view of this, only free combinations of words belong to speech. However, there are a huge number of expressions that are unconditionally related to the language; these are quite ready-made sayings in which the custom forbids changing anything even if it is possible, upon reflection, to distinguish significant parts in them (get married, and so on).

If language and speech are contrasted as separate phenomena, then it becomes necessary to attribute some facts to language, which is one phenomenon, and other facts to speech, which is another phenomenon.

From this point of view, language is the subject of lexicology and morphology, and speech is the subject of syntax.

3. Scientists of the school of F. de Sosstor recognized consistency as a characteristic property of the language; it is assumed, obviously, that speech is not characteristic, at least of the systemic nature that is characteristic of language.

However, such a contrast between language and speech can hardly be accepted, because it is logically contradictory. If a language is recognized as a system, and if it turns out that some facts are not of a systemic nature, then either the conclusion must be drawn that the language is not a system, or that the system of the language has been established incorrectly.

If the provision about the systemic nature of language is preserved, then it should be extended to speech. The attitude to systemicity cannot be the basis for opposing language and speech.

As mentioned above, the main thing in the concept of de Saussure is the distinction between language and speech as different objects of different sciences. However, this is precisely what is objectionable.

In linguistics, the position is accepted, according to which the language develops according to its own internal laws. But if we recognize that language and speech are different objects, that the units of language and speech are studied in different sciences, then it is necessary to conclude that speech must have its own special internal laws of development. If such a conclusion cannot be supported by observable facts, then it must be regarded as evidence of the falsity of the original premise. Since there is no empirical basis for recognizing the special laws of development in language and speech, we are forced to consider language and speech not as different phenomena, which are objects of different sciences, but as different aspects of one phenomenon, which are one subject of one science.

Overcoming the view of language and speech as different phenomena is achieved by putting

forward the category of essence and its manifestation as the basis for opposing language and speech. Such an understanding of the basis for distinguishing between language and speech excludes the possibility of attributing some facts to language, and others to speech. From this point of view, there cannot be such units in speech that would not have a place in language, and there are no such units in language that would not have a place in speech. Language and speech differ not in the difference of phenomena, but in the difference of essence and its manifestation.

From this point of view, the units of the language are not only words and their forms, but also free phrases, as well as sentences. In phrases and sentences there is not only what is produced anew each time, but also what is reproduced in every act of communication - these are sentence models.

Language is such an entity, the mode of existence and manifestation of which is speech. Language as an entity finds its manifestation in speech. Language is learned through analysis, speech through perception and understanding. In the expression "he reads books" the fact of using the word book refers to the manifestation of something that may find its manifestation in another word, for example, "he reads magazines". There is a certain identity that is preserved in both the first and second sentences and which manifests itself in different ways in them. These sentences, from the side of their difference, refer to speech, and from the side of their identity, to language.

DATA ANALYSIS

Let us consider the grounds for opposing language and speech as different sides of one phenomenon.

1. Both language and speech have a public, social nature. But in the act of communication, the social nature of language takes the form of individual speech. Language in the act of communication does not exist otherwise than in the form of individual speaking. For Saussure, language and speech are different phenomena. Language as a social phenomenon is opposed to speech as an individual phenomenon. In his opinion, there is nothing collective in speech, and nothing individual in language. Such an

understanding of the relationship between language and speech is possible only if we assume that language and speech are different phenomena representing the subjects of different sciences. And this understanding is completely excluded if the relation of language in speech is regarded as the relation of essence to its manifestation. Language is social in nature; the individual form of the manifestation of the social nature of the language indicates that the individual form is also social in its essence. The individual is not opposed to the social, it is only a form of social being.

Some of de Saussure's commentators interpret the correlation of the social and the individual as the correlation of the objective and the subjective: but in their opinion, language is objective and speech is subjective. The possibility of such an interpretation of the social and the individual follows from the premise that the individual and the social are opposite in essence and represent different phenomena. But if the individual is considered as a form of existence of the social, then it is necessary to conclude that the first is not the opposite of the second, that if an objective character is attributed to language, then it must also be attributed to speech.

The opposition of language and speech on this basis suggests the need to consider the same units both as units of language and as units of speech. There can be no units which, being related to language, would not be related to speech, and vice versa.

2. Language and speech are opposed on the basis of the general and the singular, the constant and the variable. But again, the general and the individual, the constant and the variable, cannot be regarded as separate phenomena existing separately.

The general and constant exist in the form of the individual and the variable, and in every individual and variable there is the general and the constant. Let's explain this with examples. In the sentence "He looked at the picture" we can replace the word picture with the word photograph. As a result of this operation, we will get a new sentence: "He looked at the photo." But in that which is in a relationship of mutual substitution, there is a common, constant. This general, constant is manifested in individual words that have the form of an

accusative case. Language is speech taken from the side of the general and permanent. Speech is language taken from the standpoint of the individual and the variable. Any linguistic unit has one side turned to the language, and the other - to speech. Each linguistic unit should be considered both from the side of language and from the side of speech. The opposition of language and speech on the basis under consideration excludes the possibility of referring some units to language, and others to speech.

3. Language and speech differ on the basis of a certain establishment and process. There is language as a means of communication and there is speech as a process of communication through language. Speech has the property of being loud or soft, fast or slow, long or short; this characteristic is not applicable to the language. Speech can be monologue, if the interlocutor only listens, and dialogical, if the interlocutor also participates in communication. Language can be neither monologic nor dialogic. In order for speech to have its own units, different from the units of language, they must be distinguished by those properties that the process has and which the tool with which it is performed does not have.

Unlike language as a tool of communication in speech, we can highlight the moments that characterize the process of communication. In speech, the frequency of repetition of certain elements of the language in certain conditions of the communication process differs.

Mathematical statistics studies frequencies in the form of calculating various kinds of averages. Frequency characterizes not a unit of structure, but its repetition in the process of communication. Strength characterizes not the phoneme as a unit of language, but the pronunciation of sound in the process of communication. You can use units to measure the strength of sound. Interference characterizes not the units of the language, but the implementation of the communication process. You can use units to measure the degree of interference. Such units cannot be not only words or their forms, phrases or sentences, but even paragraphs.

We will not discuss here whether complex integers, as well as paragraphs, are units of linguistic or non-linguistic structure. However,

it is clear that they are not units of actions, processes; they are units of some structures, rather non-linguistic than linguistic.

The selection of complex wholes or paragraphs as units of speech, and not language, also does not rely on the basis of the opposition of language and speech, as well as the allocation of free phrases or sentences as units of speech.

It seems to us that those linguists are wrong who, while recognizing as units of language not only words and word forms, but also phrases and sentences, nevertheless consider that speech should have its own special units, which they consider a paragraph, a complex whole, a phrase, etc.

CONCLUSIONS

So, language and speech are not different phenomena, but different sides of one phenomenon. All linguistic units are units of language and speech: on one side they are turned to language, on the other - to speech.

Language is the most complex sign system that works in unity and interaction with human consciousness and thinking. Language is a historically established system of sound, vocabulary, grammatical means that objectifies the work of thinking and is a tool for communication, exchange of thoughts and mutual understanding of people in society (S.I. Ozhegov. Dictionary of the Russian language).

The question of the essence of language is one of the most difficult in linguistics; language is considered as a biological (natural) phenomenon, as a mental (individual) and as a social (social) phenomenon. The manifestation of the essence of the language are its functions. The main functions include communicative and cognitive. The communicative function is to be a means, an instrument of human communication; its private functions:

contact-establishing function - the function of creating and maintaining contact between interlocutors. It is usually expressed in words and phrases of speech etiquette;

appellative function - the function of a call, an incentive to action; conative function - the function of assimilation of information by the addressee, associated with empathy, for

example, the magical power of spells and curses in an archaic society or advertising texts - in a modern one;

epistemic function - the function of storing and transmitting knowledge about reality, the traditions of culture, the history of the people.

Cognitive function (epistemological, cognitive function)

- to be a means of obtaining new knowledge about reality, this function connects the language with the mental activity of a person; derivatives of this function: axiological function

– evaluation function; nominative function

- naming function, etc.

In addition to these functions of the language, sometimes they distinguish: emotional, or expressive function (to be a means of expressing a person's moods and emotions); aesthetic (associated with the aesthetic impact of the language of fiction on the reader), metalinguistic, metalinguistic (to be a means of describing the language in terms of the language itself, when it becomes necessary to explain an incomprehensible word) and others.

Language is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, which is unthinkable to consider only from one side. Each of the considered approaches is correct in its own way, but in order to determine the nature of the language as accurately as possible, one has to turn to all its aspects, remember its biological nature, do not forget about the social side, consider it from the point of view of the human psyche and perceive it as a system of signs. In addition, the listed approaches are only the main ones, in addition to them, there are others that also need to be taken into account.

Reference

[1] Alefirenko N. F. Theory of language. Introductory course. - M., 2004;

[2] Alpatov A. M. "Port-Royal Grammar" and Modern Linguistics// Questions of Linguistics. - 1992., No. 2;

[3] Amirova T. A. From the history of linguistics in the 20th century. Structural-functional linguistics. - M., 200.

[4] Amirova T. A., Olkhovikov B. A., Rozhdestvensky Yu. V. History of linguistics: Textbook. - M., 2003;

[5] Maslov Yu. S. Introduction to linguistics. - M., 1987.