

**INVESTIGATION OF METROLOGICAL UNITS AS "NOTIONAL
CONCEPT" IN ENGLISH**

Umirzoqova Nozimabonu Aziz qizi

Teacher of Uzbekistan State World Languages University

All patterns of the objective world are reflected in the categories of human knowledge. The categories of modern man's thinking are the product of a long historical development. Their content changes as a person's knowledge of objective reality deepens [Panfilov 1971: 3]. Aspects of the world can be very diverse, but in the center there is always an object or phenomenon with objectively inherent specific certainty [Kuzmin 1966: 22]. Without a reflection of all kinds of certainties of being, neither cognition, nor practical activity, nor human communication is possible. A person's awareness of the surrounding world and himself in the world leads to the formation of notional categories. Philosophers speak in this respect of the involvement of categories in the world of ideal and objective existence. Analyzing the categories of Aristotle, E. Benveniste comes to the conclusion that "such types are, first of all, linguistic categories, and Aristotle, singling them out as universal ones, actually receives as a result the main and initial categories of the language in which he thinks". Separation of categories is associated with cognitive processes, for their fixation in memory and extraction from it as new units of thinking, a verbal name is required, as mentioned by Cliques. In general terms, categorization is the process of dividing the world (universe) into discrete entities and groups of such entities, which makes it possible to reduce the unlimited diversity of the world to acceptable (from a human point of view) proportions.

Understanding of the relationship between language and thinking began to take shape in the 19th century. In Potebnya's judgments, from the point of view of modern researchers, the formulation and interpretation of the following questions is of particular importance: a) on the distinction and correlation of linguistic content and "extra linguistic meaning"; about linguistic meaning as a form (method of presentation) of mental content; b) about linguistic categorization of mental content [Bondarko 2002: 31]. Speaking about the relationship between thought and language, A.A. Potebnya

means that “the word is not an external addition to the idea already ready in the human soul. It is a means of creating this idea arising from the depths of human nature, because it is only through it that the decomposition of thought takes place. In a word, for the first time, a person is aware of his thought”. The understanding of the “way of presenting extra linguistic content” is concretized by A.A. Potebnya in the following reasoning: “Through language, a person brings to his consciousness or, in other words, imagines the content of his thought. Language has its own content, but it is only a form of another content, which can be called personal-objective on the grounds that although in reality it belongs only to the person and is different in each person, the person himself is taken for something that exists outside him. This personal-objective content stands outside language. The issues of the relationship between the categories of language and the extra linguistic (mental) content of human consciousness were also considered in the works of F.F. Fortunatova, I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, A.A. Shakhmatova, A.M. Peshkovsky, I.I. Meshchaninov and other linguists. Specifically, the question of the existence of notional categories in the minds of people was first formulated in the work of the famous Danish linguist Otto Jespersen's "Philosophy of Grammar" (1924). O. Jespersen wrote that “along with syntactic categories, or besides them, or behind these categories, depending on the structure of each language, in the form in which it exists, there are also extra linguistic categories that do not depend on more or less random facts of existing languages. These categories are universal in that they apply to all languages, although they are rarely expressed in those languages in a clear and unambiguous way. For lack of a better term, I will call these categories notional categories” [Jespersen 2002: 57-58].

The main thing is the interpretation of notional categories as categories of consciousness and, at the same time, linguistic categories. I.I. Meshchaninov wrote in his book *Members of a Sentence and Parts of Speech* (1940): “The notional categories in question turn out to be, under such conditions, also categories of consciousness, expressed in one form or another in the language. At the same time, they also turn out to be linguistic categories, since they are revealed precisely in the language”. He considered notional categories as a way of conveying in the language itself the concepts that exist in a given social environment. These concepts are not described with the help of language, but are revealed in it, in its vocabulary and grammatical structure. Notional

categories in modern linguistics are semantic components of a general nature, characteristic not of individual words and systems of their forms, but of vast classes of words, expressed in a natural language by various means. Unlike hidden categories and grammatical categories, conceptual categories are considered regardless of one or another specific mode of expression (direct or indirect, explicit or implicit, lexical, morphological or syntactic). These concepts provide the basis for correlating the common and the different in the unities under study. Functional-semantic fields in different languages associated with the same semantic category may differ significantly in their structure and means of expressing the category under consideration.

Functional-semantic fields are in the focus of attention of researchers, because, in the light of cognitivism, "in linguistics, there has been a tendency to study the language in its interaction with the categories of thinking traditionally studied by logic and philosophy, as well as psychological and sociological factors that influence the construction of statements. Such a synthesis of data from several sciences and its inclusion in the sphere of linguistic description is a complex task aimed at creating a single and effective meta language and requiring a lot of preliminary work". "Thanks to cognitive research, there are more and more reasons to assume that it is the categories of thinking that determine the categories of language" [Gureev 2004: 58].

Notional categories play the role of a substratum underlying many linguistic phenomena. "For linguistic categories, conceptual categories play the role of a kind of epistemological basis from which idio-ethnic features of their morphological interpretation grow" [Dmitriev 1995: 112]. "Thinking categories form the basis of the grammatical structure, since with their help the comprehension of sensory data and the transformation of their propositions are achieved" [Katsnelson 1986: 151]. Carrying out "intermediary" functions between ontology and language, the conceptual sphere is characterized in relation to each of them in different ways. Being genetically derived from ontological phenomena, it is called upon to carry out at the non-verbal semantic level the ideal structuring of reality, the quantization of mental units, a certain systematization of discrete elements of consciousness, thus preparing a certain ground for their subsequent systematization, "linguistics". Unlike mental categories and

operations aimed at cognition of reality, linguistic categories are a means of objectifying mental processes and knowledge as their results.

Categorization in cognitive science is considered as a cognitive activity of a person, in which, after the formation of concepts, the creation of categories occurs. Thus, the exchange of information with the help of language is reduced to correlation with the system of knowledge available to a person, to the identification of objects and events with a certain group of similar objects and events, that is, with a certain category. E.V. Koskina cites in her work the following series of universal principles of categorization, formulated by such researchers as J. Lakoff, E. Roche by referring to the languages of the so-called civilized peoples and primitive tribes: 1. The prototypical structure of categories. The leading concept in the category, according to the cognitive approach, is the concept of a prototype - a unit that exhibits to a greater extent the properties that are common with other units of this group. 2. Non-strict nature of the categorization of objects. Features of the categorization process indicate that the assignment of a word (and, accordingly, an object) to a certain more general class is carried out on the basis of certain ideas about the world, and they, as you know, are largely subjective, intuitive, emotional and are not limited to knowing it (the world) objectively. 3. Flexible adaptability of categories. Flexible adaptability is reflected in the possibility of expanding the category, in which it becomes possible to bring the phenomenon under a certain category in the apparent absence of objectively significant features that determine the "family" similarity with the prototype.

The processes of conceptualization and categorization are closely related to each other in such a way that the former conditions the latter. A category as an association of certain entities is formed on the basis of some concept or conceptual structure expressing the idea of similarity or similarity of the united units, and the categorization mechanism consists in comparing two conceptual structures, as a result of which a conclusion is made about belonging to a particular category.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bruce R. Gilson. Units and Measurement systems. Second edition. England. 2014.
2. Bryansky L.N. Uncombed metrology. Moscow. 2002.
3. Bryson Bill. A Short History of Nearly Everything. New York. 2008.
4. Clarence L. Barnhart & Robert K. Barnhart. The World Book Dictionary, Volume one A – K, 1998 - 1066.
5. Hebra Alex. Measure for Measure: The Story of Imperial, Metric, and Other Units. Baltimore. Johns Hopkins University Press. 2003.
6. Lakoff G. A study in meaning criteria in the logic of fuzzy concepts. Papers from the 8 Regional Meeting Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago, 1972 – 183.
7. Miller G.A. Practical and Lexical Knowledge. 1987 – 305-319.
8. Zupko. Revolution in Measurement: Western European Weights and Measures since the Age of Science. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society. 1990.
9. Бондарко А.В. Категории в системе функциональной грамматики. Коммуникативно-смысловые параметры грамматики и текста. Сборник статей. 2002 - 15-21.
10. Кулагина О.С. Об аспекте меры в лингвистическом знании. Вопросы языкознания. 1991 - № 1 - 49-60