

# LANGUAGE AS A MEANS OF COMMUNICATION, VEHICLE FOR CONVEYING IDEAS AND TRANSMITTING MEDIUM

Diyora A. Yunusova

Head of the department “Uzbek language, literature and foreign languages”  
Samarkand Institute of Veterinary Medicine

True Speech Is Impressive,  
Short speech is captivating.  
The one who speaks for a long time gets fed up,  
Stupid one who always The same thing repeats.  
(Alisher Navoiy)

**Abstract:** No matter what a person does, he constantly speaks, and even when he works or rests, listens or keeps quiet. It is human nature to speak in the same way as walking or breathing. We very rarely think about what language is and how communication with other people is possible. Language penetrates our entire lives. Each of us from the moment of birth finds the language as an already established set of means, rules, and norms of communication of people. He uses them to convey his thoughts to another person in the form of speech: written or oral, related languages of culture, religion, art, science, etc. When the speech is built according to the rules of the language, it becomes understandable to another person. This is our individual ability to use language as a coherent set of socially significant means of communication.

**Communication** is traditionally called the exchange of values (information) between individuals through a common system of symbols and signs. This field of knowledge and scientific interests, like many others, began to form back in ancient times, so communication has about the same number of definitions as the authors of works about it.

**Communication** (this word is taken from Latin which means making it common linking it) - a specific form of interaction of people in the process of their cognitive and labour activities. The main goal of speech communication is the exchange of information of various kinds, its perception and comprehension.

As everyone knows, the medium of communication is language (verbal human language), more precisely, one of the means of communication between people (among individuals,

individuals vs society, among groups of individuals, and even communication with themselves). The term "language" can also be interpreted in a broad (semiotic) sense (including other sign systems).

The study of language in both theoretical and applied terms, both in terms of general and in terms of particular problems, is inevitably associated with the clarification of the essential characteristics of the language, which determine the approach to the analysis of all links of the structure of the language, respectively.

The recognition of language as a means of communication gives reason to consider language in its only function, namely, the function of communication, which is a truly complex integrated phenomenon in which all the properties of language are integrated, which are found in the process of serving the life of human society at all stages of its development.

The communicative function of language has been studied in linguistics throughout its history and has received many interpretations and justifications of both aspects of a single function and various functions of language in society.

The consideration of language in its communicative purpose, in its single, integrated function, is now of considerable interest, since it can help to illuminate a number of important properties of the language mechanism.

Linguistics focusing on the theory of language, primarily in the communicative aspect - communicative linguistics - with all its undevelopment, it has the advantage that it does not distance itself from the essence of language by designing certain abstract, formal laws that do not reflect the complex

nature of language, but aims to describe language in all its links that unambiguously perform their functions in the process of speech communication.

In Western philosophy of the XX century there were established the idea of language as the "house of man". Close attention to language problems is due to the development of both the humanities and natural sciences. There are many options of the philosophy of language over the past century. All of them, to one degree or another, tend to consider the existence of a person in the world as a set of language practices. At the same time, the "language" began to be understood as widely as possible. It turned out that the whole reality has a linguistic nature, because it is given to us no other than in the language.

All this leads to a need not just in the theory of communication, but in the philosophy of communicative acts. The foundations of this latter were laid in the phonology of N.S. Trubetsky, who showed that elements of the communicative opposition become such only at the moment of communication, these elements are constitutionalized. Such a position raises the issue of the ontological status of communication elements and raises the search for some common grounds for linguistic activity.

The language sign has two significant properties: 1) the connection connecting meaning with the meaning is arbitrary; 2) meaning has a linear character. It is freely chosen with respect to what it expresses. In relation to the language team that uses it, on the contrary, it is not freely imposed, but imposed. The arbitrariness of the sign protects the language from any attempt to deliberately change it. J. Derrida tends to ontologize the teachings of F.Saussure. "Wherever the direct and complete presence of what is meant is hidden," he says, "meaning will always have an indicative nature." F.Saussure's statement about the arbitrariness of the connection meaning with the meaning has the character of an axiom and is not proven in any way. This seems to be told by our common sense, which, however, is rather unreliable and historically due to.

Somehow or another, the language community always resides "within" some language system that is given to it forcibly. Therefore, it makes sense to say that language is an authority that dictates to a person not only the methods of expression, but also the expressive statements themselves. M. Foucault in "words and things" perfectly showed the dependence of man on modern discursive practices. This led the French thinker to think that "a man has died." Foucault is often understood in a simplified way - in the sense that he "declared a person" non-existent. " However, in fact, we are not talking about the disappearance of a person in general, but about the exhaustion of the Cartesian model of him as the master of the meanings he produces. Man as a socio-biological

reality becomes such in the field of utterance, and all the possibilities of utterance are dictated by the discourse of the era. In other words, a person is "in captivity" of the language.

Language is not a means used by some institutions of power external to it; it is the field in which power is constituted and exercised.

R. Bart claimed that "writing is the area of uncertainty, heterogeneity and evasiveness, where traces of our subjectivity are lost, a black and white maze, where all self-identity disappears, and primarily the bodily identity of the writer". The author did not always exist: it was invented in new time period thanks to English empiricism, French rationalism and the Protestant principle of personal faith.

However, from modern linguistics point of view "the utterance as such is an empty process and is perfectly accomplished by itself". This position, according to which the author was completely eliminated from the text, and this latter turned out to be an uncontrolled space of language play, was almost generally accepted in literary criticism and literary criticism of the late 1960s. The language, according to Merlo-Ponti, should be understood as the unity of soul and body, given in an expressive gesture. The gesture is not yet an explicit meaning of the object, it is the meaning in the germinative state, but we understand a lot about the style of writing or the gait of a person. Our bodies and feelings include us in the world and provide grounds for understanding our "cultural gesticulation." Thus, summarizes V. Decomb, "language exposes history, since the meaning of history is to be the history of meaning".

Let's recall the speech of the brilliant vivisector from the novel by G. Wells: "According to him, the main difference between man and monkey lies in the larynx, in the inability to finely distinguish all kinds of sounds - symbols of concepts with which thought is expressed.

Language is no longer means of communication in the traditional sense. Mindful of McLuen's famous medium is message formula, we can argue that any message itself is a "body". The language expression expresses nothing but itself, and this expression of itself becomes only in an expressive sense, constitutionalized by messages in some contact.

An expression is not an expression of something else that is not itself. "Here is a letter to you" - this can be said only if the postman is already in communication with the recipient. And this communication arises precisely due to the message. The addressee has already received a message without opening the envelope. It made him the addressee and the postman the source of the message. But these words became a message only when communication arose between the postman and the recipient of the letter. Of course, this is somewhat more complicated - someone wrote this letter, it

talks about some circumstances, etc., but this does not change the situation on the merits: all three members of the communication act become such only at the moment of communication created by them. More simply, the speech messages are not intermediators, they themselves are what they are called to express.

### References

1. F. de Saussure “General Linguistics” / Translation made by A. Sukhotina under the supervision of M.E. Ruth. Yekaterinburg 1999, p.69.
2. Citation by: Yu.Habermas “Philosophical discourse on Art Nouveau” under the supervision of E.L. Petrenko. Moscow 2003, p.307.
3. Yu.Kristeva “Selected works: Destruction of poetics” under the supervision of G.K. Kosikova. Moscow 2004, pp. 200-201.
4. V.I.Kodukhov “General linguistics”, Moscow 1974, p.142.
5. V.B.Kasaevich “Elements of general linguistics” 1977, p.21.
6. G.Wells “The Island of Dr. Moreau” under the supervision of K. Morozova //”Selected science fiction works” In 3 Chapters, T. 1. Moscow 1956, p. 215).