ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES VOLUME 2 | ISSUE 5 | 2021
ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24411/2181-1385-2021-00919

THE NAME OF LENGTH MEASURES IN RUSSIAN BASED ON THE MATERIAL OF FICTION

Ruhsora Alaudinova
Master student of Termez State University

ABSTRACT

A thousand years ago, the Russian people had not only their own system of measures, but also state control over measures. By the end of the eighteenth century, this system had become the world's only national system of measures. When I was little and couldn't read, the fairy tales and stories that I listened to from my mother and grandmother were always understandable. The time came, I became a reader, and here a huge number of different questions appeared.

Keywords: length, material, literature, naming, measures

INTRODUCTION

The linguistic understanding of measure and degree, being generally based on a philosophical interpretation, has a certain specificity. Consequently, a comprehensive consideration of measure and degree in language should also be carried out from special methodological positions, in which homo loquens - "human speaker" - takes a central place. The linguocognitive approach to the study of measure and degree within the anthropocentric paradigm allows not only a deeper understanding of this category and systematization of knowledge about it, but also a deeper understanding of the phenomena of thinking and language in general. The cognitive approach to the study of linguistic phenomena is based on the notion that language as a unique cultural phenomenon is based on the system of knowledge about the world, which is formed in the human mind as a result of its cognitive activity. Thanks to the cognitive approach, the phenomenon of language itself receives a different interpretation:

1) as means of expression and transfer of information, therefore, as I.M. Kobozeva notes, "it is necessary to understand what is the information that can be coded by language means, what are its types, internal structure, rules of connection of some fragments of information with others at construction and interpretation of integral messages" (Kobozeva 2000: 44);

2) as a means of "access to all the mental processes taking place in a person's head and determining his/her own being and functioning in society" (Kubryakova 2004:63: 12), i.e. as a means of consciousness objectification.

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24411/2181-1385-2021-00919

The cognitive approach allows us to explain the specificity of grammatical categories, the specificity of parts of speech as special fixed classes of words, united by common features, underlying the cognitive structures of a person's "internal vocabulary".

METHODOLOGY

This approach is found in the fact that "man becomes the point of reference in the analysis of certain phenomena, that he is involved in this analysis, determining its perspective and ultimate goals. The cognitive approach marks, in other words, the tendency to place the human being at the centre of all theoretical assumptions of scientific research and determines its specific perspective. Anthropocentrism as a key research principle dictates the need to find a new explanatory basis for language phenomena, which are connected with "the processes of categorisation and conceptualisation of native speakers' experience" (Kubryakova 1994, 4: 35).

Language plays a dual role in conceptual system formation: through its encoding function, it captures the concepts of the conceptual system, and through its verbal symbol manipulation function, it enables the construction of new conceptual structures in the conceptual system (Pavilenis 1983: 15; 1986: 21).

Language provides access to all concepts, regardless of how they are formed. At the same time, language remains one of the possible ways of forming concepts in human consciousness, so language conceptualisation - one of the ways of comprehending the surrounding world and forming knowledge about the world in the form of verbalised concepts.

In our research a concept is understood as an operational, substantial unit of conceptual system, an elementary discrete element of knowledge system about the world. It is these units and structures that a person operates in the process of thinking and speech-thought activity.

Producing or comprehending any utterance, we necessarily refer to categories. The concept of a category indicates not only a certain way of thinking, but also a certain understanding of the world. Categorisation is the division of world objects into categories, that is, the selection of groups, classes, categories of similar objects or events in the world. The concept of categorisation demonstrates what knowledge we possess and how we apply it when we use language.

It reveals the general principles of the cognitive process and the formation of knowledge - how we know the world around us and in what form and how we store our knowledge through language. In other words, categorisation is, on the one hand,

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24411/2181-1385-2021-00919

the knowledge of categories of objects and phenomena and their names, and, on the other hand, the very process of assigning objects to a particular category, including naming them accordingly.

Both conceptualisation and categorisation are classificatory activities, but the former is aimed at highlighting the minimal meaningful units of human experience, knowledge structures, and the latter at combining similar or identical units into larger classes, categories (Kubryakova 1994, 4: 41), in which categories-classes of words (lexical) and categories-parameters (grammatical categories) are distinguished.

The categorisation of measure and degree of quality, on the one hand, is characterised by strict ordering and is represented by a clear set of corresponding linguistic phenomena of various natures. On the other hand, this category is also characterised by a different systematicity: its individual components are organised / correlated as a fuzzy set of constituents, between which a relation of comparison, opposition, quantification, intensification is established.

In this case, the category of measure and degree reveals a dependence on the more general category of qualitativity (qualitative).

RESULTS

The category of qualitativity "arises only with the presence of man in the objective reality", "arises in the human world as a result of his interaction, assimilation, appropriation, comprehension of the material of nature and as a result of his purposeful activity with this natural material" (Shibkova 2006: 41). If property is a category belonging to objective reality, then quality is a category of "the human world, which along with the mastered nature includes man himself and the results of his ... activity" (Shibkova 2006: 42). The categorisation of quality arises only in human consciousness. The property is comprehended, evaluated by man, and as a result, the quality of the object is realized and signified.

Measure and degree of quality, along with intensity, gradation, comparativity, etc., are among the derived conceptual (semantic) categories. Some researchers prefer to include these categories in the fields of quality or quantity, others think that another variant of solving the problem is possible: the categories in question, including measure, can be treated as independent functional-semantic fields, occupying "the median position between the fields of quality and quantity (overlapping with both)" (Bondarko 2002: 313; Rodionova 2005: 154-155).

According to Yu. D. Apresyan, the meaning of measure acts as a general, invariant meaning and is realised by a bundle of semantic components, forming a

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24411/2181-1385-2021-00919

complex hierarchical structure of the semantic field. "The semantic field is formed by a bundle of meanings that have at least one common semantic component, such as magnitude, weight, capacity, height, depth, length, intensity, quantity, volume, area, size, height, strength, speed, temperature, thickness, number, width, brightness, as well as all their semantic and other derivatives, including words of other parts of speech" (Apresyan 1974: 367).

Proceeding from the above theoretical positions, the functional-semantic field of measure and degree of quality in Russian, which represents in semantics the corresponding conceptual category, can be regarded as an independent field structure of polycentric type. The core of this field consists of three centres: 1) a measure of a graded quantitative manifestation of an object feature, 2) a measure (degree) of an indefinite quantitative manifestation of an object feature, and 3) a degree of intensity (qualitative manifestation of an object feature. Thus the most essential characteristic of syntactic representation of a category of measure and degree is its functioning in a field of comparativity. The semantics of linguistic means in this case has exact or quite exact characteristics. The periphery is constituted by syncretic linguistic units which are joint expression of relations of measure and degree of quality with relations of purpose, consequence, time, way of action, evaluation, etc.

The category of measure and degree can be considered as a cognitive-syntactic category because it has the necessary categorical features: all the properties of a cognitive category are observed in it, while its representation lies entirely in the syntactic space of language.

DISCUSSION

Scholars investigating the semantics of language categories have directly or indirectly shown various features in the organisation of the semantic content of the category as such. It is clear that the principles of organisation of semantic categories in a broad sense differ from the axiomatic nature of logical classical categories. A classical category cannot have the best representative prototype, e.g. we will never say that the best representative of the category of time is "present tense", and the model adjective is "beautiful" (or "big" or "tall").

Lakoff devotes the first part of his book Women, Fire and Dangerous Things to proving the fact that cognitive models contribute to linguistic categorization, which is also stated in the subtitle "What the categories of language tell us about thinking". Meanwhile, the book itself shows that the relationship between language categories

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24411/2181-1385-2021-00919

and cognitive models is bidirectional. This is also confirmed by J. Lakoff's analysis of the main provisions of theories of categorisation (Lakoff 2004: 154).

Comparing colour categorization systems in different languages, we may say, following F. de Saussure's statement, that each word-sign in its system has its value, which is determined by the system as a whole, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, each word is connected with different cognitive models of comprehension of the category and has its unique concept. It clearly follows from this that there is no single conceptual and categorical system as the basis of rational thought, but rather unique conceptual systems that represent, or rather conceptually embody, perfect, specific cognitive models in different ways. Both cognitive models and corresponding conceptual systems in different languages may not coincide, and therefore the so-called language pictures of the world are distinctive, with their own qualitative categorical systems, not always available for unambiguous interpretation.

We can draw the following conclusions from the above: first, cognitive models are embodied in various combinations and structures of the neurophysiological order; second, a man is most actively involved in creating cognitive models, i.e., and this is very important, a man is at the centre of the cognitive model, moreover, such phenomenon as "colour" does not and would not exist without a man and his vigorous interaction with the environment.

In other words, for a categorization of a certain area of the surrounding world to take place, it is necessary, as a precondition for categorization, to have many objects, different actions, phenomena, evaluations, values, on the one hand, and gestalt perception, mental imagery, motor activity of the subject, place and social function and memory of past experience, on the other. The consequence of these two aspects of categorization is that cognitive models, as mental images, are always complex structures that do not depend on whether they represent object, action, phenomenon, condition, property, attribute, and, finally, quality.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above, we can conclude that measure and degree in the aspect of linguistic categorization is a holistic characteristic of the functional unity of essential properties of an object, the ability to vary the intensity of manifestation of these properties to the extent of maintaining its external and internal definiteness, as well as its similarity and difference with other objects. The world is perceived by man through a system of attributes, but each language, being a unique ethno-cultural phenomenon, represents an attributive picture of the world in its own way: each

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24411/2181-1385-2021-00919

nation goes its own way in defining a cognitive strategy, and unique cultural dominants allow it to develop distinctive features in orientation in the surrounding world and interaction with it.

The category of measure and degree plays an extremely important role in a person's comprehension of the surrounding world, as it allows not only to recognise and distinguish those or other fragments of the world picture, but also to categorise them or to contrast each other on the basis of intensity of qualitative and quantitative-qualitative characteristics, thereby forming a functional model of the surrounding world.

REFERENCES

1. А.И Молотков. Фразеологический словарь русского языка. М.: «Русский язык», 1986г. 543 стр.
2. В. И. Даль. Толковый словарь русского языка. М.: Астрель, 2001
3. Е.А.Быстрова. Учебный фразеологический словарь русского языка. М.: «АСТ-ЛТД», 1997г. 304 стр.
4. И. Депман. Меры и метрическая система.- М.: Просвещение, 1953
5. Ожегов С.И., Шведова Н.Ю. Толковый словарь русского языка. М. Азбуковник, 1997г.
6. Краткий энциклопедический справочник по математике. – М., 2003
7. Пословицы. Поговорки. Загадки. – М. Современник, 1986