

Theoretical Views on the Category of Place/Space: Analysis and Relationship

Ikramova Saida Alimdjanovna

Journalism and mass communication university of Uzbekistan, Associate professor PhD.

Abstract. *This article explores the linguistic category of space by analyzing theoretical approaches from classical and contemporary linguistics. It examines the semantic, pragmatic, cognitive, and linguocultural dimensions of space as reflected in language. The study highlights the role of locative expressions, and culturally specific perceptions of space across languages. The relevance of spatial categorization in shaping linguistic worldview and cultural identity is emphasized. The article also underlines the importance of studying space from a cross-linguistic and interdisciplinary perspective to better understand its conceptual and communicative functions.*

Key words: *space category, linguoculture, cognitive linguistics, spatial semantics, pragmatic linguistics, cultural perception, comparative analysis, discourse analysis.*

In world linguistics, space is studied as *a category, concept, functional-semantic field*. For example, E.S. Kubryakova focused on the study of space as a category in her article “Язык пространство и пространство языка”¹. This article, devoted to the study of the category of space and related concepts, presents new approaches to the interpretation of the category of space in recent times, as well as responses to the current issues of modern linguistics related to this problem.

Another work devoted to the linguistic analysis of spatial relations is the collection “Logical Analysis of the Language. Languages of Spaces”². This work discusses issues such as the dynamics of space, the “high-low” opposition in the spatial model of language, the semantics of words delimiting space, some aspects of the spatial parameter in nouns, the reflection of agent and observer space in language, material and spiritual space, the location of space in time, spatial situation, the world and its linguistic ontology, using the example of Russian language materials³.

In the last century, serious attention was paid to the expression of the meaning of space in language, the types of space, and the analysis of phenomena related to space. In several works of I.M. Kobozeva, the issue of “grammatical description of space” was raised. He focused on the following aspects when describing the space:

- a simple description of space, whether it is a landscape, an interior or something lying on a table, consists of enumerating the “things” located in it. This description indicates the orientation of one thing relative to another or to the observer. In this case, space has a discrete nature, divided into separate parts that are connected to the objects that make it up.

¹Kubryakova E.S. Yazyk prostranstva i prostranstvo yazyka (k postanovke problems) // Izv. RAN. Series lit. i zazyka. – 1997. T.56. – No. 3. - S. 22.

²Logical analysis language. Yazyki prostranstv. - M., 2000. - 76 p.

³Logical analysis language. Yazyki prostranstv / Otv. ed.: N.D. Arutyunova, I.B. Levontina. - M.: Yazyki russkoy kultury, 2000. – 448 p.

The idea of the continuity of space, characteristic of scientific understanding, is not reflected in ordinary thinking;

- when describing the space on a domestic basis, precise quantitative descriptions of the size of objects, distances between them, angular sizes, etc. are not used. Space prepositions, which are the main means of expressing spatial relations in the language, idealize the spatial descriptions of objects and schematize the relations between them...⁴

In a number of works of E. V. Rakhilina, interesting information is given on the semantics of units representing space. He analyzed the scope category that forms the meaning of space and revealed the semantics of Russian "positional" predicates such as⁵ *стоять, лежать, сидеть, висеть*.

Spatial relations and the category of space are also addressed in E.S. Kubryakova's work "Language and Knowledge"⁶. In this work, the scientist expressed valuable ideas about the language of space and the place of language⁷.

The issue of the representation of space in the linguistic landscape of the world has not been ignored by linguists. In the works of Yu.D. Apresyan, space is studied as a part of the linguistic landscape of the world. According to him, "Linguistic meanings can be associated not with events in the universe, but with some aspects and details of a simple model of the world given in a given language. As a result, a basis will be created for identifying universal and national specific features in the semantics of natural languages, some fundamental laws and rules for the formation of linguistic meanings, and important commonalities in previously described as diverse facts will be identified"⁸.

In recent years, the category of space has been studied from cognitive, pragmatic, and linguocultural aspects. In particular, V.M. Toporova has commented on the issue of the logoschema's role as a conceptual mediator in the semantic scope of language⁹.

V.A. Maslova also paid attention to the analysis of space and time as concepts. Analyzing the substantial and relational concepts of space, the scientist writes about its extension, continuity, multidimensionality¹⁰, etc. She also emphasizes that space is an important condition for the existence of the world, reflected in human language, consciousness, culture, and mythology¹¹.

I.V. Voropaeva also analyzed the units representing space from a cognitive aspect. She studied the expression of the concept of space in English through the relators *after, before, for, and* analyzed them in detail, distinguishing between absolute spatial direction and relative spatial object¹². The scientist's work is characterized by the fact that the category of space is analyzed in close connection with fundamental linguocognitive categories such as relation, time, cause, and effect. As she emphasized, "the space perceived and accepted by a person always has an anthropometric orientation and is organized around a person, and a person is located in the center of this microcosm"¹³.

⁴ Kobozeva I.M. Grammatical description of *prostranstva* // Logical analysis language. *Yazyki prostranstv*. - M., 1997. - S. 152 - 163; This is the author. *Kak my opisivaem prostranstvo, kotoroe vidim: problema vybora "orientira"* // *Trudy mejdunar. s seminar "Dialog-95"* on computer linguistics and ee application. - Kazan, 1995.

⁵ Rakhilina E.V. Semantics of Russian positional predicates: *stoyat, sidet, lejat, viset* // *Voprosy yazykoznaniya*. - Moscow, 1998. - No. 6. - S. 69.

⁶ Kubryakova E.S. Knowledge of language: Not getting knowledge of language: Often it is a cognitive eye sight. *Rol yazyka v poznanii mira* / Kubryakova E.S. Russian Academy of Sciences. In-t yazykoznaniya. - M.: Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury, 2004. - S. 26 - 33.

⁷ Kubryakova E.S. Source indicated. - B. 32.

⁸ Apresyan Yu.D. *Izbrannyye trudy. T. II. Integral description of language and systematic lexicography*. - M., 1995. - S. 630.

⁹ Toporova V.M. Logoschema kak mediator concept in semantic space language // *Methodological problems of cognitive linguistics*. - Voronezh, 2001. - S. 88 - 93.

¹⁰ Maslova V.A. *Cognitive linguistics*. - Minsk, 2008. - S. 39.

¹¹ Maslova V.A. *Featured work*. - B. 106.

¹² Voropaeva I.V. *Kognitivnyi analiz angliyskikh relyatorov BEFORE, AFTER, FOR, SINCE, TILL i UNTIL: Autoref. diss. ... candy*. Philol. science - St. Petersburg, 2006. - S. 24.

¹³ Voropaeva I.V. *Research indicated*.

In Sh. Safarov's book "Pragmalinguistics", space was studied from a pragmatic perspective. As is known, in recent years, new scientific theories have been formed in linguistics that interpret language phenomena in relation to the context, speech situation, and personal characteristics of the speaker. One of such theories is deixis, which also pays attention to the issue of the expression of spatial deixis in language.

According to the theory of deixis, deictic means expressing space include pronouns and adverbs such as *that, that, there*, or *this, here*, as well as other units that have the property of referring to space in a certain context. As these units, nouns denoting objects that are converted into units of measurement through Gestalt psychology can be indicated. For example: *house, street, mountain, river*, etc.

Sh. Safarov in his work highlighted the deixis of space and drew attention to its aspects related to the human factor. He explains the following about this: "In any case, the speaker stands at the center of the deictic field, which is imagined as a four-dimensional field. The person reporting information about the event determines time and space in relation to the place he occupies, in time. The social position of the interlocutors is also determined in relation to the speaker. The speaker, perceiving reality and wanting to think about it, starts the measurement of distance from himself and determines the location of the places of events ¹⁴." It is understood that in the expression of certain information in language, the perception of space is determined by man.

Sh. Safarov drew valuable conclusions about the use of place adverbs and demonstrative pronouns to describe the location of persons and objects "*near*" or "*far*" *from the area of verbal communication*, the fact that in such a description, the distance or proximity of the place can be determined not only in relation to the speaker, but also in relation to the listener - the addressee, and the direction of the movement also affects the use of deictic expressions ¹⁵.

Of course, the presence of information about the space to which the direction of movement leads in the semantics of some verbs can serve as a basis for considering them as units expressing the deixis of place. For example, in Uzbek verb-based sentences of the type "*Kir*", "*Kel*", the meaning of place is restored based on the speech situation and context (*as in "Uyga kir", "Yonimga kel"*). Such verbs can create certain ideas about place in human thinking. These ideas, of course, can differ in different languages and cultures.

Usually, the concept of *space* is perceived by a person as a limited variety. Linguistics also deals with this issue. L. B. Lebedeva noted, "We cannot accept, understand, and mentally imagine a size that has no limits. The very concept of infinity is only a mentally imagined structure ¹⁶."

E.S. Kubryakova was also named He recognized that it can have different sizes. In his opinion, this is due to the anthropocentric perception of space, where a person's gaze can be fixed on objects around him or directed to the distant horizon or heights ¹⁷.

Indeed, our perception of space, its understanding and our ideas about space necessarily include some boundaries. According to L.B. Lebedeva, space is such an entity that a person cannot imagine himself outside of it, and his relationship with space requires a psychological support, a support. In particular, it can be seen in the existence of the "I", the subject of consciousness, which always places itself in the center of the ideal space and is a border opposite to the subject, or in the presence of borders that enclose the space around it. Such general features are reflected in the semantics of the words *border, edge, bottom, line*, which serve to express various types of spatial boundaries. However, in each of these words it manifests itself in its own way. Spatial words can be used in any situation, for example, when the subject of the message is interpreted

¹⁴ Safarov Sh. Pragmalinguistics. - Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2008. - B. 179-180.

¹⁵ Safarov Sh. Source indicated. - B. 188.

¹⁶ Lebedeva L.B. Semantics of the word "boundary" // Logical analysis language. Yazyki prostranstv. - M., 1997. - S 93.

¹⁷ Kubryakova E.S. O ponyatiyax mesta, predema i prostranstva // Logicheskyye analiza. Yazyki prostranstv: sbornik statey / Otv. ed. N.D. Arutyunova, I.B. Levontina. - M.: Yazyki russkoy kultury, 2000. - S. 26.

on the basis of space, and in describing various types of spaces. This, in particular, distinguishes “boundary” words from the word ¹⁸эхо, which is close to them, but is always associated with time parameters.

It is characteristic that *border, edge, bottom, line* Unlike the word “finally,” the words “finally” also convey information about the existence of a certain place on the other side and the possibility of crossing a certain boundary.

The semantics of demarcation and demarcation is clearly expressed in the word *чезапа*. It is no coincidence that the verb *to delimit*, which expresses the actions associated with qualitatively defining a part of space and separating it from another part, is derived from this very word. The specific semantic sign of the words *to limit, to exclude, to delimit is the border*. It is determined ¹⁹by comparing it with the word.

In linguistics, the category of space is also studied in the linguistic and cultural aspect. In particular, Yu.S. Stepanov puts forward the following ideas about the national-cultural perception of space: “People brought up in different national cultures use space differently, that is, in the words of the American researcher T. Hall, people use space in accordance with the “patterns” adopted in their country. According to this author, in the Middle East he felt like he was stuck in a crowded, crowded environment, and this often worried him. Houses and office buildings were so different from American houses and buildings that his compatriots had difficulty adapting to them. They always complained about the excessive size or smallness of the space and its waste. Such differences in the organization of space are not limited to this. In Japan, the places where the streets intersect have names, but the streets themselves are not named. The Arab “To a place “How can I get there?” gives such instructions that a European unfamiliar with the Arabic system of instructions would have difficulty using them. For a Prussian German, if you are standing on the threshold, but you see someone in the room and talk to them, then you are “in the room.” For an American, if your body is completely inside the room and your hand is removed from the handle near the door, then you are “in the room.” Colombians or Mexicans say that North Americans who talk to them coldly and as if they are strangers often do not like to be touched and, although this is considered a very close distance for Colombians to talk, they often step back. The most comfortable distance for an American during a conversation is 75 cm, but for a Mexican it is too far ²⁰. Therefore, space is not just a place that represents a specific object, it is also a place in the human imagination, defined by the person themselves.

V. G. Gak also recognized the importance of the category of space in the world view in different cultures and emphasized that space is one of the first realities in the process of studying the environment ²¹.

Spatial localization is one of the central concepts in the study of the category of place in linguocognitive and linguocultural aspects. Locativity is a lexical-grammatical and functional-semantic category that has its own means of expression at the following different levels of the language system:

dative, accusative declensions in Old English and prepositions of place and direction;

b) lexical tools, adjectives and nouns meaning place, space;

c) syntactic tools include prepositional phrases, conjunctions with adverbial clauses.

The main functional-semantic dominant of the category of locality is the determination of the course of events within the framework of an event. Spatial relations associated with the localization of events are expressed through nouns that include “locality” (in the broad sense).

¹⁸ Lebedeva L.B. Featured article. - B. 93 - 97.

¹⁹ Lebedeva L.B. Featured article. - B. 94.

²⁰ Stepanov Yu.S. V trekhmernom prostranstve zhyzky (Semiotic problems linguistics, philosophy, art). - M.: Nauka, 1985. - S. 7.

²¹ Gak V.G. Prostranstvo vne prostranstva // Logical analysis journal. Yazyki prostranstv: sbornik statey / Otv. ed. N.D. Arutyunova, I.B. Levontina. - M.: Yazyki russkoy kultury, 2000. - S. 127 - 135.

In general, each language has special units that express space. Studying the issue of which of these units is activated in the language helps to identify the specific features of the category of space specific to certain languages. The multidimensionality and comprehensiveness of space opens the way for the category of space to be expressed in language in a variety of ways. Space in the external world that surrounds us is realized in language through units of morphological, lexical and syntactic levels.

Studying the linguistic and cultural features of units representing space in different languages in a comparative aspect is one of the current problems of linguistics. Although the issue of space category, its expression, composition has been studied until now, the linguistic and cultural features of the space category specific to different languages have not been researched as a special research object.

It should also be noted here that on the basis of *the spatial* seme, a spatial relationship is also formed between two or more linguistic units, and this relationship arises not through a paradigmatic relationship between these units, but through a syntagmatic relationship. Therefore, just as it is important to study *the spatial* seme present in the content of linguistic units from a paradigmatic aspect and to reveal its integrative function, it is equally important to study the spatial relationship between linguistic units from a syntagmatic aspect.

The list of used literature:

1. Apresyan Yu.D. Izbrannye trudy. T. II. Integral description of language and systematic lexicography. - M., 1995. - S. 630.
2. Gak V.G. Prostranstvo vne prostranstva // Logical analysis journal. Yazyki prostranstv: sbornik statey / Otv. ed. N.D. Arutyunova, I.B. Levontina. - M.: Yazyki russkoy kultury, 2000. - S. 127 - 135.
3. Kobozeva I.M. Grammatical description of prostranstva // Logical analysis language. Yazyki prostranstv. - M., 1997. - S. 152 - 163; This is the author. Kak my opisivaem prostranstvo, kotoroe vidim: problema vybora " orientira " //Trudy mejdunar. s seminar " Dialog-95 " on computer linguistics and ee application . - Kazan, 1995.
4. Kubryakova E.S. Knowledge of language: Not getting knowledge of language: Often it is a cognitive eye sight. Rol yazyka v poznanii mira / Kubryakova E.S. Russian Academy of Sciences. In-t yazykoznaniiya. - M.: Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury, 2004. - S. 26 - 33.
5. Kubryakova E.S. O ponyatiyax mesta, predema i prostranstva // Logichesky write an analysis. Yazyki prostranstv: sbornik statey / Otv. ed. N.D. Arutyunova, I.B. Levontina. - M.: Yazyki russkoy kultury, 2000. - S. 26.
6. Kubryakova E.S. Yazyk prostranstva i prostranstvo yazyka (k postanovke problems) // Izv. RAN. Series lit. i zazyka. – 1997. T.56. – No. 3. - S. 22.
7. Lebedeva L.B. Semantics of the word "boundary" // Logical analysis language. Yazyki prostranstv. - M., 1997. - S 93.
8. Logical analysis language. Yazyki prostranstv / Otv. ed.: N.D. Arutyunova, I.B. Levontina. - M.: Yazyki russkoy kultury, 2000. – 448 p .
9. Maslova V.A. Cognitive linguistics. - Minsk, 2008. - S. 39 .
10. Rakhilina E.V. Semantics of Russian positional predicates: stoyat, sidet, lejat, viset // Voprosy yazykoznaniiya. - Moscow, 1998. - No. 6. - S. 69.
11. Safarov Sh. Pragmalinguistics. - Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2008. - B. 179-180.
12. Stepanov Yu.S. V trehmernom prostranstve zyzyka (Semiotic problems linguistics, philosophy, art). - M.: Nauka, 1985. - S. 7.

13. Toporova V.M. Logoschema kak mediator concept in semantic space language // Methodological problems of cognitive linguistics. - Voronezh, 2001 . - S. 88 - 93.
14. Voropaeva I.V. Kognitivnyi analiz angliyskikh relyatorov BEFORE, AFTER, FOR, SINCE, TILL and UNTIL: Autoref. diss. ... candy. Philol. science - St. Petersburg, 2006. - S. 24.