QR – Issue   QR – Article

Nargiza Mardonovna Suleymanova
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (PhD), Associate Professor
Associate Professor of the department of Theoretical Aspects of the English Language
javohirkhonn97@gmail.com

ON THE NOMINATIVE NATURE OF THE SENTENCE

Abstract: The article focuses on the question of the nominative nature of the sentence, which is very relevant in modern linguistics. In the analysis of actual language material, the nominative value is compared with the predicative value.
Key words: communicative, predicative, nominative, phraseology, linguistics.
Language: English
Citation: Suleymanova, N. M. (2020). On the nominative nature of the sentence. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 04 (84), 307-309.
Soi: http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-84-53   Doi: crossref https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.04.84.53
Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

The concept of a nominative unit requires one of the topical issues on the research agenda in the field of modern development of linguistics. Indeed, the nominative meaning of language units is extremely important in the formation of the communicative process. We observe this primarily in the nominative meaning of the word, because this unit of language is distinguished not only by its meaning, but also by the fact that it itself provides the nominative expression of large units.

Indeed, the nominative meaning of persistence quotes and phraseological expressions that are considered units of language and even the unit of speech - the nominative sign of a sentence - is also expressed through words. In other words, the semantic value of a sentence arises from the synthesis of words that make up its component (building material). Of course, phraseological expressions in the form of speech are an exception.

It should also be noted that speech is always predictive in nature, since it expresses an attitude towards reality. Even sentences consisting of a single word are no exception. But predicative and nominative meanings cannot coexist. As if the predicative case focuses on the reaction to reality, the nominative meaning has nothing to do with it. In this regard, the phenomenon of predicative and nominative can be called the opposite. These phenomena can only be connected through the concept of proposition, which requires a semantic invariant. As a matter of fact, a proposition has the same meaning both for the general syntactic structure of a sentence and for transforms formed within the framework of the phenomenon of nominalization. Since we interpret the proposition in the style of the semantic structure of the sentence, it is undoubted that both the phenomenon of predicativity and the phenomenon of nominative can be reproduced under its influence. According to N.Yu.Shvedova, in the grammatical aspect of the formation of the sentence, its semantic structure is also important. This, in turn, indicates that the phenomena of predicativity and nominative have a certain relationship. But we should not understand this, that it has an absolute character. Since, if we consider a deeper approach to describing the issue, we will see that the phenomenon of nominativity is far from a reaction to reality. Therefore, phrases are usually called nominative meanings. We usually study a word as a nominative unit, since it (except for non-independent words) serves to denote objects and events in reality. But in this process, the nominative meaning expressed through the word may not always have the same status following its internal capabilities. We see that in some words the nominative sign gives its objective expression, and in some words, there are nominative signs associated with the meanings of an event or

Clarivate Analytics indexed

situation. In some words, such as auxiliary and conjunctions, the nominative sign is not noticeable. However, this does not mean that a similar situation is observed in all auxiliary words. Evidence of our opinion can be seen in auxiliary verbs: started speaking, finished reading, kept speaking, etc. In this case, the verbs speaking, reading, which have an auxiliary position, do not require explanation, since they have a nominative sign following their internal characteristics.

In general, the word stands in the main (central) place among nominative units. This feature of the word has a non-changing character, both when appearing in the vocabulary of the language, and when performing the function of phrases and components of speech. In particular, simple words differ in that they express an integral (global) nominative meaning. However, the nominative meaning expressed by word combinations resulting from the interaction of words, in contrast to simple words, becomes complex due to the confusion of more than one nominative meaning. The nominative meaning formed in this situation will have additional features. For example: *большой стол (a big table), a clean room, қизиқарли китоб (an interesting book)*.

Despite the fact that these examples are taken from different languages, we see that phrases are complex nominative units. In this case, we observe the complexity of nominative meaning, when the sign of the table is big, sign of the room is clean and a sign of the book is interesting. But it is worth noting that in phraseological units that denote word combinations, the expression of the nominative meaning is indivisible, that is, it has a global character. The main reason for this is that the semantic components of phraseological units do not consist of a synthesis of their meanings: A plain dealer, sinister motives, etc. The expression of the nominative meaning of phraseological units in the form of such a phrase has a permanent character because they exist in the language in a ready-made form. But this opinion cannot be drawn about the fact that free phrases mean the expression of a nominative meaning. The main reason is that they are formed in speech and each time they receive the status of a nominative unit only in this process.

The concept of "process", which is mentioned above as a free phrase, plays an important role in realizing the nominative meaning of a unit of speech. In other words, a sentence is also formed in speech and in this process, a nominative meaning arises. But there are other aspects of the sentence, in contrast to phrases, which we primarily see in the signs of communicativeness and predicativity. The communicative function of a sentence is related to its actual use in speech because any sentence must have a certain communicative function for its practical application. The phenomenon of predicativity means the relation to the reality of the message that is transmitted through the sentence. In this respect, the phenomena of communication and predicativity are inextricably linked.

The phenomenon of nominativity also has a connection with these two aspects of the sentence. However, this relationship is not the same for both communicative and predicative phenomena. The connection of nominativity with the phenomenon of communicativeness is much less, because in the process of the communicative function of the sentence and its execution, the phenomenon of nominativity becomes secondary. In fact, during the communication period, we do not use the nominative meaning of the sentence, but its overall semantic value. However the direction of the predicative phenomenon is different. This phenomenon is much closer to a nominative phenomenon than to a communicative phenomenon. The main reason for this is that the denotation of nominativity, expressed through speech, is not a subject, but a whole situation. This, in turn, indicates that there is a certain relationship between nominativity and predicativity. In addition, predicativity is inextricably linked to the concept of proposition (the meaning of a message expressed in a sentence). Since there is a concept of a proposition, it is natural that there is a predicative phenomenon in it. However, it cannot be concluded that predicativity is a factor that creates the phenomenon of a proposition. Since the phenomenon of a proposition can be the basis for the formation of predicativity, but not vice versa.

It should also be noted that the opinions expressed by linguists regarding the phenomenon of proposition still do not coincide. While N.D.Arutyunova interprets the proposition as semantically invariant, some linguists (G.N.Manaenko) argue that this status is more of a nominative phenomenon than a proposition. In our opinion, it is appropriate to consider nominativity as an invariant character rather than a proposition. Because the concept of nominativity can serve as the basis for the formation of the semantic meaning of a particular sentence, and the concept of a proposition - a real one in the process in which we can perceive the semantic perception of the sentence structure after the complete formation of the syntactic form of the sentence.

In general, in our modern linguistics, the question of the relationship between the concepts of communicative, predicative and nominative remains ambiguous. Of course, each of these concepts has served as the basis for several monographic studies. But in the research chapter on the level of connections between them, riddle situations are still visible.

References:

1. Arutunova, N.D. (1990). *Propozicija. Lingvisticheskij jenciklopedicheskij slovar`.* (p.401). Moscow.
2. Zolotova, G. A., Oninenko, N.K., & Sidorova, M.Jy. (1998). *Kommunikativnaja grammatika russkogo jazyka.* Moscow.
3. Stepanov, Jy. S. (1975). *Osnovy obshhego jazykoznanija.* Moscow.
4. Manaenko, G. N. (2004). Predikacija, predikativnost` i propozicija v aspekte "informacionnogo" oslozhnenija predlozhenija. *Filologicheskie nauki*, 2.
5. Kubrjakova, E.S., Dem`jankov, V.Z., Pankrac, Jy.G., & Luzina, L.G. (1996). *Kratkij slovar` kognitivnyh terminov.* Moscow.
6. Krylova, O. A., Maksimov, L.Jy., & Shirjaev, E. N. (1997). *Sovremennyj russkij jazyk.* Teoreticheskij kurs. Sintaksis. Punktuacija. (pp.22-23). Moscow.
7. Stroson, N.F. (1982). *O referencii. Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike.* Vyp.XIII. Logika i lingvistika (Problema referencii), Moscow.
8. (1990). *Lingvisticheskij jenciklopedicheskij slovar`.* Moscow.
9. Lomtev, T.P. (1972). *Predlozhenie i ego grammaticheskie kategorii.* (pp.26-29). Moscow.
10. Maskal`skaja, O. I. (1974). *Problemy sistemnogo opisanija sintaksisa.* Moscow.

Clarivate Analytics **indexed**