

## Unraveling the Permanence of Words: Exploring the Fragility of Linguistic Stability

Fakhrul Abedin Tanvir

### Abstract

This paper explores the notion of word permanence and challenges the assumption that words possess inherent stability. Through experiments and observations, it is found that words can be easily forgotten or replaced, and their meaning can be influenced by external factors. The study concludes that relying solely on words for decision-making is flawed, as they lack a solid foundation and can change over time. It emphasizes the need to consider alternative factors, such as bodily attachment, in understanding language's role in human existence

### Introduction

The permanence of the word is not yet clear to the people. But based on this, any person is found guilty or innocent. Basically, the relationship of the human body with words needs to be clear.

It is very important for the real life of the people. We are constantly being misled into not being able to evaluate the word in its position. When it comes to communicating with someone, we prioritize words first and foremost. As a result, we are faced with a variety of problems that occur through abnormal language responses.

I think previous philosophers and linguists have left a very fine space which I will try to complete. They talk about the response to the word and its external use. But it is very difficult to describe another position in this which is the permanence of words. And they have done the analysis keeping in mind the whole body of the human being in every source, which has made it less clear whether there is a physical position or not in the stability of speech. Which was a very difficult subject to distinguish. So their solutions do not work well in this field.

I conducted a test to find out the speaker's connection with a group of people, focusing on their words in particular. Through which it will be proved that there is no basis for what people are saying.

### Literature review

### Searle's discussion

Searle's view, there are only five illocutionary points that speakers can achieve on propositions in an utterance, namely: assertive, commissive, directive, declaratory and expressive. Speakers achieve the assertive point when they represent how things are in the world. They commit themselves to doing something or make an attempt to

get hearers to do something. They express their attitudes about objects and facts of the world by virtue of saying that they do.

### **My discussion about Searle's opinion:**

Therefore, we can say that, in speech act they haven't clearly talk about their view of literature.

We have heard Searles' discussion on speech react but he hasn't talk about their literature point in speech act. Searle's discussion was only on there are only five illocutionary points that speakers can achieve on propositions in an utterance, namely: assertive, commissive, directive. He has talked about how speech react functions but in my opinion his discussion has a gap in it. Besides these functions literature view is another important point of speech react which we can not deny. But Searle did not talk about this point in his discussion.

### **John Dewey's discussion about "Knowledge and Speech Reaction " .**

We are likely to say that speech is a reaction to a thing sensibly present, that, for example, I say «this is a knife» because a knife is sensibly present as a stimulus to speech. The behaviorist, of all persons, can not afford to give this account of the stimulus to speech. knowledge already there in fill] existence. If the stimulus is not a thing sensibly present, neither is it merely some prior complete act or piece of behavior which causes contractions in the vocal organs.

There is a difference between the concept of stimulus-reaction and that of cause-effect. Seeing as an act may be part of the stimulus to saying «that is a knife, » but it cannot be the entire stimulus. For seeing as a complete stimulus gives rise to the response of reaching and taking or withdrawing, not of speech. What has to be accounted for is the postponement of the complete overt reaction, and its conversion into an intermediate vocal reaction.

There must be a defective or hesitant connection between seeing and handling which is somehow made good and whole by speech. Hence the stimulus to speech cannot be identified, per simpliciter, with its object. Not every speech reaction, even when genuine and not a mere vocalization, is a cognitive statement even by implication. A reader of Shakespeare may become a student of the sources upon which Shakespeare drew, and make speech reactions to this study.

Then the reaction is cognitive. judgment. we go outside of mere story-telling. The play's the thing and it has no object of knowledge.

### **My discussion about John Dewey's discussion about "Knowledge and Speech Reaction "**

John Dewey's discussion was on knowledge and speech reaction. He has more likely talk about how speech reaction acts. He has clear the concept how speech is a reaction to a thing sensibly present, that, for example, I say «this is a knife» because a knife is sensibly present as a stimulus to speech.

For seeing as a complete stimulus gives rise to the response of reaching and taking or withdrawing, not of speech. If the stimulus is not a thing sensibly present, neither is it merely some prior complete act or piece of behavior which causes contractions in the vocal organs.

But his speech reaction and knowledge did not give readers a clear view of every sides of speech react. He did not make any points on literature view of speech act which is a very important part of speech act.

### **Shakespeare's theory discussion**

These remarks are intended to call attention to the need of discovering some differential trait of those speech reactions which do constitute knowledge. A story or play is there, and the re-enacting of it in a speech mode is purely additive. It makes another piece of behavior, but this new mode of behavior does not react back into the play or story or its conditions. A play of Shakespeare may mean a hundred different things to a hundred different audiences or a hundred different persons in the same audience, and the diversity of the hundred speech reactions evoked is no matter.

The speech reactions need have no connection with what Shakespeare himself meant, in his reaction, beyond being caused by the latter. It has to be a reaction not merely to the play as a. Our problem is to name that distinctive feature of a speech reaction which confers upon. It serves to supplement or complete a behavior which is incomplete or broken without it.

In the latter case, the patch would not be known as red, say, or the light, as the light of a lamp on the desk until the speech reaction definitely determined a stimulus.

This gives no differentia of speech from a sigh, or grunt, or ejaculation due to respiratory reactions to pain. A speech reaction is the innervation-of-vocal-apparatus-as stimulus-to-the-responses-of-other-organs-through-the-auditory-apparatus. It involves the auditor and his characteristic reaction to speech heard. Often and primarily the auditor is another organism whose behavior is required to complete the speech reaction, this behavior being the objective aimed at in the speech reaction.

When the speech reaction consists in a «silent» innervation the principle is the same. The agent issuing the stimulus and the one receiving it form two agents or persons or behavior systems. «' » This account involves the mistake pointed out in the case of the statement «this is red color.» It assumes that the object is known and

also truly known prior to the speech reaction. There is only a new kind of solipsism, that of private speech. In this historical case, I clearly can not direct my remark to a man long since dead and secure concordant behavior response from him.

subsequent course of events, their responses will correspond to mine--or that the different reactions will all enter into a single complex behavior system. Clearly our speech reaction is to observations of present perceptions of data, rocks, fossils, etc. The other auditor and speaker to whom the statements are addressed are other possible observers of these and similar data. The ulterior «object» is the concordant, mutually reinforcing behavior system, including, of course, the speech responses.

### **My another discussion about Shakespeare:**

A play of Shakespeare may mean a hundred different things to a hundred different audiences or a hundred different persons in the same audience, and the diversity of the hundred speech reactions evoked is no matter.

Shakespeare has said about his audiences' reactions, their comments but he has never said about how much he remembers his audiences reactions, comments or those thinks they told him.

The speech reactions need have no connection with what Shakespeare himself meant, in his reaction, beyond being caused by the latter.

In the latter ease, the patch would vote be known as red, say, or the light, as the light of a lamp on the desk until the speech reaction definitely determined a stimulus.

The ulterior «object» is the concordant, mutually reinforcing behavior system, including, of course, the speech responses.

Clearly our speech reaction is to observations of present perceptions of data, rocks, fossils, etc.

It involves the auditor and his characteristic reaction to speech heard.

### **Observation**

The observation conducted in this study aimed to delve into the concept of word permanence and its connection with the human body. Through a series of carefully designed experiments and meticulous observations, several significant findings emerged.

In the first stage of the study, participants were exposed to various stories in a closed room, with the stories being the sole auditory stimuli. Interestingly, it was observed that participants had limited recollection of the stories, often only remembering their chosen favorite sentences. This suggests that when confronted with an

array of words, individuals tend to prioritize and retain those that resonate with them personally. This selective retention indicates a lack of inherent permanence in words, as the majority of the content was quickly forgotten or replaced.

Moving on to the second stage, participants were assigned specific sentences to speak, and they were subsequently instructed to repeat those same sentences upon hearing them again. What emerged from this exercise was a remarkable observation: the tone, feeling, and even the position of the words seemed to undergo continuous fluctuations. It became evident that the mere presence of external influences, such as ambient sounds or environmental factors, could significantly impact the expression and interpretation of words. This dynamic nature of words further supports the notion that they lack a fixed and stable identity.

These observations hold profound implications not only for individual behavior but also for wider contexts such as justice and literature. It raises questions about the reliability of using words as a sole basis for decision-making or as a foundation for the interpretation of events. The inherent instability of words calls for a more comprehensive understanding of language that considers the interplay between words, the human body, and the surrounding context.

Moreover, this observation underscores the limitation of replicating discoveries or maintaining consistent interpretations solely through words. It highlights the need to incorporate other elements, such as bodily attachment and contextual factors, to gain a more nuanced and accurate understanding of language.

The impermanence of words and emphasizes the significance of a holistic perspective on language that accounts for the dynamic interaction between words, the human body, and the broader context. By recognizing the inherent instability of words, we can move towards a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of language and its role in human communication and decision-making.

## **The result**

In the first step we asked everyone to know about the permanent sentences in the stories. Basically the stories that were told to the people mentioned were so random that they could only remember the new sentences i.e. their own favorite sentences and the rest of the words were basically replaced with their chosen ones.

In the next step, we noticed a difference in the feeling and tone of voice of a group of people after talking, almost every moment, the effect of anything around them, even the sound of the wind can change the tone countless times. And the word loses its real identity.

Basically, it is found that speech is not an independent entity. On the basis of this analysis, it is quite useless to react to anything based on word.

## My discussion

There has been research on human speech for ages. Almost every decision in our life is based on the permanence of words. Human physical movements also depend on the stability of speech and excitement. The position of words is also clear in our justice system. There are thousands of conflicts over the origin of the word and its trial is also concluded on the pretext of the permanence of the word. Basically, it was important for us to know the position of this word. Past researchers have discussed the response and type of speech. But word stability is more important than that. There is no point in punishing the patron of the thing for the sake of the thing that disappears in the blink of an eye. That is, the thing here is the word and the shelter is our body. On the other hand, if we analyze very subtly, then words can be imagined without the human body. Then one word changes effortlessly with another word. This is why it can be said that words can fly. I mean, we heard a beautiful thing, after a while we heard a much more beautiful thing. In the absence of the body, the previous word will be replaced with a new word. And the first word will lose its identity. On the other hand, if the body is not considered only for conspiracy, then such a thing will happen again. Because in most cases, people have no new creations. they imitate almost everything. If we consider the conduct, then of course human does not do any of his own conduct. He does this by imitating the surroundings in various ways. And experiments have shown that if people say the same thing a second time, they cannot remain in the previous doctrine. He changes his position countless times every second. So the stability of the word is not here.

No writer or scientist can repeat his own discovery exactly. If the analysis is done, then the matter is changing innumerable times in a matter of moments. But man has been able to hold his own because he has the ability to imitate or act. Man has no super power without acting mainly in one direction. And based on this reason, I know the stability of words is wrong. There is no basis for words and all decisions based on words are ultimately weak.

## Conclusion

*We are all praised or hated by words. This conventional rule is not entirely wrong. However, it is very weak in terms of word stability. Because if we don't have a decision even after imagining that we have nothing, it will be a crime. There must be permanence in union with the human body and there is also permanence in the pain of injury, but not only the permanence of words but also the attachment of the body.*