



## **ATTITUDE TO THE ISSUE OF VALENCY IN UZBEK LINGUISTICS**

Mamarakhimov Sirojiddin Murtazaevich  
Trainee Teacher of Gulistan State University,  
Independent Researcher

### **Abstract:**

The issue of valency in Uzbek linguistics is one of the significant processes in word and sentence structure, which has remained at the forefront of linguistic studies. Valency examines the syntactic and semantic properties of words, exploring how they connect with other words, specifically what arguments (actants) they require and the types of collocations they form. In the Uzbek language, the study of valency requires a deep analysis of both semantic transformations and syntactic structures of words. This article investigates the peculiarities of valency in Uzbek, focusing on the actants within word combinations and their roles, as well as the distinctive features of the valency system. The paper reviews scientific perspectives and theoretical approaches to valency in the Uzbek language, and through analyzed examples, demonstrates the practical application of the valency system in speech.

**Keywords:** Valency, Uzbek linguistics, syntactic structures, semantic properties, word combinations, actants, linguistic analysis, syntactic-semantic processes, grammatical system, theoretical approaches.

### **Introduction**

The issue of valency plays a significant role in the study of word and sentence structure in linguistics. It encompasses the syntactic and semantic properties of words, how they connect with other words, and what arguments (actants) they require. The valency system reveals the structural features of language and shows how words change depending on the context. In Uzbek linguistics, this issue, especially concerning the construction of word combinations, their interconnections, and the role of each word in the linguistic system, requires in-depth analysis. Valency is unique not only syntactically but also semantically, helping to understand the complexity of grammatical processes in the Uzbek language.



On the issue of valence, more verb-related levels have been studied up to now. Particularly, the word in the function of participle receives its actants depending on the situation created by speech based on its valence, that is, its semantic parts are reflected. These act as part of a sentence. The actant of the current valency is also a specific part of the sentence. In a word, valency has become the intersection of grammar and lexis, syntax and semantics. It should not be forgotten that when talking about the logical parts of the lexical meaning of a word, only its denotation in its lexical meanings is meant. Only they create semantic valency, more precisely, lexical-semantic valency. Therefore, valency is approached from two points of view and studied in such types as semantic and syntactic.

Semantic valency is based on logical parts of lexical meanings of words. This part is semantically compatible with the logical part of the lexical meaning of another word. It is possible to give this word with a word whose parts match. This is its semantic valency. The possibility of words, especially verbs, should be mentioned separately here. They have the ability not only to name the action, but also to preview all the actors and participants of this action, the background and the whole situation. This possibility of the verb is explained as its semantic valency. It is a mistake to use this case only within the verb group. Since the words require one another in a sentence is a characteristic of other word groups. We aim to talk about this at work. Therefore, it is appropriate to assume that this possibility is also observed in words belonging to other categories. In this regard, it would be appropriate to analyze several examples. For example, when a noun phrase acts as a part of a sentence, it can attach other parts to it and make it dependent. For example, **Ma'lum** o'tliq qutidorning darvozasida otini to'xtatdi-da, o'ng oyog'ini uzangidan uzdi. [A horseman stopped his horse at the gate of the box and cut off his right leg from the stirrup]. In this sentence, the words "darvozasida" [gate] and "oyog'ini" [leg] belong to the noun group, and they are subordinate to the parts of the sentence that appear in the sentence. However, in order to fulfill the function of a subordinate clause in the structure of a sentence, it occurs as a result of a slight change in the position of word groups from the point of view of determining or completing the meaning of the clause. Otherwise, speech communication would not have occurred. In addition to the deviation of words from the norm, the use of word-forming adverbs, grammatical forms, and words that do not express lexical meaning are of particular importance.



The state of aggregation in word groups has a special appearance in the adjective word group. Since the words belonging to the adjective group are connected to all the word groups in the sentence, and are distinguished by the fact that they express its color, taste, shape, size, movement and smell. As a result, in this category, it can simultaneously express different signs and form the relationship of subordination in words. When it comes to the issue of special conjunction, the adjective phrase occurs in the sentence most often in the function of a participle, and in some cases in the functions of other parts of the sentence. For example, Qoramol bilan uvoq molga bu yerda to‘playdigan yem-xashagimiz bermalol. [The fodder appearing on these lands for cattle and small animals is much enough]. In this example, the word “bermalol” [much enough] is used as part of the sentence, so it connects all parts of the sentence. Adjectives can perform the function of connecting a part of a part even when it appears in other places of the sentence.

In the matter of valency, we can give examples of other word groups. For instance, Gazobodda gazning kindigi qayerdaligini aniqlab olgach, birdaniga uch joyga parma vishkasi tikladi.(I. Rahim, Taqdir.) [After finding out where the umbilical cord of gas is located in Gazabad, there was installed a drill bit in three places at once]. However, in this place, the unmarked pointer in the sentence is forming a compound together with the part of the sentence in the function of determiner kindigi [cord]. In this respect, it is implementing the phenomenon of cohesion. We can see examples like this with other words of the pronoun. For example, U [Azimjon] mastlikda hech kimni rioya qilmasligini mingboshi yaxshi bilar edi. (M. Ismaili, Ferghana) [He [Azimjon] knew very well that he would not respect anyone when he was drunk].

Logically, a word accepts certain textual parts depending on certain semantic features in semantic valences and does not recognize textual parts with other semantic features. We can also see this in the phraseology. For example, Tojiboyning Gulsumga jazmanligi sho‘g‘risidagi gaplar esiga shushib, tabiati biroz xira bo‘ldi. [He remembered the words about Tajiboy's crush on Gulsum, and his mood became a little bit gloomy] (P. Tursun, Teacher). O‘tmishda xalqimiz tabobatchilikda ko‘pgina turli giyohlar, dori-darmonlar ishlatganlar [In the past, our people used many different herbs and drugs in medicine]. (A. Rahimjanov, Headache). The word biroz ["a little bit"] in the first sentence formed a special inflection by attaching the word tabiati ["mood"] to itself, and the word ko‘pgina



["many"] in the second sentence fulfilled the legality in linguistics by attaching the word "medicine" to itself. Thus, the composition of substantive, that is, semantic valency is the composition of thinking, such as the predicate and its arguments, recorded in the terms of formal logic.

In short, "any syntactic connection is a manifested valency," Professor M. Mirtojiyev emphasized. Therefore, it is also possible to analyze the valency from a syntactic approach. In this regard, it shows that all word groups have the ability to connect words to themselves in some way. In fact, the question of valence arose because the words were connected to each other in a chain. Taking the views of European scientists as a basis, the French linguist L. Tenier considered that when he started working as an initial researcher of valency, he studied it as a syntactic valency. The scientist believed that the verb tense is at the center of the sentence and emphasizes that the possessor has not found its place as the main clause. In this case, the verb as a participle determines the possessor in the function of the actualizer – the first, the passive object – the second, the object object – the third order. We can see that valences are recorded in the same order according to the parts of this sentence. However, the fact that the scientist ignored other parts from the point of view of valence in the analysis of the sentence is because he did not analyze this level in depth. Researching the valency of the verb part with attention to such syntactic valence does not lead much beyond the traditions of syntactic analysis of speech. So, we can say that we have achieved some success. However, the presence of semantic-syntactic imbalance in sentence fragments causes certain difficulties. That is why the German linguist W. Bansio put forward the idea that there is only semantic valence. With this opinion, we consider him to be right and recommend not to include syntactic valence among the types of valence, which was mentioned in M. Mirtojiyev's scientific analysis.

In the monograph "Uzbek semasiology" published in 2010 by M. Mirtojiyev, we find the evidence that G. Helbig's ideas are compatible with Uzbek linguistics. In addition, the scientist noted that there is also a logical valency. "Logical valency," he points out, "is the relation between the concepts of language." In this case, the word, including the verb, cannot be formed on the basis of a certain scheme of the possible combination scheme. Its valence is realized through a logical approach to the concept represented by the meaning of this word, and accordingly, he tried to prove his word with the thoughts that the word combination is formed with its



actant. For example, the verb *vu kamst* [you came] in the German and *ты пришел* [you came] in the Russian do not have valency indicating the second person singular. It is logically known that these actions are performed by the second person. Accordingly, they entered into a syntactic relationship with pronouns denoting unity of the second person. As shown, logical valency is logically available for these sentences. However, it is very difficult to analyze and prove the existence of logical valency based on the facts of the Uzbek language, and Turkic languages in general. Because in the Uzbek language, if a sentence of *bordim* [went] is the smallest form, it is clearly a simple sentence. The verb in it is given in the first person singular. This is clear from the morphological form of the section. It is expressed through the pronoun *men* [I]. Through this participle, it is understood that there is a present tense. As a result, this simple sentence simultaneously expresses meanings such as when and where he went. In this case, the part itself is formed, and the fact that it directly has and connects secondary parts related to it, indicates that there are invisible connections. Accordingly, the actant expressing the past tense is realized. Such ideas are also expressed in candidate theses. It is noted that the tense of the verbs determines the time valence. This valency can also be applied to verb ratios. Because the semantics of the relative form of the verb introduces its valence in this verb. Observing this state in all proportions occurs in the process of determining which proportion it is. For example, in this ratio, the relation to the subject is expressed by the zero form, and the UGM of the form is "to indicate whether or not the action is performed by the person or object represented by the possessor": *Baxtiyor bildi, olim koʻrdi, Dilshod soʻradi, Karim aytdi, (qaytdi)* [Bakhtiyor knew, scientist saw, Dilshod asked, Karim said, (returned)], etc. The verb in this ratio can be transitive *oldi* [got] or intransitive *uxladi* [slept]. Verbs in such definite proportions express that the owner is directly attached to it. Therefore, the formation of the participle indicates the presence of the owner. Otherwise, the shape of the exact ratio would not have been formed. This zero form fully reflects the essence of the category to which it belongs in the UGM compared to others. It is known that all forms of the verb can be divided into two – marked forms that have a specific sign in the conflict between the forms within the category, and forms that do not have a clear sign in this conflict. This aspect explains that there is a question of valence in the exact proportion of the



verb. The first group of forms "specializes" a certain appearance from the UGM of the category to which they belong.

UGM of self-ratio - "combining the subject and object of the action, turning a transitive verb into an intransitive verb." In some cases, although the grammatical form is that of the subject, this form does not mean that the action returns to the doer, and that the doer is also the object of the action: 1. Bir mahal G‘ulomjon tuynukdan erinib chiqayotgan tutunga qarab **so‘zlandi**. (M.Ism.) [Once Ghulamjon spoke looking at the smoke coming out of the hole]. The fact that the verb "spoke" in the above sentence was in the personal relation led to the formation of the sentence in this way. At first, the words connected to the verb were formed, and at the next stage, the fragments connected to the part of the clause were formed. In this case, we designated the first stage with the letter [a], and found it necessary to designate the second stage with the letter [b].

- a.1) qarab **so‘zlandi**
- a.2) bir mahal **so‘zlandi**
- a.3) G‘ulomjon **so‘zlandi**
- b.1) tutunga qarab
- b.2) chiqayotgan tutunga
- b.3) erinib chiqayotgan
- b.4) tuynukdan chiqayotgan
- a.1) **spoke** looking
- a.2) once **spoke**
- a.3) Ghulamjon **spoke**
- b.1) looking at the smoke
- b.2) coming out of
- b.3) coming out of
- b.4) out of the hole

To the formation of the sentence at this level, to the perfect syntagmatic connection of words, the suffix -n is added, which expresses the ratio of identity. If it was possible to drop the relative adverb in this sentence or replace it with another adverb, a special speech unit would be formed. From the verb **so‘zlandi** [spoken] in the sentence, we can conclude that the words bir mahal [once], G‘ulomjon [Ghulamjon], qarab [looking] can be a special right-hand conjunction in relation to the word **so‘zlandi** [spoke]. In this case, the verb on the left side forms the category



of verbs, and these forms are characterized by the integral expression of the meanings of person, number, tense, inclination, affirmation/negation, and this meaning is not only with one suffix, but also with several can also be expressed with the addition. So, the participle in this sentence appears through the suffix -di, which expresses the meaning of time. After all, it covers all the meanings of the plant category. As independent verbs are assigned the task of connecting to words such as modifying verbs, proper nouns, and adverbs. However, the relative suffix in the independent verb is also important in the formation of the sentence. The reason is that when the relative adverbs in the part of the sentence are replaced by other relative adverbs, the structure and content of the sentence changes.

Bir mahal G‘ulomjon tuynukdan erinib chiqayotgan tutunga qarab so‘zlandi. [Once Gulomjon spoke looking at the smoke coming out of the hole]. This sentence is an indicative sentence in terms of the purpose of expression, it means “G‘ulomjon tutun bilan gaplashayotganligi” [“Ghulamjon is talking towards the smoke”], and it is created by adding a relative suffix to the pure verb. Within the ratio categories, in a specific ratio, the connection of words in the sentence and the semantic aspect of the sentence remain unchanged. However, the semantic and syntactic aspects of the sentence change in the passive, accusative, and unity ratios.

Bir mahal G‘ulomjon tuynukdan erinib chiqayotgan tutun bilan so‘zlashdi [Once, Ghulamjon spoke to the smoke coming out of the hole]. This sentence is a demonstrative sentence in terms of the purpose of expression, it means "Gulomjon is talking to the smoke", and it is created by adding a relative suffix to the pure verb. So, the semantic and syntactic aspects of the sentence are changed, precisely by the addition of the suffix that forms the ratio of unity. In particular, bilan komakchisi is a common auxiliary word. Its binding and helpful nature caused controversy among our scientists. For this reason, the opinion that "... va, bilan, hamda, shuningdek also belongs to the conjunctive type of the equal conjunction in the modern Uzbek literary language" was also put forward. But at this point it should be noted that the connecting function of bilan, va, ham has its own characteristic, which differs from the linking conjunction. This connector expresses the unity of persons or objects in the performance of an action, the meaning of the means in the performance of the action, the meaning of the moment, the meaning of the cause, the state of the performance of the action. In this sentence, it expresses the unity of persons or objects in the performance of an action. Therefore, the



adverb of departure in the lexeme *tutun* (*tutunga*) was dropped because it could not be connected with the suffix through its helper. Because the auxiliary *bilan* has the ability to connect only with the words in the main agreement.

Bir mahal *G‘ulomjon* *tuynukdan* *erinib* *chiqayotgan* *tutunni* *so‘zlatdi* [Once, *Ghulamjon* made the smoke coming out of the hole to speak]. This sentence is a demonstrative sentence in terms of the purpose of expression, "*Ghulomjon* was talking about the smoke", that is, it is meant to speak about an inanimate object, and it is created by adding an accusative relative suffix to a pure verb. So, the semantic and syntactic aspects of the sentence are changed, precisely by the addition of the suffix that forms the ratio of unity. In particular, due to the moderation of the independent word in relation to the sign of "relevance", a relative auxiliary is separated from the independent word. A relative auxiliary is similar to a semantically independent lexeme with one characteristic, a semantically independent lexeme with the second characteristic, and forms the third intermediate group. When a lexeme occurs as an independent lexeme, the sememe of the lexeme weakens its specificity and the sememe occurs as a grammatical meaning. The accusative relative form in this sentence restricts the use of the relative clause (-*ga*) and the clause according to. Because the helper with has the ability to connect only with the words in the main agreement.

Bir mahal *tuynukdan* *erinib* *chiqayotgan* *tutun* *so‘zlatildi*. [Once, the smoke coming out of the hole spoke]. This sentence is an indicative sentence in terms of the purpose of expression, "*tutun gapirtirgandi*" ["the smoke spoke"], that is, the person doing it is unknown, and it is assumed that it is not clear by whom it was done. It is caused by suffocation. In particular, the general grammatical meaning of the accusative ratio is "acquiring an action executor, introducing an "extra" executor into the process, and turning an intransitive verb into a transitive verb." Subjects of actions increase in proportion, and they are divided into direct and indirect subjects. So, the semantic and syntactic aspects of the sentence are changed, precisely by the addition of the suffix that forms the ratio of unity.

Basing on the analysis above, it can be stated that the logical-semantic valency, put forward by G. Helbig and repeated by some linguists, is characteristic of the verb word group and its framework, mainly for Indo-European languages, but it cannot be implemented in Turkic languages, including the Uzbek language too. It has been emphasized that it cannot be applied to the Uzbek language. Instead, it is shown



that word form semantics has valency in Turkic languages. It turned out that logical-semantic valency cannot be explained within the framework of verbs.

## Conclusions

In conclusion, the study of valency in Uzbek linguistics provides valuable insights into the syntactic and semantic properties of words and their interrelations within sentence structures. By examining the actants required by words and the types of collocations they form, this research highlights the complexity of the Uzbek language's grammatical system. The theoretical approaches discussed in this article contribute to a deeper understanding of valency, offering a comprehensive view of its role in shaping the structure and meaning of sentences in Uzbek.

## References:

1. Abramow, Boris A.. "Zum Begriff der zentripetalen und zentrifugalen Potenzen". Probleme der Sprachwissenschaft: Beiträge der Linguistik. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 1971, pp. 361-380. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110815986-020> (in German)
2. Bondzio, Wilhelm. "Valenz, Bedeutung und Satzmodelle". Beiträge zur Valenztheorie, edited by Gerhard Helbig, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 1971, pp. 85-104. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111350851-007> (in German)
3. Engel Ulrich, Tertel Rozemaria K. Kommunikative Grammatik Deutsch als Fremdsprache. München: Iudicium, 1993. — 343 S. ISBN10: 3891292538, ISBN13: 978-3891292532. (in German)
4. Grebe, Paul V. Der semantisch-syntaktische Hof unserer Wörter // Wirkendes Wort, 16, 1966. 6. S. 361-364. URL: [https://ids-pub.bsz-bw.de/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/1999/file/Grebe\\_Der\\_semantisch-syntaktische\\_Hof\\_1967.pdf](https://ids-pub.bsz-bw.de/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/1999/file/Grebe_Der_semantisch-syntaktische_Hof_1967.pdf) (in German)
5. Helbig, Gerhard. Valenz Semantik und Satzmodelle // Deutsch als Fremdsprache, 2, 1976. (in German)
6. Leise, Ernst. Der Wortinhalt. Seine Struktur im Deutschen und Englischen. — Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer UTB, 1953. — 146 S. (in German)
7. Philipp, Marthe. Semantik des Deutschen. 1 Auflage. – Weidler: Bucherlag Berlin, 1998. — 165 S. ISBN13: 978-3896933133. (in German)



8. Pottier, B. La définition sémantique dans les dictionnaires. Travaux de Linguistique et de Littérature. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1965. — 78 p. (in French)
9. Rahmatullaev, Sh., Yunusov R. Sememalarning semalar sostavi va semantic bog‘lanish masalasi // O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti, 1, 1974. — 51-53 b. (in Uzbek)
10. Sayfullayeva, R.R., va boshqalar. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. Toshkent, 2010. — B. 383-389. (in Uzbek)
11. Schippan, Thea. Einführung in die Semasiologie. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, 1972. — S. 30. (in German)
12. Кацнельсон, С. Д. Типология языка и теории валентности. Ленинград: Наука, 1982. — С. 47. (in Russian)
13. Миртожиев, М. М. Ўзбек тили семасиологияси. Тошкент: Mumtoz so‘z, 2010. — 288 б. (in Uzbek)
14. Mamaraximov, S. (2022). MAQSAD MA’NOSINI IFODALOVCHI DASTLABKI VOSITALAR. Academic research in educational sciences, 3(7), 376-385.
15. Rizaqulovich E. I., Murtozayevich M. S., Qizi N. O. A. OTNING XUSUSIY LUG‘AVIY SHAKLLARI HAQIDA //Central Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies. – 2024. – T. 1. – №. 3. – С. 26-29.