

NOMINATIVE SENTENCES OF THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Barnoev Orifjon

Navoi State University,
Navoi, Uzbekistan

Abstract: Nominative sentences are among the insufficiently developed issues and are still problematic. This article examines the structural and semantic features of nominative sentences and their types, taking into account the semantic and functional features.

Keywords: nominative sentences, existential sentences, demonstrative sentences, desirable-existential sentences.

Nominative sentences are one-member sentences that assert the presence, existence of a phenomenon or object called the main member of the sentence, which is expressed by a noun in the nominative case or a quantitative-nominal combination, a numeral or a personal pronoun in the nominative case [3, p. 211].

Nominative sentences are among the insufficiently developed issues and are still problematic. For example, we have noted the appropriate reasoning of I.P. Raspopov: "The nominative sentence "Зима" in its constructive relation can be attributed to the usual scheme of verbal sentences, which allows us to consider it as one of the variants of such sentences with a zero predicate (for example: "Зима." - "Была зима"; "Стояла зима"; "Была зима", etc.). However, this is not always possible. In the case of the sentence " Земская больница. За отсутствием доктора, уехавшего жениться, больных принимает фельдшер Курятин...", the nominative sentence " Земская больница " clearly does not fit into the structure of verb constructions [6, p. 70-71].

The main feature of these sentences is their fragmentariness, which at the same time is accompanied by a significant capacity of the content conveyed. They mention only individual, but significant and expressive details of the situation, which are oriented towards the experience and imagination of the listener or reader, allowing him to form a general idea of the described situation or events: Шум, хохот, беготня, поклоны, галоп, мазурка, вальс...(Пушкин); Выси. Облака. Воды. Броды. Реки. Годы и века. (Пастернак). In other words, these are phenomena and objects that lend themselves to visual-sensory perception.

Nominative sentences, as is known, are limited by words that must convey the semantics of being. In addition to the semantics of being and the nominative case, determined by the grammatical nature of the main member, nominative sentences are also characterized by other mandatory grammatical features: 1) the meaning of predicativity is manifested through the ascertaining intonation; 2) these sentences can only be affirmative, since negation contradicts the very nature of a nominative sentence associated with the concept of being; 3) nominative sentences have a fixed modal-temporal meaning - the present tense, do not allow paradigmatic changes in moods and tenses (expressing the future or past tense makes them two-part: "Была весна"; "Будет весна").

There are also alternative views on this issue: two-partness is not observed in this case, as stated, for example, by the author of Academic grammar-70, N. Yu. Shvedova [2, p. 560] and V.V. Vinogradov [1, p. 135]. According to N. Yu. Shvedova, sentences of the type "Была весна"; "Будет весна" are included in the paradigm of a nominative sentence, representing a variant of the structural scheme "Весна", since no relationship of a feature and its carrier is established between the name and the verb, and the verbs была, будет act as an auxiliary syntactic element indicating a temporal reference or temporal changes: this is a simple statement of a phenomenon in the past and future.

As we understand, in the future and past tense in sentences of the type "Весна" an auxiliary verb *быть* appears, which is lexically discolored and comes as close as possible to a non-notional copula, therefore such sentences are not syntactically divided into a subject and a predicate.

This concept is debatable. We adhere to the majority opinion on the advisability of classifying sentences of the type "Была весна"; "Будет весна" is a two-part sentence, since such sentences are not a syntactic paradigm of the "Весна" type of construction, and the verb denotes the presence of a phenomenon at a certain time.

While paying tribute to what was done by our predecessors, we nevertheless believe that sentences like *На улице дождь; За поворотом наш дом* are nominative sentences that contain an "existential" meaning, which is a defining feature of nominative sentences with the "where is what" scheme, and, from our point of view, the presence of a circumstance becomes possible due to the predicative nature of the main member. Such sentences, as N.D. Arutyunova and E.N. Shiryaev correctly noted, are a consequence of the incomplete implementation of the structural scheme of nominative sentences with a zero predicate of being, and form one type of nominative sentences - an incomplete version of existential sentences. V. Yu. Koprov also defined the above sentences as actantless nominatives.

Sentences of the above sample are therefore recognized in our dissertation as single-member, the main member of which is distributed by secondary members - circumstances or additions.

It is worth noting that the localizer (the place of the existing object) may also be absent: *Горе; Тоска;*; such constructions, in our opinion, are a consequence of the reduction of two-part sentences: *У меня горе; У них тоска.*

In such sentences, the location of the object is determined from the context or consituation, since the existence of an object is impossible without a localizer: the localizer can be expressed either explicitly (verbally) - *На уроке шум*, or implicitly - *Шум*.

So, what is left unsaid, not expressed in verbal form, cannot be restored in the sentence, because it is clear from the context or from the sentence itself. The absence of what is left unsaid does not create the impression of incompleteness, semantic incompleteness; on the contrary, nothing can be added to the composition of a one-part sentence without changing the structure of the sentence, its content, its emotional coloring and richness, the stylistic features of its use, etc. In this regard, it is necessary to clearly distinguish one-part sentences from two-part incomplete ones.

There are several points of view on the issue of varieties of nominative sentences, which can be reduced to a single classification taking into account semantic and functional features: we distinguish existential, demonstrative, evaluative-existential, desirably-existential.

Existential sentences denote: 1) the presence of a conceivable phenomenon in time: *Ночь; Холод, туман; Сумерки; Осень;* 2) the existence of objects located in space: *Тополь; Дом; Машины.*

Demonstrative sentences contain some indications of objects and phenomena, and the indication is expressed by demonstrative particles *вот, вон*: *Вот твоя сумка; Вон знакомое здание.*

Evaluative-existential sentences express the speaker's emotional assessment of an object or phenomenon that the speaker sees and experiences some emotions from this. The structural feature of such sentences are the emotionally expressive particles *какой, ай да, прямо, ну, то-то, тоже мне, а еще, что за, etc.*, as well as the demonstrative particle *вот*, but in the meaning of an assessment: *Ну уж и праздник! Какой прекрасный день! Что за погода?! Также мне гость. Вот такая ревность! Вот нахал!*

However, there were also opposing opinions: some linguists (I.P. Raspopov [5, p. 241], A.M. Lomov [4, p. 253], L.A. Bulakhovsky) classify such constructions as incomplete two-part sentences with a nominal predicate as the main member.

We do not share this opinion and believe that it is advisable to consider such sentences as one-part nominative, since such sentences evaluate actions, and recognizing the predicate as the main member is unconvincing due to the impossibility of restoring the subject.

Desirable-existential sentences express the desirability of an object with the help of the particles только бы, если бы, лишь бы: Лишь бы отдых!; Только бы уважение!; Если бы воля!

Nominative sentences are found in all genres of fiction. They are widely used in dramatic works as stage directions. They are also used in lyrics to describe individual details of the situation being described:

Ночь, улица, фонарь, аптека,
Бессмысленный и тусклый свет.
Живи еще хоть четверть века —
Всё будет так. Исхода нет

Used literature:

1. Виноградов В.В. «Синтаксис русского языка акад. А. А. Шахматова» // ст. в сб. Вопросы синтаксиса современного русского языка. – М.: Учпедгиз, 1950. – С. 135.
2. Грамматика современного русского литературного языка / ред. Н.Ю. Шведова. – Москва : Наука, 1970. – С. 560
3. Казарина В.И. Современный русский синтаксис: структурная организация простого предложения / В.И. Казарина. – Елец: ЕГУ им. И.А. Бунина, 2007. С. 211
4. Ломов А.М. Типология русского предложения. Воронеж: Изд-во Воронеж. ун-та, 1994. – С. 253
5. Распопов И. П. Основы русской грамматики. – С. 241
6. Распопов, И.П. Строение простого предложения в современном русском языке. Из лингвистического наследия И.П. Распопова. Изд. 3. Либроком, 2013. С. 70-71