

Article

Semantic Valency in Uzbek Speech: Syntactic and Lexical Connections in Verb Phrases

Sh. Akramov^{*1}, N. Tokhtasinova²

1,2 Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

* Correspondence: shukurjonakramov84@gmail.com

Abstract: This study examines the valency possibilities of expressions used in Uzbek speech, focusing on verb phrases and their syntactic and semantic connections. While prior research has primarily addressed valency in verbs, this work extends the analysis to include nouns, adjectives, and numbers. The study highlights a critical knowledge gap: the comprehensive understanding of subordinate-governor relationships and their role in the structure of Uzbek phrases remains underexplored. This research addresses the gap by analyzing verb phrases in terms of their ability to form connections and semantic relationships. The methodological approach combines linguistic analysis and the application of valency theory, focusing on the logical and syntactic connections within phrases. Key findings reveal that verb phrases demonstrate a higher propensity for forming connections compared to other word types, primarily due to their inherent syntactic dominance. Verb phrases are classified based on their linking potential—one-link, two-link, or three-link—and their ability to connect with possessors, complements, or clauses. Additionally, the study identifies significant differences in the valency behavior of transitive and intransitive verbs within phrases. The results underscore the importance of semantic valency in understanding Uzbek phrase structures, offering insights into the syntactic and semantic interplay of lexemes. Implications include enhancing the comprehension of Uzbek syntax and improving pedagogical strategies for teaching Uzbek as a language. This study provides a foundation for further exploration of valency theory in Turkic linguistics, contributing to a deeper understanding of the dynamic relationships between words in speech.

Citation: Akramov, S., Tokhtasinova, N. Semantic Valency in Uzbek Speech: Syntactic and Lexical Connections in Verb Phrases. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics* 2025, 4(1), 74-78.

Received: 25th Dec 2024Revised: 10th Jan 2025Accepted: 23th Jan 2025Published: 30th Jan 2025

Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Keywords: management, lexeme, connection, word expander, possibility of valency, language categories, sentence connection, semantic connection

1. Introduction

Control in linguistics has been a subject of study for decades, with researchers exploring its semantic, pragmatic, and syntactic aspects. Jackendoff and Culicover[1] emphasize the importance of semantics in control, distinguishing between unique, free, and nearly free control. They argue that in many cases, the controller is determined by semantic role rather than syntactic position. Ruzicka[2] supports this view, highlighting the role of thematic features in determining control behavior. Joseph[3] notes that control constructions are fundamental to language structure across diverse linguistic types. Historically, control has been differentiated from raising, with the former considered a construal process and the latter a movement operation [4]. However, Hornstein[4] challenges this distinction, proposing that obligatory control structures are also formed by movement, a perspective made possible by minimalist approaches to grammar.

Verb conjugation and syntactic relationships involve complex interactions between morphology, syntax, and semantics. Conjugation classes determine a verb's morphophonological shape through theme vowels, which are purely morphological

markers[5]. The concept of actants in semantics and syntax is crucial for understanding verb-argument structures, with semantic actant slots defined by both semantic and lexicosyntactic properties[6]. Word combinations in syntactic constructions can be simple or complex, with subordinate words typically preceding dominant words[7]. Recent changes in Russian language usage challenge traditional views on agreement, suggesting that linear or probabilistic agreement may occur when case forms are homonymous, leading to unexpected agreement patterns[8]. These findings highlight the intricate nature of verb conjugation and syntactic relationships, emphasizing the need for comprehensive analysis of morphological, syntactic, and semantic factors in linguistic research[9].

The word that creates the connection of the sentence is the ruler, and the expanding words come in the subordinate position[10]. For example, what did I eat? (meal) when? where (today)? (in the kitchen) with whom(what)? or what kind of food? (hot). I eat here, today, in the kitchen, with my brother, hot words (subordinate words or) are actants. In this case, the necessary connection of the next word in the phrase is combined with the initial connection of the previous word. Even so, under the terms "word valency" or "word-semantic connections" we mean the previous expanders of the word itself. Because the issue of subordinate-governor relations in the phrase is not resolved definitively, the interpretation of "next-governor" and "subordinate-governor", which has become a picture in Turkic studies, will continue to be followed. As can be seen from the above comments, the concept of "word valence" collides with the concepts of "word combination", "dominant word" and "subordinate word". This is not accidental, because the semantic connection (semantic connection) of the word occurs in speech in the form of syntactic connection (syntactic connection). The syntactic connection of words is embodied in word combinations. This is a phenomenon that has become an axiom in linguistics..

2. Materials and Methods

In Uzbek linguistics, the study of the semantic valence of the word has gained momentum in recent years. The study of such a connection in the interpretation of valence theory was first carried out in speech verbs, and then continued in case verbs. In his work, I. Kochkortoyev puts forward his ideas on the study of speech verb phrases as well as speech verb lexemes from the perspective of the theory of connection.

These scientists are based on logic (logic) from philosophical methods in the description of language phenomena. In this work, it is emphasized that it is important to explain language phenomena with language categories and at the same time to use the term connection instead of the term connection. Traditional syntactic terms (possessive, complement, referent, determiner, case) were used to describe the types and forms of conjunction. Conjunction is characteristic of all types of lexemes, but it is very strong in this verb. Because of this, linguists often focus primarily on verb lexemes.

3. Results

Linking is actually characteristic of all types of lexemes, but it is relatively strong in verbs, which, in addition to forming links with lexemes, also have the property of connecting with verb phrases through the possibility of linking. Since the meaning of phraseological expressions is equal to the meaning of lexeme (word), their connection is subject to the same law. Verb phrases are grouped according to the possibility of connection, such as one-link, two-link, three-link, and in terms of what parts and parts each of them forms a connection with. is separated. That is, verb phrases that can be connected with the possessor, and verbs that can be connected with complement, focus and case clauses from secondary clauses. It can also be learned in the form of phrases.

Verbal phrases that can only be connected with possessors are grouped in terms of being referred to a person and being referred to an object. In this case, the verb phrase is intransitive, intransitive, transitive and transitive, and affects their valence. For example, verb phrases with an intransitive verb in their composition are mainly two-membered, and

the intransitive member is represented by different types of units. Such an expression includes an intransitive verb that does not have a control and is used as an infinitive member: to add grain (who?), to stay late (who?), not to be short (who?).

In addition, there are also such phrases, which should be distinguished from the previous phrase given by the fact that the weak member is an adjective group: go big (who?), go without faith (who?), go hard (who?), come empty (who?), get down(who?), go well(who?), stay well(who?) like. The phrase "breathe a sigh of relief" (who?) expressed by a verb phrase also belongs to this type. Phrases with the verb "to speak loudly" and "to draw attention" also participate with an intransitive sememe that does not control the complement, even if its verb part is transitive.

The lexeme *tortmoq* is described in the "Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language" as a multi-meaning lexeme representing 18 meanings. This verb *leeksema* is transitive in most semes and often governs an indirect object. In the structure of the phrase to be vigilant, this verb lexeme participates with an intransitive sememe that does not control the complementizer, this sememe is given as 18 in the explanatory dictionary and is defined as "to change in some direction and acquire an appropriate characteristic", to the noble case it would be more correct to describe it as passing. It seems that if the verb part of the verb phrase has multiple meanings, it is tried to determine with which meaning it participates in the structure of this phrase. In the above-mentioned two types of verb phrases, the case is expressed by an adverb or an adjective, and in other phrases, it can be seen that the noun is expressed by a lexeme. In form, this article is singular, in the main agreement, and in content it means "to become": to pick a pig (who?), to swallow land (who?). In these phrases, the verb in the past participle form is represented by a lexeme or a verb combination: to lie down as a blanket (who?), to lie down with rust (who?). In some verb phrases, the verb is expressed by an intransitive verb that does not control the object complement, and the phrase includes a participle formed in the locative agreement: to stand in the middle (who?), to walk outside the soil in the compound case (who?). In many expressions, the verb is represented by an intransitive verb that governs an instrumental complement, and such a complement appears in the structure of the phrase. Such a tool filler is formed in the dispatch agreement. Such verb members are included in the structure of the phrase as follows: to fall - to be tempted (who?), to be confused (who?), to convulse (who?), to worry (who?), to despair (who?), to enter - to enter the road (who?), to enter the road (who?), to enter (who?), to sleep - to sleep, to dream (who?), to think (who?), to ride - to fulfill to ride (who?), to ride (who?).

Phrases with intransitive verbs that control the form of the exit agreement are also often found in our speech. The word form in this conjugation is basically equal to the instrumental complement: stay gives rise to 5 expressions - stay out of power(who?), stay out of sight(who?), stay out of sight(who?), stay out of ear(who?) to stay out of line (who?), and there are 2 phrases that come with to get down: to get off the throne (who?), to get off the saddle (who?), and also to get out: from humanism to come out (who?), like to come out of humor (who?). The word form in the conjugation of exit is equal to the case participle in the following expressions: to come from above (who?), to come from the sky (who?), to leave the world (who?), to come out of the ground (who?) and in the composition of such an expression is the case is also observed: passing away from the world (who?). In phrases, the verb to be is added to the part equal to the noun, and sometimes it also has the property of being added to the part equal to the adjective, and it is as if the adjective phrase is formed into a verb phrase. Another difference is that the first member is formed in the adverbial clause and becomes an instrumental complement: to be close to the eye (who?), to be cunning to the ready (who?), to be close to the eye (who?). *lmoq*(who?). It seems that here the instrumental complement is controlled by the adjective rather than the verb. In these phrases, a noun lexeme comes in place of an adjective: to be in love with ready-made soup (who?), not to be superior to the sky (who?). Here, too, horse

management takes place. The verb part of the phrase is intransitive and does not control the complement, so the verb phrase is connected only with the possessor.

Some expressions have two parts, and these parts are expressed differently: 1) they are made up of an independent verb and an auxiliary verb, the first part comes in the form -guncha: to shoot until lying down (who?). 2) it is equal to the case compound, the first part is used in the form of adverb, the case function is the count number, sometimes the adverb is used: one talk and ten laughs (who?), seven measure and one cut (who?). 3) it is equal to the case combination, the case participle is formed in the agreement of exit, the first part is in the form of the conditional subjunctive: if he comes from the garden, to come from the mountain (who?), even if he gets off the horse, not to get off the saddle (who?), walking on a branch, walking on a leaf (who?). 4) the first part is expressed by the repetition of the verb in the form of the adverb, and the second part is expressed by a compound with a complement, and in the composition of the uts, an instrumental complement participates in the agreement of departure: to be met with (who?). 5) the first part is equivalent to a predicative syntagm, its part is expressed by an intransitive verb, and the second part is expressed by a passive compound: the earth did not crack, and the earth did not penetrate (who?). 6) expressions expressed by the verb "to mean" are also among two-part expressions. The first part of the following expressions is in the form of a subjunctive. say (who?), say "Pain", say "Trouble" (who?), say "U", say "Bu" (who?). It is natural to meet expressions with intransitive verbs in our speech. In such phrases, the verb is originally transitive, and when it receives a subject object, it becomes intransitive, and therefore cannot control an objectless object. The construction of a phrase with such a verb as a participle is as follows: 1. It has two parts, and the case expressed by an adjective is participle: otsez ortanmak (who?). 2. Subordinate member is represented by an adjective compound and is equal to the instrumental complement formed in the departure agreement: to be hanged on a high gallows (who?). 3. In the three-membered case formed in the locative agreement, the object complement formed in the destination agreement takes part: to be caught on a hook when old (who?), to be fried in one's own fat (who?). 5. A sentence has two parts, both verbs are represented by the intransitive verb, and the first part is formed by the agreement of exit, and the second part is formed by the agreement of departure. to be caught (who?).

4. Discussion

One of the Russian linguists L.N. Chesnokova[10] in her treatise "Svyazi slov" also mentions two types of connection in word groups[11], that is, word groups that form a one-way connection and words with the possibility of two-way connection. had recognized the existence of his categories[12]. In particular, it is emphasized that if a noun phrase or an adjective acquires a two-way connection, the verb stands out as a typical representative of a one-way connection phrase[13]. In fact, the word group book-noun requires good, artistic and other qualifiers before it, and after it, it shows its duality by accepting lexemes such as read or write, take, which come according to its content[14]. Even if the verb lexeme is one-sided, it differs from other types of word combinations in that it preserves the specific patterns of the thought that should be expressed to a certain extent. That is, the lexeme to read is distinguished by the possibility of following several things and objects intended for reading, and also by the expression of a meaningful relationship without the participation of lexemes[15]. Probably for this reason, the linguist scientist Sh. Rakhmatullaev[16] shows that there are two types of connection in verb lexemes:

1. The verb lexeme connects another unit to itself, the connection is made. For example, a verb connects a complement to itself, a linking event occurs. In this case, if the verb is a conjunction, the complement is a conjunction.

2. The verb lexeme is connected to another unit, the connection is made. For example, the verb lexeme is connected to the possessor in the function of participle, a connection event occurs. In this case, the possessor is the linker, and the participle is the linker.
Conjugation has certain differences between verb lexemes and verb phrases.

5. Conclusion

So, these emphasized expressions are characterized by the fact that they are mainly referred to a person while entering into a relationship with the possessor. These expressions can be inflected and express the number form of the possessor: I will break the mountain, you will break the mountain, we will break the mountain. Some of these expressions have limitations: the expression to eat the meat of an unseemly calf (who?) and to cut off an ear if needed (who?) are used only in the II and III person. The valence possibilities of such expressions are important as they serve to clarify the place and role of words in the spiritual connection and to improve the student's skill in using words.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Jackendoff and P. W. Culicover, "The semantic basis of control in English," *Language*, vol. 79, pp. 517–556, 2003.
- [2] R. Rudolf, *Control in Grammar and Pragmatics: A Cross-Linguistic Study*, vol. 27. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 1999.
- [3] B. D. Joseph, "Diachronic perspectives on control," in *Control and Grammar*, 1992, pp. 195–234.
- [4] N. Hornstein, "Movement and control," *Linguistic Inquiry*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 69–96, 1999.
- [5] I. Oltra-Massuet, "Conjugation Class," *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, 2020.
- [6] I. Mel'čuk, "Actants in semantics and syntax I: Actants in semantics," *Linguistics*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 1–66, 2004.
- [7] S. Y. Yokubova and M. Khojiyeva, "Word combination and patterns of linguistic syntactic construction," in *E3S Web of Conferences*, 2024.
- [8] I. E. Kim, "Morphological, syntactic and semantic nature of agreement in Russian," *Verba Northwest Linguistic Journal*, 2023.
- [9] Sh. Akramov, *O'zbek tilining gap qurilishida to'ldiruvchi va hol valentlik aspektida*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: NDA, 1997.
- [10] Sh. Iskandarova, *Til sistemasiga maydon asosida yondashuv*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan, 2007.
- [11] H. Ne'matov and R. Rasulov, *O'zbek tili leksikologiyasi asoslari*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 1995.
- [12] U. Tursunov et al., *Ho'zirgi zamon o'zbek adabiy tili*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O'qituvchi, 1993.
- [13] R. Sayfullayeva et al., *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2005.
- [14] Sh. Rahmatullaev, *O'zbek tilida fe'l frazemalar bog'lashuvi*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: T. Universitet, 1992.
- [15] *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati*, 5 vols. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2005.
- [16] A. Abbasov and A. Fatullayev, "The use of syntactic and semantic valences of the verb for formal delimitation of verb word phrases," in *Proc. of L&TC*, vol. 7, pp. 468–472, 2007.