

THE CONCEPTION OF VALENCE AND ITS ANALYSIS.

Xashimov Abdumutalib Mamadaliyevich

A Senior teacher at Andizhan state university

E-Mail: abdumutalibxoshimov25@gmail.com +998911735013

Kuchkarov Iskandar Alisher o'g'li

A teacher at Andizhan state university

E-Mail: Ula20061985@gmail.com +998934261881

Annotation:

In this article, the valence of the atom is an unrealized possibility that requires conditions for its manifestation. Linguistic unit also has such a possibility of merging, it (that is, valence) also lives with the linguistic units themselves in the minds of the members of a particular language community is considered.

Keywords: valence, atom, syntactic, lexeme, lexical, grammar

Valency is actually a chemical term, applied in linguistics to a linguistic phenomenon, which is considered as the unemerged - attachment possibility of linguistic units. The chemical description of valency is as follows. For example, an oxygen (O) atom can bond to two other atoms of a different type. It is determined by the vacancy of two atoms in its electron shell. In the water molecule (H₂O), these vacancies are filled. Also, not only oxygen, but also hydrogen (H) has a valency, and its vacancy is one. Hence, it appears that the valence potential of both oxygen and hydrogen has become a reality in the water molecule, and they have an associative nature in the case of oxygen and a bonding nature in the case of hydrogen. A compound can form only when both atoms (hydrogen and oxygen) are compatible with each other. For example, hydrogen and gold atoms cannot combine to form a molecule.

The valence of the atom is an unrealized possibility that requires conditions for its manifestation. Linguistic unit also has such a possibility of merging, it (that is, valence) also lives with the linguistic units themselves in the minds of the members of a particular language community. For example, the lexeme arrow exists in a person's mind with several empty spaces, and it can appear in speech and

simultaneously attract as many conjunctions. It can be visualized in the diagram as follows (**Table 1**):

Who

What

To whom

read?

How

when

With what

For what reason

How much

In this case, interrogative pronouns refer to words that can be attached to the axis lexeme. This possibility is not given in direct observation and is hidden in the essence of the axis lexeme. But in the speech combinations of reading a book, reading every day, and reading a lot, these possibilities are realized one by one. In the following one, two of these possibilities were simultaneously realized in the first case, and three in the second case, a phrase was formed:

- 1) read the book quickly;
- 2) read a book quickly in the library.

Since the ability of the lexeme to connect in the mind is valency, its speech manifestation is a syntactic connection. So, valence is considered as a linguistic phenomenon, and syntactic communication as a speech phenomenon. They reflect all the opposite signs of language and speech. For example (**Table 2**):

Valence

Syntactic communication

Generality

Separation

The essence

The event

Opportunity

Reality

Reason

Consequence

Table 3

Valence

Syntactic communication

Free from materiality

Social

Social

Individual

Repeatable

Unique

A unit that complements the valence of a linguistic unit is also called an actant.

As mentioned above, the lexeme attached to the axis lexeme also has valence, just as the hydrogen atom has valence along with the oxygen atom. However, since the lexeme of the axis is in the dominant, attracting position, its valence is called the dominant valence, and the valence of the lexeme connected to it is called the subordinate valence.

Just as different atoms can be united only when they are compatible with each other, the linguistic unit should be compatible in terms of meaning and grammar. In other words, a connecting lexeme requires that the lexeme to be joined be compatible not only in meaning, but also in a grammatical form. Accordingly, valency is divided into lexical and syntactic layers.

Lexical valence. Lexical valence is the selection of semantically appropriate conjunctions of the linking lexeme. For example, the lexeme hangra cannot attract the lexeme bird, and the lexeme bird cannot fall into any space in each lexeme. Because they have no moral compatibility. In order for lexemes to be meaningfully compatible with each other, their meaning structures should contain similar meaning fragments - semes. For example (**Table 4**):

bird	sing
poultry	sound out
flying	bird-like
can sing	

It seems that in the meaning of the lexeme of a bird, the fragment of the meaning "can walk" is contained in the lexeme of the bird, and the fragment of the meaning "specific to the bird" is contained in the lexeme of the bird. This can be the basis for their formation of a compound.

Now let's compare the lexemes of bird and hangra in this way (**Table 4**):

bird	hang out
poultry	sound out
flying	donkey-like
can sing	

In these lexemes, as above, semantic compatibility is not observed. Therefore, the lexeme of hangra cannot attract the lexeme of bird to fill its valence, and the lexeme of bird cannot fill the empty place in the lexeme of hangra.

The valences of a lexeme can be narrow or wide. For example: the valence complement of the hangramok lexeme, which is the answer to the question of what - donkey, colt, hangi lexemes. Elements that complement this valency of the whining lexeme are the lexemes of horse, foal, bedou, and straw.

Sometimes connecting or conjunctive lexemes can form a conjunction in speech if their meanings are not consistent. For example, the artist "hangradi". In this case, the normative valence is manifested in a broken state, and a portable, figurative meaning emerges. But this is a purely speech phenomenon, not based on the linguistic essence of hangra and artist lexemes. Because the meaning of the lexeme artist is "artist", "singing-theatre" meaning, it does not have the meaning "hangra", the lexeme hangramoq has the meaning "donkey", "sounding", it has the meaning "artist", "singing" fragments are not available.

We tried to prove the lexical valence based on the sample taken from the noun and verb group. But the linguistic and lexical valency is characteristic not only of nouns or verbs, but also of other groups of words.

Syntactic valency. Syntactic valency The second side of lexeme valence is that the dominant lexeme requires subordinate lexemes to receive a certain syntactic form - agreement, auxiliary, adverbial, adjectival suffix. This governor is determined by the syntactic position and grammatical form of the lexeme.

For example, the grammatical form of the words (khatni) and (khat) in the syntactic devices Khatni wrote, Khat wrote is determined by the grammatical form of the main word.

Syntactic valence is closely related to lexical valence, if one changes, the other changes, and if one disappears, the other does not. For example, the lexeme etakla does not attract a noun in the case of departure (as in Halimga etakla). But if the lexeme etakla is formed with the accusative relative form -, the word form (Halimga)

can be drawn to it. The syntactic valency of such a lexeme etakla has changed. Although lexical and syntactic valence are interrelated, they often change. For example, in the Ashulachi "hangradi" combination, the syntactic valency is unchanged, but the lexical valency is updated. Such a case indicates that a figurative meaning has emerged. In the conjugations Khat wrote, Khatni wrote, the semantic valence is in place, but the syntactic valence has changed. This shows that different syntactic forms occurred. However, both of these changes are of a one-sided or spiritual tactical nature.

What if the change is both lexical and syntactic? This is where the derivation takes place. This can be confirmed by identifying the lexical and syntactic valences of the verb to open as evidence:

1. The student opened the book.
2. The book was opened by the student.
3. America was discovered by Vespucci.
4. The flower opened.

In examples 1 and 2, the meaning of the word (student) that complements the valences of the verb to open has not changed, but its syntactic form (student - in the main agreement, by student - auxiliary) has changed. Therefore, the semantic valence of the lexeme of open has been kept unchanged, but the syntactic valence has changed. This change was introduced by the passive participle suffix -il to the verb to open. In example 3, the semantic valence of the verb has changed, while the syntactic valence of the verb has remained unchanged.

Because the meaning of the word America does not correspond to the meaning of the verb to open. But the syntactic form is appropriate. In example 4, both the semantic and syntactic valences have completely changed. Because the word flower is not compatible with the verb to open. In addition, the syntactic form of the compound word (flower- head agreement) was changed as a result of adding the suffix -il to the verb ing.

So, it turns out that the linguistic valence of a lexeme is two-sided, the semantic side indicates the norm and limit of what kind of lexeme can be combined with it, and the syntactic side determines what grammatical suffix the connecting word takes.

Grammatical form valence. When a grammatical form is added to a lexeme, there is a serious change in their combinations. Before the word form -man was combined with the person-number suffix, that is, as a poet lexeme, it did not need to be

combined with the pronoun "I". Such a need arose when the suffix (-man) representing the meaning of person-number was adopted. This need is embodied in the suffix -man, it is the syntactic need, expansion requirement, i.e. valence, of the singular singular person-number suffix.

The grammatical form either expands or limits the linguistic (semantic and syntactic) valence of the lexeme to which it is attached. For example, a possessive suffix gives the possibility to enter into a subject-pointer relationship with another noun in the form of a demonstrative agreement to a word belonging to the group of which it is added. Therefore, it expands the syntactic possibility of the word it joins. The semantic and syntactic valence of a word form is wider than the linguistic valence of the lexeme that is the basis for this word form. Such a phenomenon can be seen in the combination of an intransitive verb lexeme with an accusative relative morpheme. Compare: The car drove. The child slept, sleep, walk verbs cannot be combined with an object without an object. But the driver drove the car, the mother put the child to sleep. Associating with an indirect complement gave valency to the lexemes yur, ukhla, the accusative morpheme, in other words, when it was added to the verb, that morpheme brought its valence. Some grammatical form narrows the linguistic valency of the lexeme to which it is attached.

For example, the passive and personal relative forms make a transitive verb intransitive, limiting its ability to combine with an intransitive object. To be sure of this, it is enough to compare the possibility of valency of the book lexeme in the ungrammatical and grammatically formed state (**Table 5**):

It's interesting

book

Big

Artistic

Ten

A lot

It's interesting

booklet

It's interesting

It's interesting

Ten

A lot

It is clear that in the above table, the combination of the book lexeme is limited by the plural form -s and diminutive suffix -cha. In the following sentences, we can be sure that the lexeme's ability to connect is expanded: 1. Halim read a book. 2. Halim taught his brother. Places of speech, today, another type of linguistics science - the classification and organization of species valence - is turned into an urgent issue of the day.

References

1. "The Roots of Human Aggression." Scientific American. Retrieved October 7, 2019 from Scientific American scientificamerican.com.
2. Top 3 Theories of Aggression". Psychology Discussion. Retrieved October 7, 2019, from psychology discussion: psychologydiscussion.net
3. "Disorder of aggressive behaviour": healthy children. Retrieved October 7, 2019 from Healthy Children: healthychildren.org.
4. S.D. Katsnelson O grammaticheskoy kategorii//Vestnik LGU, 1948.
5. A. Khoshimov. "The Human Sense" Bukh.DU. Methods and methodology of language research. 2009 pp. 37-40.
6. A. Khoshimov. "About Sense" OshDU. Memlekettik language. Reading and research. 1995, pp. 96-98.