



CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE

Volume: 03 Issue: 03 March 2022

Objective, Subjective and Human Factor in Language

Matkarimova Barno Khabibullaevna

Urgench Branch of Tashkent Medical Academy

Received 21st Jan 2022, Accepted 19th Feb 2022, Online 22nd March 2022

Abstract:

The answer to the question of the link between objective, subjective, and human aspects does not rest in listing the similarities and differences between particular language elements. The fact is that all of the semantics of a language's lexical and grammatical units fit into a person's universal cognitive system, and the semantics of language units that have developed over time in the historical development of any one language not only do not become an impediment to a single and universal process of cognition flowing in linguistic form, but also contribute to its creation.

Keywords: cognitive, communicative, objective, subjective, language, lexical, unit, phenomena, linguistic.

Any link between cognitive and communicative acts must be fixed in linguistic substance - in the text, and all individual links of communication can be regarded as an unending text formed by society throughout its history. The dialectical opposition "discontinuity-continuity," typical of any movement and development, is formed by the instantaneity and length in time of the act of communication. On this basis, the book can be viewed as a synchronous and diachronic depiction of society's language communication. Such an approach to the text pushes us to examine its cognitive content not as part of a distinct fixed cognitive act, but as part of the overall process of reality cognition. The so-called originality of the designations of reality phenomena in various language systems usually boils down to the fact that if one language lacks a lexical unit for designating the corresponding object, the other has either a verbose (descriptive), or very detailed in terms of lexemes, or grammatical designation.

All such "inconsistencies," also known as lacunae, can be divided into two categories: 1) mismatch of meanings (semantic mismatch of individual units and categories of language systems) and 2) inconsistencies associated with ethno-cultural features established in a particular society rather than the absence of linguistic units.

According to various scholars, the first sort of discrepancies appears as follows: 1) the lack of distinct language units (primarily lexical ones) for naming a specific phenomenon (for example, satellite, collective farm, etc.); 2) differences in internal etymology that affect the nature of the object's perception and the conceptual features of semantics that result from this (for example, snowdrop); 3) contradiction between the semantics of language units in the sphere of feature enumeration and designation of a common feature in diverse sublanguages (for example, agricultural vocabulary, professional language, and so on); 4) disparities in the nomenclature of phenomena, implying a fundamentally different choice of relevant attributes for the development of unit semantics (e.g., a counting system); 5) a conceptually significant classification of words

into classes that influences the description of the associated objects (morphological classes, semantic classes, word association based on the principle "property," "gender," "color," and so on); 6) grammatical features that differentiate different genres (spheres) of communication (forms of politeness, male and female languages, speech etiquette, terminology, sublanguages, etc.) due to their own set of categories (kind, tense, modality, etc.) presented in each language system; 7) style features of the language that differentiate different genres (sphere) of communication (forms of politeness, male and female languages, speech etiquette, terminology, sub (cultural and aesthetic associations, individual figurative associations, etc.).

The answer to the question of the link between objective, subjective, and human aspects does not rest in listing the similarities and differences between particular language elements. The fact is that all of the semantics of a language's lexical and grammatical units fit into a person's universal cognitive system, and the semantics of language units that have developed over time in the historical development of any one language not only do not become an impediment to a single and universal process of cognition flowing in linguistic form, but also contribute to its creation. Because the structures of the communicative units of language basically objectively reflect patterns of relationships between real objects and phenomena, they create a prerequisite for their use in the so-called individual plan, which then develops into the property of the entire team, because all members of this team own the structure language at first.

It is self-evident that subjective variables should be attributed to the very matter of language, especially the physical properties of sounds, as well as systematic forms of language (from morphology to syntax). The fundamental world is expressed through the designation of things and phenomena - nomination; the connections of things and phenomena in the realm of human thought (reference) are reflected in the connection of names. In reality, language forms are nothing more than the physical manifestation of the biological and mental apparatus of human consciousness. The biological properties of the human body are referred to as the neurophysiologic substance of thinking and it is an individual property of a person as an individual. Individual awareness has become alienated as a result of the transition from the category of the individual to that of the subject as a member of society. This transition also entails the development of language as a method of bringing people together in the category of society. As a result, language is both a material, physical fixation of people's neurophysiologic thinking processes and a means of internalizing thinking within societal constraints.

The question of the content side of language from epistemological and communicative perspectives is fundamentally discussed in V. Lorenz's well-known work, devoted to the problem of the relationship between language and thinking. Very important issues for theoretical linguistics are raised, such as the problem of the singularity of meaning and concept, the dialectical process of reflection and its expression in verbal signs, and the problem of the functioning of language. The author concludes that "knowledge, as determined by a person's actual action, cannot be reduced to an individual component" based on Marxist epistemological principles and data from languages and neuropsychology. Any contemplation is influenced by social circumstances, giving each act of reflection a social aspect. When a material linguistic sign becomes individual, the reflection of reality created in the individual process of reflection becomes socially important and suitable cognition. In summary, the author contends that the social aspect of cognition is the foundation of language communication, in which people exchange objectively produced products of cognitive activity.

The dialectic of the relationship between the person's language and the language of society is included in the transformation of the individual into the social, the substantive into the functional, the objective-physical (biology, living matter) into the human (mental-linguistic-thinking matter). This dialectic also serves as a

middle ground between the language's nominative and communicative features. "Communication is a subjective-objectifying, external form of linguistic activity flow, phenomena of linguistic reality, a method of real being of the linguistic universe, a domain of expressive-communicative functioning," says the author.

Although the relationship between man and the world runs along the line of demarcation of these objects of the world, the humanity of language is not revealed in this opposition, i.e., in the opposition that puts man on an equal footing with all other things of the material world. If man had not acted as a self-cognizing subject, this dual unity would have remained in the realm of material objects. Cognition aimed not at the world, but at one of its objects - at a person, at oneself - produces the subjective human factor, which can be correctly termed such in English. Man, as a cognizing and self-cognizing subject, opposes the world not as a passive object, but as an active subject, attempting to create his own world in his mind from the world of things. The basic distinction between the subjective element as the producer of linguistic structure and the human factor as the subject of linguistic content must be kept in mind. The subjective factor should be interpreted as a person's effect on the production of such a language structure, such an internal construction of it, which would be a product of only one person and would be independent of external world laws. Such an understanding of language would fundamentally solve the problem of human knowledge's veracity, and language would become its own world-creating force, i.e., a power that would create the world or its image for a person. This interpretation is incompatible with a materialistic reading of the language, as well as with thousands of years of human practical activity.

Language is a subject's property; as a personal attribute, it opposes the objective world as a constituent element. The subject, that has a plethora of features, including speaking activity (language), is involved in active engagement with the outside environment, resulting in the complex network of these relationships. Anthropocentrism is the beginning point for man's theoretical and practical action. Man as a subject has first and foremost relationships with the natural world, then with the social environment, then with each individual, and finally with himself (self-knowledge). Regardless of how strange a person's interaction with these four sides of the objective universe is, the most humanistic of these relationships is, of course, the "man-man" bond.

The relationship of man and his environment is supported by historical evidence. The following issues must be considered in a language analysis of ways to express the complete network of human relationships with the natural and social world: Individually stylistic, modal-evaluative, pragmatic aspect (speech impact). Language is an effective technique of expressing the cognizing subject, which in this case is the individual as a member of society. To put it another way, the concept of the human component exists inside the system of objects displayed in cognition and language, but not independently within the system of linguistic structure. The human aspect in language is just a factor of the subject's particular, which is complicated not only by a person's unique features as a material and spiritual being, but also by the peculiarities of self-knowledge, or knowledge directed, as it were, at one's own inner reality. Such a distinction between the concept of the human factor - a person as an object of cognition and language as an attribute of a person - does not contradict language's unified ontological nature, and thus contributes to the cognition of the world in all specific varieties of its phenomena that serve as the subject of practical and theoretical development by a person, and fixes the results of this cognition in the language matter, and determines the specifics.

The following are some of the categories that characterize human cognitive activity: 1) the truth or falsity of learned facts as a result of practical and theoretical human activity; 2) the geographical orientation of cognitive actions relative to the subject - a person; 3) the temporal orientation of cognitive acts; and 4) the

evaluative orientation, i.e. attitude toward good and evil. Any statement is the result of an individual's cognitive speech creation, but this subjectivity does not identify the content of specific claims made by a specific person in terms of truth-untruth.

And they can be either true or false in this regard. Only the difference in social relevance may explain the basic difference between the assertions of both programs. The unification of the social and individual features of the content of utterances that are permanently derived in one or more collectives effectively eliminates the so-called subjective nature of a person's language. This is true for both social and individual erroneous statements, and more broadly, delusions. Only in the context of real facts and events is a misperception as a result of a statement's deliberate or unconscious error characterized as such. The referential basis of delusions is a distortion of the representation (cognition) of a fact, which can be caused by a wide range of factors.

These arguments, on the other hand, do not excuse the individual's arbitrariness in speech and cognitive activity; rather, they are explained solely by the incompleteness of the conditions that lead to the establishment of the truth. As a result, only one criterion, the sufficiency of reflection in the secondary, ideal world, in the so-called human vision of the world, the objective reality that exists independently of it, becomes the decisive fact for a person's cognitive speech-thinking activity. As previously said, any statement is social-individual, and in this sense, social-personal, which is particularly true of statements relating to the conduct and acts of the person himself in the realms of ordinary life, science, and art.

All sorts of spiritual assimilation of reality have the property of reflection. In terms of individual types of consciousness, such as science and art, it is universal. This also implies that the basic objective in reflection has the quality of universality. In both science and art, the moment of reflection in its object is intrinsic. The following proposition comes from the fact that the object is universal: the dialectical unity of the objective and subjective, reflection and judgment in the content of art is the dialectical unity of the universal and the particular at the same time. This means that the universal does not exist in and of it, but is embodied in the social and manifested in the specific.

References

1. Arutyunova N. D. Linguistic problems of reference // New in foreign linguistics. M., 1990. Issue. XIII.
2. Matkarimova B. H. etc. Benefits of interactive activities in teaching foreign languages // Achievements of science and education. – 2019. – №. 8-3. – p. 105-106.
3. Matkarimova B. H. etc. METHODS OF USING INTERACTIVE TECHNOLOGIES IN PRACTICAL CLASSES //Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University. – 2019. – V. 1. – №. 8. – p. 367-372.
4. Matkarimova B. Kh. RAISING LEARNERS'MOTIVATION THROUGH SONGS IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES // Questions of science and education. – 2019. – №. 4. – p. 128-131.
5. Matkarimova B. Kh. THE PROBLEM OF TEACHING ENGLISH FOR ENGINEERS //Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University. – 2019. – V. 1. – №. 4. – p. 265-269.
6. Matkarimova B. Kh. MODERN MODELS OF SPEECH COMMUNICATION AND SPEECH ETIQUETTE //NovaInfo. Ru. – 2016. – V. 2. – №. 48. – p. 279-283.