

## Syntactic-Semantic Analysis of Divalent Syntactic Units

Khalikhnazarova Ziyada\*1, Djoldasova Gawhar Batirovna2

1MD, Karakalpak state university

2Phd, Karakalpak state university

<p><b>Received</b> 12-03-2022</p>	<p><b>Abstract:</b> Valency the syntactic valence of a verb is the number of overt morpho-syntactically. coded arguments it takes. One can talk about the semantic valence of the verb. as well, where valence here refers to the number of semantic arguments that a. particular verb can take, and syntactic analysis and semantic analysis, Syntactic Semantic Analysis. Syntactic analysis (syntax) and semantic analysis (semantic) are the two primary techniques that lead to the understanding of natural language. ... Syntax is the grammatical structure of the text, whereas semantics is the meaning being conveyed</p>	<p><b>Keywords:</b> Syntax, Valency, grammatical structure, primary techniques, natural language, semantic arguments, valence, semantic analysis, Syntactic Semantic Analysis</p>
<p><b>Accepted</b> 16-04-2022</p>		
<p><b>Published</b> 25-04-2022</p>		

Copyright © 2022 The Author(s): This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License.

### INTRODUCTIONS

In linguistics, valency or valence is the number and type of arguments controlled by a predicate, content verbs being typical predicates. Valency is related, though not identical, to subcategorization and transitivity, which count only object arguments - valency counts all arguments, including the subject. The linguistic meaning of valency derives from the definition of valency in chemistry. The valency metaphor appeared first in linguistics in Charles Sanders Peirce's essay "The Logic of Relatives" in 1897,[1] and it then surfaced in the works of a number of linguists decades later in the late 1940s and 1950s.[2] Lucien Tesnière is credited most with having established the valency concept in linguistics.[3] A major authority on the valency of the English verbs is Allerton (1982), who made the important distinction between semantic and syntactic valency.

There are several types of valency:

- impersonal (= divalent) it rains
- intransitive (monovalent/monadic) she sleeps
- transitive (divalent/dyadic) she kicks the ball
- ditransitive (trivalent/triadic) she gave him a book
- tritransitive (quadrivalent/quadradic) I bet her a dollar on a horse

An impersonal verb has no determinate subject, e.g. It rains. (Though it is technically the subject of the verb in English, it is only a dummy subject; that is, a syntactic placeholder: it has no concrete referent. No other subject can replace it. In many other languages, there would be no

subject at all. The Spanish translation of It rains, for example, is a single verb form: Lluève.)

An intransitive verb takes one argument, e.g. He<sub>1</sub> sleeps. a transitive verb takes two, e.g. He<sub>1</sub> kicked the ball<sub>2</sub>. a ditransitive verb takes three, e.g. He<sub>1</sub> gave her<sub>2</sub> a flower<sub>3</sub>.

There are a few verbs that take four arguments; they are tritransitive. Sometimes bet is considered to have four arguments in English, as in the examples I<sub>1</sub> bet him<sub>2</sub> five quid<sub>3</sub> on "The Daily Arabian"<sub>4</sub> and I<sub>1</sub> bet you<sub>2</sub> two dollars<sub>3</sub> it will rain<sub>4</sub>. However, since the latter example can be restated as I<sub>1</sub> bet you<sub>2</sub> two dollars<sub>3</sub> without becoming ungrammatical, the verb bet is not considered to be a true tritransitive verb[citation needed] (that is, the clause it will rain is an adjunct, not an argument). Languages that mark arguments morphologically can have true "tritransitive" verbs, such as the causative of a ditransitive verb in Abaza (which incorporates all four arguments in the sentence "He couldn't make them give it back to her" as pronominal prefixes on the verb).[4]: p. 57

The term valence also refers to the syntactic category of these elements. Verbs show considerable variety in this respect. In the examples above, the arguments are noun phrases (NPS), but arguments can in many cases be other categories, e.g.

Many of these patterns can appear in a form rather different from the ones just shown above. For example, they can also be expressed using the passive voice:

- Our training was made worthwhile (by winning the prize).

- We were not surprised (by the fact that he came late).
- We were persuaded to contribute (by Sam).
- That she would veto this bill was mentioned (by the president).

The above examples show some of the most common valence patterns in English, but do not begin to exhaust them. Other linguists[who?] have examined the patterns of more than three thousand verbs and placed them in one or more of several dozen groups.[5]

The verb requires all of its arguments in a well-formed sentence, although they can sometimes undergo valency reduction or expansion. For instance, to eat is naturally divalent, as in he eats an apple, but may be reduced to monovalency in he eats. This is called valency reduction. In the southeastern United States, an emphatic trivalent form of eating is in use, as in I'll eat myself some supper. Verbs that are usually monovalent, like sleep, cannot take a direct object. However, there are cases where the valency of such verbs can be expanded, for instance in He sleeps the sleep of death. This is called valency expansion. Verb valence can also be described in terms of syntactic versus semantic criteria. The syntactic valency of a verb refers to the number and type of dependent arguments that the verb can have, while semantic valence describes the thematic relations associated with a verb.

#### Changing valency

Most languages provide a means to change the valency of verbs.[9] There are two ways to change the valency of a verb: reducing and increasing.[10]:72

Note that for this section, the labels S, A, and P will be used. These are commonly used names (taken from morphosyntactic alignment theory) given to arguments of a verb. S refers to the subject of an intransitive verb, A refers to the agent of a transitive verb, and P refers to the patient of a transitive verb. (The patient is sometimes also called undergoer.)

These are core arguments of a verb:

Lydia (S) is sleeping.

Don (A) is cooking dinner (P).

Non-core (or peripheral) arguments are called obliques and are typically optional:

Lydia is sleeping on the couch.

Don is cooking dinner for his mom.

#### Valency-reducing

Reducing valency involves moving an argument from the core to oblique status. The passive voice and antipassive voice are prototypical valencies reducing devices.[10]:72 This kind of derivation applies most to transitive clauses. Since there are two arguments in a transitive clause, A and P, there are two possibilities for reducing the valency:

1. A is removed from the core and becomes oblique. The clause becomes intransitive since there's only one core argument, the original P, which has become S. This is exactly what the passive voice does.[10]:73 The semantics of this construction emphasize the original P and downgrades the original A and is used to avoid mentioning A, draw attention to P or the result of the activity.[10]:474

(a) Don (A) is cooking dinner (P).

(b) Dinner (S) is being cooked (by Don).

2. P is moved from the core and becomes oblique. Similarly, the clause becomes intransitive and the original A becomes S.[10]:73 The semantics of this construction emphasizes the original A and downgrades the original P and is used when the action includes a patient, but the patient is given little or no attention.[10]:474 These are difficult to convey in English.

(a) Don (A) is crushing a soda can (P).

(b) Don (S) is crushing. [with the implication that a soda can is being crushed].

Note that this is not the same as an ambitransitive verb, which can be either intransitive or transitive (see criterion 4 below, which this does not meet).

There are some problems, however, with the terms passive and antipassive because they have been used to describe a wide range of behaviors across the world's languages. For example, when compared to a canonical European passive, the passive construction in other languages is justified in its name. However, when comparing passives across the world's languages, they do not share a single common feature.

#### REFERENCES

1. Gerdruang, A., Panwatanasakul, C., & Nurnazar, P. (2021). THE DESIRABLE MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION IN URBANIZATION AREA UNDER THE OFFICE OF NON-FORMAL AND INFORMAL EDUCATION IN BANGKOK

- THAILAND. *湖南大学学报 (自然科学版)*, 48(10).
2. Gerdruang, A., Panwatanasakul, C., & Nurnazar, P. (2021). The Development of Administrators Affiliated with the Office of Non-Formal and Informal Education (NFE). *Review of International Geographical Education Online*, 11(9).
  3. Lawrence, S. (2002). *The lovely lady and other stories*. Moscow; Prosveshenie.
  4. Nurnazar, P., & Islambek, S. (2022). HUMANISM OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY OF HUMANISM. *Uzbek Scholar Journal*, 2, 11-14.
  5. Nurnazar, P., & Islambek, S. (2022). HUMANITY AS AN EXPRESSION OF THE SPIRITUAL BEING OF HUMAN. *Uzbek Scholar Journal*, 2, 15-19.
  6. Qarlibaevna, B. A., Yusupbay, A., & Sabirovna, K. K. (2020). ABOUT THE ACTIVITY TASKS OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM IN THE REPUBLIC OF KARAKALPAKSTAN. *Ижтимоий фанлар*, 2(3).
  7. Rakovskiy, V.S. (1972). Transformation and derivation Text. In V. S. Khrakovsky (Eds.), *Problems of structural linguistics*. Moscow.
  8. Slesar, H. (2011). *Succes Machine*. London, A-star Books.
  9. Telegin, L. A. (1992). *Non-affix transposition and influence on the derivation process in modern English language* (Doctoral dissertation, Dissertation of Doctor Philological Sciences. Abstract.-Samarkand).
  10. Thompson, A.J., & Martinet A.V. (1972). *A Practical English Grammar for Foreign Students*. London; Oxford University Press.
  11. Turniyazova, Sh. N. (2010). *Derivative features of the text formation of the text language in modern Uzbek* (Dissertation of Candidate). Philological Sciences. Abstract. Tashkent.
  12. Turniyozov, N.K., Turniyozov, B., Turniyozova, Sh. (2011). *Uzbek language derivation syntax*. "Navruz" publishing house, Tashkent.
  13. Uli, P. N. R (2021). Development of a Person's Spirituality in Dialogue with Another. *Zien Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(1), 133-135.
  14. Voynich, E. (2013). *The Gadfly*. United States; Hard Press Publishing..
  15. Wors, D.S. (1962). *Transformational analysis of constructions with the instrumental case in Russian*. New in linguistics. Vip.2. Moskow: Progress, 1962.
  16. Yartseva, V.N. (1968). *The relationship between grammar and vocabulary in the language system*. Research on the general theory of grammar. - Moskow: Progress.
  17. Yusupov, U.K. (2007). *Theoretical bases of comparative linguistics*. Tashkent: Science.
  18. Алима, Б. (2014). X? зирги заман глобалласуу маш? алалары:?? дири х? м?? тери. *Бестник Каракалпакского университета*, 25(4), 68-75.
  19. Алимбетов, Ю. (2017). ПРОБЛЕМА ВЗАИМОСВЯЗИ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОГО И ОБЩЕЧЕЛОВЕЧЕСКОГО. In *Актуальные проблемы многоуровневой языковой подготовки в условиях модернизации высшего образования* (pp. 12-16).
  20. Алимбетов, Ю., & Камалова, Х. С. (2020). QARAQALPAQSTAN RESPUBLIKASI TA'LIM SISTEMASININ'ISKERLIK MA'SELESI HAQQINDA. *Журнал Социальных Исследований*, 3(2).
  21. Бердимуратова, А. (1997). Экологический кризис Приаралья и проблемы его решения. *Экономика и статистика*, (11-12), 70.
  22. Бердимуратова, А. К., & Бердимуратова, С. П. (2021). ИСТОРИЯ. СОЦИОЛОГИЯ. ФИЛОСОФИЯ. ЮРИСПРУДЕНЦИЯ. *Вестник КГУ им. Бердаха*. №, 1, 50.