ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 1| January 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2022: 8.205 || ISI Value: 1.188

SYNTAXEMES REPRESENTING TOPONYMS IN THE PLACE OF NUCLEAR COMPONENTS IN ENGLISH

Jumatov Rashid Yangibaevich
PhD student at Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

ANNOTATION

In this article, the categorical differential syntactic-semantic features of toponyms in English sentence structures were identified and then the non-categorical differential syntactic-semantic features in their coverage are revealed and analyzed through examples.

KEYWORDS: ***syntaxeme, toponym, locative, qualitativeness, processuality, nuclear, component, seme.***

INTRODUCTION

From the point of view of comparative linguistics, analysis of toponyms in different systematic languages, in particular English and Uzbek languages, by separating them into syntaxemes is one of the most urgent issues. A number of studies have been conducted on toponyms in both languages, but the topic has not been approached from the point of view of syntaxeme research. In the process of researching the composition of the sentence separating into syntaxemes, categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs are first identified, and then non-categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs are revealed in their scope. Next, syntaxemes identified in the English and Uzbek language systems are compared and functionally analyzed.

DISCUSSION

Linguist O.G. Vetrova says that substantiality is one of the categorical syntactic-semantic signs, which is defined by contrasting it with other differential syntactic-semantic signs, that is, qualificativeness and processuality [1, 45].

When toponymic examples taken from works of art were analyzed, locative syntaxemes and their paradigmatic series were identified and compared within the framework of substantive and qualificative syntaxemes from categorical symbols.

Let's analyze the following examples by separating them into syntaxemes:

1.On August 15, India will celebrate 75 years of independence.

2. A Blue Crab Advisory Commission was appointed.

3. Stonehenge attracts up to 1.6 million visitors a year.

4. ... the Mount Pleasant mega-henge was built on a grassy upland overlooking the Rivers Frome and Winterborne.

5. The Reykjanes peninsula was erupting, again.

In the given sentences, the syntactic units *India (1), A Blue Crab Advisory Commission (2), Stonehenge (3), the Mount Pleasant (4), The Reykjanes peninsula (5)* are the nuclear predicated components, i.e., it represents substantiality among the categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs. In order to determine the non-categorical sign of the components in the sentence, it is necessary to determine the component with which they entered into a syntactic relationship. It is known that, as mentioned above, the categorical sign is the lexical meaning of the word in the dictionary, while the non-categorical sign is the meaning expressed by it under the influence of other syntactic units in the context of the sentence. In this regard, when comparing with the lexicology branch of linguistics, we suggest that the categorical sign can be an alternative to the denotative meaning, and the non-categorical sign can be an alternative to the connotative meaning. In the sentence, the nuclear predicated (having) component enters into a syntactic relationship with the core predicating (predicate) component. In the given sentence devices, the nuclear predicating components *will celebrate (1), was appointed (2), attracts (3), was built (4), was erupting (5)* express processuality from the categorical signs and non-categorical actional (1, 3, 5) and actional directive (2, 4) signs. The components associated with actional syntaxeme represent agentiveness, the units associated with directive syntaxeme represent objectivity. So, the toponyms in the function of the nuclear predicated component in the sentences represent substantial agentive – SbAg (1, 3, 5) and substantial object – SbOb (2, 4) syntaxemes.

The non-categorical sign of agentiveness is derived from the word agence, which means *doer* and indicates the doer of the action represented by the unit in syntactic relation. The object syntaxeme represents the person or object to which the action is directed, on which the action is performed.

Non-nuclear dependent components also participated in the given sentences. In the first sentence, the syntactic unit *On August 15* expresses substantiality from categorical signs and temporality from non-categorical signs, that is, *On August 15* is a substantial temporal – SbTm syntaxeme. The component of *75 years* indicates quantification (Qun) on the

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 1| January 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2022: 8.205 || ISI Value: 1.188

basis of the qualitative (Qlf) categorical seme and the object (Ob) in relation to the component *will celebrate*, the syntactic unit *of independence* indicates possessiveness (Ps) on the basis of substantiality (Sb).

In the third sentence, the number of subordinate components is three, the component *up to 1.6 million* embodies the quantitative and limitative (limitation) syntaxemes in the scope of qualification, the component *visitors* embodies the object syntaxeme in the basis of substantiality, *a year* – substantial temporal iterative – SbTmItr (periodicity) syntaxeme.

The fourth sentence contains 4 subordinate components: the combination *on a ... upland* represents substantive locative (Lc) adhesive (Ad), *grassy* – qualificative qualitative explicative, *overlooking* – procedural stative, *Rivers Frome and Winterborne* – substantive locative allative syntaxemes.

The fifth sentence has one subordinate component, which is a qualificative temporal iterative syntaxeme because it expresses the repetition of an action. The syntaxeme model of the analyzed sentences is as follows:

1) On August 15, India will celebrate 75 years of independence – QlfTm . SbAg . PrAc . QlfQun . SbPs;

2) A Blue Crab Advisory Commission was appointed – SbOb . PrAcDr

3) Stonehenge attracts up to 1.6 million visitors a year – SbAg . PrSt . QlfQunLm . SbOb . SbTmItr;

4) ... the Mount Pleasant ... was built on a grassy upland overlooking the Rivers Frome and Winterborne – SbOb . PrAcDr . QlfQltExp . PrSt . SbLcAll;

5) The Reykjanes peninsula was erupting, again – SbAg . PrAcCnt . QlfTmItr.

It is often observed that toponyms are metonymically used in the function of a subject, that is, the name of that country or its capital is spoken instead of the government of a certain country.

6. The Great Britain is reported to be on favour of.

7. Tashkent seems to have more tourists this season.

8. Samarkand was appointed to hold the summit … .

The toponyms in the given sentences *The Great Britain (6), Tashkent (7), Samarkand (8)* are considered to be as double nuclear predicated components, because they are in a predicative relationship with the syntaxemes – *is reported - PrAcDr (6), seems – PrSt (7), was appointed – PrAcDr (8)* and at the same time they are in non-nuclear predicative relationship with the syntaxemes represented by infinitive forms of the verb *to be on favor – QlfSt (6), to have – PrStPs (7), to hold – PrAcFn (8)*. Therefore, the toponyms in the sentences are bivalent and represent the 1st – substantive stative object (SbStOb), 2nd – substantial stative and possessive (SbStPs), 3rd – substantial object agentive (SbObAg) syntaxemes. The syntaxeme models of sentences are as follows:

6) The Great Britain is reported to be on favour of – SbStOb **.** PrAcDr **.** QlfSt;

7) Tashkent seems to have more tourists this season – SbStPs **.** PrSt **.** PrStPs;

8) Samarkand was appointed to hold the summet ...– SbObAg **.** PrAcDr **.** PrAcFn **.** SbOb.

In the analysis of the following examples, we will reveal that the toponyms that replace the nuclear predicated component can also embody several types of syntaxemes.

9. The Caucasus are higher than the Urals.

10. Niagara is the highest waterfall in the world (Wikipedia.org).

11. Mariana Trench is 11,034 meters deep.

12. Both Europe and Russia have stakes in the region.

13. Armenia has remained part of Russia...

Based on the syntaxemes represented by the nuclear predicating components in the given sentences, we determine the non-categorical signs of toponyms in the function of a subject: *are higher (9)* - qualificative qualitative comparative, *The Caucasus* –substantial qualitative comparative object syntaxeme, *is the waterfall (10)* – substantial identifying syntaxeme, *Niagara* – substantial identified syntaxeme, *is 11,034 meters deep (11)* – qualifying quantitative identifying, *Mariana Trench* – substantial quantitative identified syntaxeme, *have (12)* – processual possessive, *Both Europe and Russia* – substantial existential comitative syntaxeme, *has remained part of Russia (13)* – processual existential, *Armenia – substantial stative syntaxemes* are connected based on a nuclear predicative relationship. We express the syntax model of sentences as follows:

9) The Caucasus are higher than the Urals – SbQltCmpOb **.** QlfQltCmp **.** SbOb;

10) Niagara is the highest waterfall in the world – $SbId_1$ **.** QlfQlt **.** $SbId_2$ **.** SbLc;

11) Mariana Trench is 11,034 meters deep – $SbQunId_1$ **.** $QlfQunId_2$;

12) Both Europe and Russia have stakes in the region – SbExCm **.** SbExCm **.** PrPs **.** SbOb **.** SbLcAd;

13) Armenia has remained part of Russia... – SbSt **.** PrEx **.** SbPs.

The analyzed examples were collected and sorted not only from literary texts, but also from periodicals and electronic magazines. As a result, it was found that the toponyms in the place of the nuclear predicative component in English represent ten different syntaxemes.

Next, we will deal with the syntaxeme analysis of sentences with toponyms in the place of the nuclear predicating component in English. It is known that the nuclear predicating component, that is, the predicate, is divided into verb-predicate and noun-predicate according to its morphological representation. Since toponyms belong to the noun group, they can only appear in the function of noun-predicate and are activated on the basis of substantiality.

1. ... space-watchers could track the errant rocket body with enough precision to predict its final resting place: Hertzsprung crater.

2. Another nation to watch is Israel, which has been closely aligned with Azerbaijan.

3. It's not just Stonehenge.

4. The next station is Bethnall Green.

5. ... the perpetrator is the antagonist on Armenia's Western border, NATO member Turkey.

We can shorten the structure of the sentence by removing certain components of the given first sentence:

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 9| Issue: 1| January 2023|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2022: 8.205 || ISI Value: 1.188

1) ... space-watchers could track the errant rocket body with enough precision to predict its final resting place: Hertzsprung crater → its final resting place is Hertzsprung crater.

Nuclear predicating components *Hertzsprung crater (1), Israel (2), Stonehenge (3), Bethnall Green (4), the antagonist (5)* represent substantial identifying syntaxemes and syntactic units they are connected on the basis of nuclear predicative relationship substantial identifyed syntaxemes – *nation (2), It (3), the perpetrator (5)* and substantial identified locative syntaxemes as *place (1), station (4)*.

Also, in the second sentence, the component *Israel* is the anaphoric possessor of the next adverbial clause and represents the agentive syntaxeme. The component *with Azerbaijan* in the sentence is connected to the syntactic unit *has been ... aligned* on the basis of a subordinate relation and expresses a substantial object comitative syntaxeme.

In the fifth sentence, the syntactic unit *NATO member Turkey* comes into an appositive relationship with the NP2 component and is in appositive relation to the antecedent. The syntaxeme model of the sentences is as follows:

1) ... its final resting place is Hertzsprung crater – SbPs **.** QlfQlt **.** PrAcEx **.** $SbId_1$ **.** $SbId_2$;

2) Another nation to watch is Israel, which has been closely aligned with Azerbaijan – SbAdd **.** $SbId_1$Ob **.** PrAc **.** $SbId_2$ **.** SbOb **.** PrAcDr **.** SbObCm;

3) It's not just Stonehenge – $SbId_1$ **.** $SbNgId_2$;

4) The next station is Bethnall Green – QlfOrd **.** $SbId_1$ **.** $SbId_2$;

5) ... the perpetrator is the antagonist on Armenia's Western border, NATO member Turkey – $SbId_1$ **.** $SbId_2$ **.** SbPs **.** SbQlt **.** SbLc **.** SbExp.

CONCLUSION

In English, it was observed that toponyms appearing in the place of the nuclear predicating component (NP2) represent three syntaxemes and in the place of the nuclear predicated component (NP1) are associated with one syntaxeme.

Table 1.
Syntaxemes represented by toponyms in place of NP_1P_1 (1a) and NP_2 (1b) and possibilities of connection with other syntaxems

1a	NP_1P_1	SbStOb	SbStPs	SbObAg
		↓	↓	↓
	ÑP$_2$	PrStPs	QlfSt	PrAcFn
1b	NP_2 / NP_1	$SbId_2$	$SbNgId_2$	SbExp
	SbId1	+	+	+

Table 2.
Possibilities of connection of syntaxemes represented by toponyms in the place of a subject (NP_1) with syntaxemes in the place of a predicate (NP_2).

NP_2 / NP_1	PrAc	PrAcDr	PrSt	PrAcCnt	QlfQlt Cmp	$SbId_2$	$QlfQunId_2$	PrPs
SbAg	+		+	+				
SbOb		+						
SbStOb		+						
SbSt			+					
SbStPs			+					
SbObAg		+						
SbQltCmpOb					+			
$SbId_1$						+		
$SbQunId_1$							+	
SbExCm								+

REFERENCES

1. *Ветрова О.Г. Вокативность как синтаксико-семантический признак // Лингвестические исследования – 1981. Грамматическая и лексическая семантика. АН СССР. Институт языкознания: – Москва: 1981.*
2. *News Decoder, online magazine on world news.*
3. *National Geographic, online magazine.*
4. *https://www.nationalgeographic.org›*
5. *Patricia Cornwell. Isle of Dogs. New York, The Berkley publishing group, 2001.*
6. *Robert Goddard. Hand in Glove. – Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 2006. –456 p.*