



SYNTACTIC-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF MONOVALENT AND BIVALENT SYNTACTIC UNITS

Z. Kaliknazarova

Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh

Trainee teacher of the Department of linguistic

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7353185>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 13rd November 2022

Accepted: 20th November 2022

Online: 23rd November 2022

KEY WORDS

Syntax, valence, grammatical structure, initial techniques, natural language, semantic arguments, valency, semantic analysis, syntactic semantic analysis.

ABSTRACT

The article describes the valence, the syntactic valence of the verb - an open morpho-syntactic number, encoded arguments. The same can be said about the semantic valency of the verb, where the valence is the number of semantic arguments, you can get a separate verb, perform syntactic analysis and semantic analysis. Parsing (syntax) Semantic analysis (semantic) are the two main methods that lead to natural language understanding. Syntax is the grammatical structure of the text and semantics is the meaning conveyed.

In linguistics, valence is the number and type of arguments controlled by a predicate, substantive verbs are typical predicates. Valency, though not the same, is related to subcategories that only consider object arguments, and transitivity—valency considers all arguments, including the subject. The linguistic meaning of valence comes from the definition of valence in chemistry. The valence metaphor first appeared in linguistics in Charles Sanders Peirce's 1897 essay *The Logic of Kin*, [1] and then appeared in the works of several linguists in the late 1940s and 1950s.[2] Lucien Tesson is best credited for introducing the concept of valence in linguistics.[3] A major reference on verb valence in English is Allerton (1982), who made an important distinction between semantic and syntactic valence.

In linguistics, verb valence or valency refers to the number of arguments governed by a verbal predicate. Although it is not the same, it is only related to the transitive verb, which counts the object arguments of the verbal predicate. Verb valence includes all arguments, including the subject of the verb. The term valency has a corresponding technical meaning in lexical semantics, which defines the role of argument structure - it refers to the ability of other lexical units to combine with a given word. For example, valence is one of the construction-defining elements in some construction grammars. This meaning of the term is sometimes called lexical valence.

Depending on how many complements a verb comes with, its valence can be described as zero-valent,



univalent, bivalent, trivalent and, rarely, quadrivalent.

Monovalent: The teacher smiled. (The teacher laughed)

Divalent: The workers are building the house. (Builders are building a house)

Trivalent: My father bought me a book. (My father brought me a book)

Tetravalent We bought many apples from an old man with 2 dollars. (We bought a lot of apples from an old man for \$2).

As can be seen from the above examples, there are several forms of sentence implementation. Bivalent terms,

trivalent and tetravalent indicate that a verb requires two, three, or four complements, respectively. Therefore, three-valent sentences can be made in different ways: with a subject, an object and an indirect object, or with a subject, an object and a verbal object, or with a subject, an object with subject and a nominal complement.

Depending on how many actions a verb takes, it can usually have zero valence, one valence, two valence, three valence and, rarely, four valence. A zero-valent verb means that it does not have to be associated with an action and can express the full meaning by itself. Univalent verbs can only dominate an action, so the verb cannot be followed by an object. Bivalent verbs can only dominate two actions, that is, it can only connect an object. A trivalent verb can dominate only three actions, meaning two objects follow the verb. Thus, the main point of valence theory is the stem of verbs. Furthermore, valence is not currently limited to the study of verbs, but is applied to subclasses of all word groups, e.g. nouns or adjectives.

In English, there are several semantic types of two-valent verbs of action, each of

which, except for the second type, has several subtypes:

1. Verbs expressing effective action: to weave, to knit, to build, to construct, to make, to write, to dig, to organize, to create, to engender, to produce, to generate, to invent, to design, to device, to form
2. Verbs expressing abstract action: shuffle, to rummage, to look for, to search, to seek, etc. (mix, get confused, search, search, search, etc.).
3. Verbs expressing movement in the oral cavity; to lick; to taste; to chew to eat to feed; to swallow to gulp etc.

There are several types of valence:

- impersonal (= bivalent) it rains
- intransitive (monovalent/monadic) he sleeps
- transitive (bivalent/dyadic) he kicks the ball
- ditransitive (trivalent/triadic) gave him a book
- tritransitive (quadrivalent/quadradic) I bet every dollar. An impersonal verb has no definite subject, e.g. It rains. (Although technically the subject of a verb in English, it is only a passive subject; that is, it occupies a syntactic position: it has no definite indicator. No other subject can take its place cannot press. For example, the Spanish translation of "It rains" is one verb form: Llueve. An intransitive verb takes one argument, e.g. He sleeps. A transitive verb takes two, e.g. He is full. kicked p. a ditransitive verb takes three, e.g. He gave her a flower. There are several verbs that take four arguments; they are tritransitive. Sometimes the verb "bet" (to bet) in English has four is considered to have an argument. The verb "bet" is not considered a true tritransitive verb. Languages that morphologically define



arguments can have true "tritransitive" verbs, such as the ditransitive verb in Abaza causative (which includes all four arguments in the sentence "He couldn't make them give them to him" as a collective prefix. verb).[4]: b. 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 of other categories, e.g. Many of these patterns can appear in a very different form than the one shown above. For example, they can also be expressed using the passive voice: Our training was worth it (by winning the prize). We were not surprised (by his late arrival). We were persuaded to contribute (by Sam). His veto of this bill (by the president) has been mentioned. The examples above illustrate the most common valence patterns in English, but do not begin to exhaust them. Other linguists [who?] have studied more than three thousand verb forms and placed them in one or more of several dozen groups.[5] A verb requires all of its arguments in a well-formed sentence, although they can sometimes be reduced or expanded in valence. For example, nutrition is naturally divalent because it eats apples, but it can fall into monovalency in nutrition. This is called valence reduction. In the southeastern United States, the trivalent form of eating is used, as in I eat myself dinner. Usually monovalent verbs, like sleep, cannot take a direct object. However, there are cases where the valence of such verbs can be expanded, for example, He sleeps in the sleep of death. This is called valency expansion. Verb valence can also be characterized in terms of syntactic and

semantic criteria. The syntactic valence of a verb refers to the number and type of dependent arguments that the verb can have, while the semantic valence describes the thematic relations associated with the verb. Changing valence Many languages provide a means of changing the valence of verbs.[9] There are two ways to change the valence of a verb: decrease and increase.[10]:72 Note that the symbols S, A and P are used for this section. These are the commonly used names given to the arguments of the verb (derived from morphosyntactic adaptation theory). S is the subject of an intransitive verb, A is the representative of a transitive verb, and P is the patient of a transitive verb. (The patient is sometimes called the transitive.) These are the main arguments of the verb: Lydia (S) was sleeping. Don (A) is cooking dinner (P). Non-main (or peripheral) arguments are called obliques and are usually optional: Lydia is sleeping on the couch. Don is making dinner for his mother. Diminishing valency Diminishing valency involves shifting an argument from a basic to an oblique case. Passive voice and antipassive voice are prototypes of valence-reducing devices.[10]:72 This type of derivation is mostly used for transitive sentences. Since there are two arguments in the transition clause, there are two possibilities for reducing the valency of A and P: 1. A is denucleated and becomes oblique. Since there is only one main argument, namely the original P that becomes S, the statement is intransitive. This is exactly what the passive voice does. [10]:73 The semantics of this construction emphasizes the original P and downplays the original A, and is used to avoid mentioning A, focusing on P or the result of an activity. [10]:474 (a) Don (A) is cooking



dinner (P). (b) Dinner (S) is being prepared (by Don). 2. P is displaced from the nucleus and becomes oblique. Similarly, the sentence becomes intransitive and the original A becomes S. [10]:73 The semantics of this construction emphasizes the original A and lowers the original P and is used when the action involves the patient, but little or nothing is given to the patient. attention.[10]:474 These are difficult to convey in English. (a) Don (A) is crushing a can of soda (P). (b) Grain (S) is being crushed. [meaning the soda can is crushed]. Note that this is not the same as

an ambitransitive verb, which can be intransitive or transitive (see Criterion 4 below, which is not answered). However, there are some problems with the terms passive and antipassive because they have been used to describe a wide range of behaviors around the world. In conclusion, compared to the canonical European passive, the passive construction in other languages is justified by its name. However, when comparing passives across the world's languages, they do not have one common feature.

References:

1. Slesar Henry. Succes Machine. – London, A-star Books, 2011. – 104 p.
2. Stem Lawrence. The lovely lady and other stories. – Moscow; Prosveshenie, 2002. – P. 56.
3. Telegin L.A. Non-affix transposition and influence on the derivation process in modern English language. Dissertation of Doctor Philological Sciences. Abstract. – Samarkand, 1992. – P. 37.
4. Thompson A.J. and Martinet A.V. A Practical English Grammar for Foreign Students. – London; Oxford University Press, 1972.
5. Turniyozov N.K., Turniyozov B., Turniyozova Sh. Uzbek language derivation syntax. "Navruz" publishing house, – Tashkent: 2011. – P 3.
6. Turniyazova Sh.N. Derivative features of the text formation of the text language in modern Uzbek. Dissertation of Canditate Philological Sciences. Abstract. – Tashkent, 2010. – P. 46.
7. Wors D.S. Transformational analysis of constructions with the instrumental case in Russian // New in linguistics. – Vip.2. – Moskow: Progress, 1962. – P. 98- 114.
8. E.Voynich. The Gadfly. United States; Hard Press Publishing, 2013. – 373 p.
9. Xrakovskiy V.S. Transformation and derivation Text. / V. S. Khrakovsky // Problems of structural linguistics. – Moskow, 1972. – 599 p.
10. Yartseva V.N. The relationship between grammar and vocabulary in the language system // Research on the general theory of grammar. – Moskow: Progress, 1968.
11. Yusupov U.K. Theoretical bases of comparative linguistics. – Tashkent: Science, 2007. 125 p.