Syntactic Valence, Syntactic Relation

Shuxratova Yulduzxon Shakarbek Qizi
Teacher Of The Department Of Primary Education Methodology Of The Faculty Of Preschool And Primary Education Of Fergana State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Syntax (ancient Greek σύν-ταξις "composition", "coordination", "order") is a section of linguistics in which nominative and communicative linguistic units are studied: a sentence and a phrase. Literally translated syntax means not only composing, but also ordering, coordinating, combining words into a coherent text. The following article looks into the syntactic relations and valence in the English language.

KEYWORDS

Valence, subordination, coordination, predication.

INTRODUCTION

In linguistics, syntax is a set of rules, theoretical systems and linguistic processes that order and study the structure of sentences in any language. The purpose of much syntax is to establish syntactic rules that are common to all languages, and to learn how words can be

combined into phrases and sentences in different languages.

The syntactic units can go into three types of syntactic relations:

1. Coordination – syntagmatic relations of independence. SR1 can be observed on the phrase, sentence and text levels. Coordination may be symmetric and asymmetric. Symmetric coordination is characterized by complete interchangeability of its elements – pens and pencils. Asymmetric coordination occurs when the position of elements is fixed: ladies and gentlemen. Forms of connection within SR1 may be copulative (you and me), disjunctive (you or me), adversative (strict but just) and causative-consecutive (sentence and text level only).

2. Subordination (SR2) – syntagmatic relations of dependence. SR2 are established between the constituents of different linguistic rank. They are observed on the phrase and sentence level. Subordination may be of three different kinds – adverbial (to speak slowly), objective (to see a house) and attributive (a beautiful flower). Forms of subordination may also be different – agreement (this book – these books), government (help us), adjournment (the use of modifying particles just, only, even, etc.) and enclosure (the use of modal words and their equivalents really, after all, etc.).

Syntactic relations of subordination are accomplished by the following forms of connection: agreement (concord), government, adjournment, enclosure. As means of syntactic relations agreement presupposes formal correspondence between members of a syntactic group: a subordinate word agrees in number with its head word if it has different number forms at all, for instance, in this book - these books - that book - those books the demonstrative pronouns agree in number with their head word. In Modern English the sphere of agreement is restricted to two demonstrative pronouns - this and that, agreeing with their head word in number when they are used in initial position in a phrase whose head word is a noun. Other types of agreement, for instance, agreement of the verb with the noun or pronoun denoting the subject of the action (The bird sings, they sing) are controversial, since there are examples which prove that the verb does not always follow the noun in the category of number: The United States of America is the most powerful state. The United Nations is an international organization. My family is large. His family are writers. The above examples show that there is no agreement in number of the verb with the noun expressing the doer of the action: the predicate can be independent of the subject (the subject is plural - the predicate is singular if the doer of the action is understood to be singular). Government is a form of subordination when the head-word determines the grammatical form of its adjunct, the latter assuming the particular form, but not coinciding with the form of the head word itself. Government is used to describe relations between the governing verb and its object, and the governing preposition and its object. The object is to take the form required by the governing element. In English, it can be observed in verbal word-groups with the pronoun in the objective case: to see him (her, them). Government may be verbal or prepositional: to replace them, to hear about him. In Modern English government is restricted only to personal pronouns and to the relative and interrogative pronoun who when they are subordinate to a verb or follow a preposition: I saw him and told him about it (case government) I rely on my knowledge (preposition government). Who(m) did you see? Who(m) did you tell? The above examples show that the notion of government is doubtful due to the obvious tendency to use the forms him, her, them, me etc. outside their original sphere as forms of the objective case,

and as applied to the form whom, which is rather often superseded by the form who.Welcome to Gboard clipboard, any text you copy will be saved here.

Basic notions of pragmatic linguistics.

Predication (SR3) – syntagmatic relations of interdependence. Predication may be of two kinds – primary (sentence level) and secondary (phrase level). Primary predication is observed between the subject and the predicate of the sentence while secondary predication is observed between non-finite forms of the verb and nominal elements within the sentence. Secondary predication serves the basis for gerundial, infinitive and participial word-groups (predicative complexes).

3. The action performed by producing an utterance will consist of three related acts (a three-fold distinction):

1. Locutionary act – producing a meaningful linguistic expression, uttering a sentence. If you have difficulty with actually forming the sounds and words to create a meaningful utterance (because you are a foreigner or tongue-tied) then you might fail to produce a elocutionary act: it often happens when we learn a foreign language.
2. Illocutionary act – we form an utterance with some kind of function on mind, with a definite communicative intention or illocutionary force. The notion of illocutionary force is basic for pragmatics.
3. Elocutionary act – the effect the utterance has on the hearer. Perlocutionary effect may be verbal or non-verbal. E.g. I've bought a car – Great! It's cold here – and you close the window.

A phrase can be a sentence or part of a sentence, and the proposal can be realized in the form of a phrase, a number of related among themselves phrases and in the form of a separate word.

The concept of valency

Valence plays an important role in a number of the syntactic frameworks that have been developed in the last few decades. In generalized phrase structure grammar (GPSG),many of the phrase structure rules generate the class of verbs with a particular valence. For example, the following rule generates the class of transitive verbs:

VP → H NP [love]

H stands for the head of the VP, that is the part which shares the same category as the VP, in this case, the verb. Some linguists objected that there would be one such rule for every valence pattern. Such a list would miss the fact that all such rules have certain properties in common. Work in government and binding (GB)[15] takes the approach of generating all such structures with a single schema, called the X-bar schema:[16]

X′ → X, Y″...

X and Y can stand for a number of different lexical categories, and each instance of the symbol ′ stands for a bar. So A′, for instance, would be a kind of AP (adjective phrase). Two bars, used here for the complements, is thought by some linguists to be a maximal projection of a lexical category. Such a schema is meant to be combined with specific lexical rules and the projection principle to distinguish the various patterns of specific verbs.

The term "valence" is borrowed from French chemistry structuralism Teniers - i.e. it means the combination possibilities of the verb. Initially, the meaning of this term did not differ from the meaning "combination". A similar interpretation is typical now for the overwhelming most of domestic and foreign linguists. However, in the last time there was a tendency to narrow the meaning of the term "valence" and apply it either only to the area of the language level to indicate the potential for compatibility of linguistic units, or only for

designations of the speech realization of these abilities.

The influence of the semantics of one of the members of the phrase on the selection other components

The influence of the semantic content of one of the members of the phrase on the selection of units combined with it is diverse and may not concern only the semantic properties of the selected units, but also their grammatical characteristics. So, for example, the Russian dialect "single file" unambiguously predicts the plurality of participants in the action, since one cannot say "he walked in single file."

Similarly, in English, the adverb "together" is related to the concept plurality, for example, the combination "to walk together" predicts that the agent of this action cannot be single.

Finishing the section on the phrase, we emphasize that the phrase - it is a unit of syntax that occurs on the tier preceding proposal, and is a unit of a lower level than sentence. Unlike a sentence, a phrase does not have communicative orientation. Only by being included in the offer and becoming a part of it, i.e. functioning as part of a sentence member, a member sentences or a whole sentence, the phrase acquires the corresponding intonation pattern and receives the corresponding communicative load.

Unlike a sentence that can be expressed in more than just a group of words, but also a separate word, the minimum composition of phrases is not there may be less than two word units. Maximum composition phrases are theoretically not limited.

REFERENCES

1. M.J. Abdullaev. Methodology of application games in the training of young athletes // European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences Vol. 8 No. 11, 2020 ISSN 2056-5852. 115-122 pg. http://www.idpublications.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Full-Paper-METHODOLOGY-OF-APPLICATION-GAMES-IN-THE-TRAINING-OF-YOUNG-ATHLETES.pdf

2. M.J.Abdullayev, A.T., O.Yu. // Improving Methodology Of Action Games In Training Athletes Of Different Ages. European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine, 2021, Volume 8, Issue 1, Pages 806-813. https://ejmcm.com/article_6556.html

3. M.J.Abdullayev, O.I. Berdiyev, N.R. Omonova. Methodology Of Organization Of" Physical Education And Sports" Lessons In Higher Educational Institutions//The American journal of social science and education innovations (TAJSSEI) SJIF-5.857 DOI-10.37547/TAJSSEI Volume 3 Issue 02, 2021 ISSN 2689-100X. 3 (02), 312-320. https://usajournalshub.com/index.php/tajssei/article/view/2214/2105

4. Rasulovich Rakhmonov Rauf. Distribution of training loads at the stage of competitive preparation for middle runners. ACADEMICIA: AN INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL. 11(2) Pg: 744-753, Published: Feb 2021. https://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:aca&volume=11&issue=2&article=123

5. S.S.Tajibaev, M.J.Abdullaev, A.T.Niyazov, O.YuNiyazova. This article scientifically analyzes and substantiates the methodology of using movement games in the development of physical and psychological training of 11-12-year-old athletes in the primary training group //European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine,2020, Volume 7, Issue 6, Pages 2907-2914. https://ejmcm.com/article_5608_3a56479f513a4dc5aab3431fbae4dacb.pdf