

## Questions of Syntagmatics in Syntax

**SOKHIBAKHON YAKUBOVNA ABDULLAYEVA**

Associate Professor,

Academy of Armed Forces of the Republic of Uzbekistan

**Annotation:** This article analyzes valence problems in modern German syntax. They tried to develop a system of basic sentence models based on the structural diagrams built on the basis of the syntactic valency of the predicate verb. Later, after establishing the structural diagram, an attempt was made to interpret it meaningfully.

**Key words:** valence problems, sentence models, through the verb, subject, complements, circumstances.

**Introduction:** The construction of a sentence, in addition to the special laws of syntax, depends on the possibility of combining lexical units with each other. Therefore, in terms of syntagmatics, the problem of valence, which is “the point of intersection of syntax and lexical semantics,” is of particular interest. The concept of valence in linguistics is still relatively new; it has become widespread only in the last 30 years - primarily under the influence of L.Tenier’s dependency grammar.

Valence, as is known, was first developed in French and then in German linguistics in relation to the verb, on the basis of the verbocentric theory of the sentence, while domestic linguists have always considered it in a broader sense. Valence was understood as the ability of a verb to have a certain number of open positions that are filled by certain elements. Initially, valence was defined only as a property of the verb, and compatibility was a broader concept and included valency.

One of the characteristic features of the theory of valence in the works of L.Tenier, and then J.Fourquet, H.Brinkman, W. Schmidt, P. Gerbe, L. Weisgerberg and other foreign linguists should be considered its combination with the verbocentric theory of the sentence, according to which the verb (predicate) is the absolutely dominant member of the sentence. “The primacy of the predicate is emphasized by the fact that it is the bearer of predicative categories (tense, modality, and others) and acts as the organizing unit of the sentence: through the verb, other members of the sentence are related - the subject, complements, circumstances.”

This approach is characterized by the fact that

- valency is considered only as a property of the verb;

- valence is quantitative in nature, in terms of the number of “required participants”;
- the qualitative characteristic of “participants,” called “distribution,” concerns their morphological and semantic properties, but is not determined by their syntactic role in the sentence.

**Main part:** However, after a certain time, changes are observed in foreign linguistics. There is a tendency to connect valence (the number of “participants”) with the meaning of the statement.

G.Helbig, based on this, defines valence as “the abstract relationship of the verb to the elements dependent on it.” At the beginning, it was not clear to what level valence should be attributed, whether we are talking about valence as a formal or conceptual category, a category of expression or content. This question at first glance is associated with an alternative: either valence is a formal property and can thus be considered in relation to distributive syntactic facts in each individual language, or it is a property of a conceptual nature and as such is universal and is the subject of relational logic.

In the mid-60s, this apparent alternative began to emerge; two different options in the interpretation of the concept of valence were clearly defined: on the one hand, it began to be considered as a formal phenomenon at the level of expression, on the other hand, as a phenomenon of a conceptual-universal nature.

After the two interpretations were initially opposed to each other, eventually the discussions revealed the possibility and necessity of distinguishing different levels of valence that stand in a certain relationship.

Their relationship is most clearly and logically presented in the work of M. D. Stepanova and G. Helbig “Parts of speech and the problem of valence in the German language.”

It says that if we proceed from the fact that there is a dialectical connection between reality, thinking and language, then the phenomena of extra-linguistic reality represent an object of mental reflection and at the same time the basis for the motivation of linguistic structures.

And then logical judgments, as a reflection of the phenomena of reality in thinking, represent a connecting link between the phenomena of reality and the semantic-syntactic structure of language. The phenomena of reality reflected in consciousness are expressed in the form of structures of statements, that is, as logical predicates with one or more open positions. The presence of one, two or more arguments to a predicate depends on its conceptual content.

Since we, in this case, are dealing with mental relations between logical predicates and arguments, we can talk about logical valency. “Logical valency has an extra-linguistic and universal character and is a reflection of the relationships between extra-linguistic phenomena.”

“Arguments to certain predicates are filled with corresponding variables belonging to certain semantic classes (for example: agent, patient, addressee) - in this case we have semantic valence.” Semantic valence reflects the fact that the verb (as a carrier of valence)

requires certain context partners with certain semantic features and excludes other context partners with other semantic features. Moreover, the selection is carried out on the basis of the compatibility or incompatibility of the characteristics of both contextual partners, which are motivated by phenomena of reality. Thus, semantic valence consists of limiting selectivity, regulated by the compatibility of contextual partners.

Arguments, which are represented in a certain way by morphological-syntactic structures (certain members of the sentence and parts of speech in a certain form), represent syntactic valency. Syntactic valence considers the obligatory or optional filling of open positions determined by the valency carrier in each individual language. It thereby regulates the filling of existing logical-semantic open positions with obligatory or optional actants and their syntactic-morphological representation by parts of speech in certain cases or surface members of the sentence.

Thus, we see that there is a relationship between syntactic and semantic valency, and the semantics of the verb is the main factor determining the number and syntactic function of arguments. But what we define as syntactic valence characterizes only the formal (structural) side. Therefore, we must consider semantic valence as content, and syntactic valence as a form of expression of semantic valency.

All that has been said can be summarized as follows:

- logical valency – extra-linguistic relationship between conceptual contents
- semantic valency is revealed based on the compatibility and compatibility of semantic components
- syntactic valence provides for obligatory and optional occupancy of open positions of a certain number and type, different in individual languages.

However, it should be noted that semantic valence is largely considered from the point of view of the logic of relations, that is, the logic of predicates. Logical relations are also used to describe semantic relations. Therefore, semantic and logical valency are often combined into one type and we can thus speak of logical-semantic valence as a whole. It should be noted that “logical-semantic valence, as Helbig writes, predetermines syntactic valence but in no way establishes it definitively”

It should also be noted that different types of valency are sometimes spoken of. However, this statement is not true, because these are not separate phenomena, but different aspects of one phenomenon. After all, a verb with valency acts as a form of expression of a semantic predicate. And the semantic predicate determines not only the number of arguments, but also their semantic function, and their role in the situation as a whole, which is represented by this semantic predicate.

According to the verbocentric theory of sentences, it is the verb in the predicate function that determines the entire structure of the sentence. As a carrier of valence, it assumes the presence of open positions around itself. In this case, the nominal members of the sentence in relation to the valency of the verb are divided into two groups: elements presupposed by valence - “actants” and elements independent of it - “free distributors”. Among the actants, in turn, mandatory and optional elements are distinguished.

Thus, obligatory and facultative actants belong to the necessary members and are connected with the verb by a valence fixed in the positional plan of the verb, and therefore their number and character can be established.

Free distributors with a verb are not connected, are not limited quantitatively, and therefore can be freely omitted and added in the syntactic structure of each sentence.

To fill open positions with a verb, only all necessary members are used. However, this statement is insufficient, namely: to distinguish between actants and free distributors, G. Helbig uses a number of “operational criteria”: techniques of elimination and substitution, deployment of an element into a sentence, changing the order of words, isolating an element from a sentence, and others.

Moskalskaya tries to overcome this shortcoming in her works, who recognizes that any model, taken as a basis on a structural basis, breaks down into several models depending on what semantic features this model contains. At the same time, Moskalskaya rightly emphasizes that the unit of modeling should not be the structural diagram of the sentence, but the structure of the meaning of the sentence.

However, it should be noted that both Moskalskaya and her predecessors did not take into account the symbolic nature of the sentence. They tried to develop a system of basic sentence models, relying on structural diagrams built on the basis of the syntactic valence of the verb acting as a predicate. Then, after establishing the structural diagram, attempts were made to interpret it meaningfully. When constructing structural and structural-semantic models, language and thinking were taken into account, but reality was omitted, and the object being described was absent.

The fact is that the sentence is a complex sign. The role of the extralinguistic denotation of a given sign is performed by the situation, event or fact of reality it describes, usually including the action, state or attitude of the participants. The exponent of a given sign is its syntactic structure. In terms of content, the exhibit must have some meaning.

**Conclusion:** Thus, a sentence always describes a certain segment of reality, and when generating a certain statement, we start from a real or imaginary situation, comprehend it and consolidate it as a result of cognition in a certain syntactic structure. Modeling of a sentence should also be carried out in this sequence.

## REFERENCES

1. ABDULLAYEVA SOKHIBAKHON YAKUBOVNA. (2021). FORMATION OF LOCAL BUDGET REVENUES IN THE MODERNIZATION OF THE ECONOMY. *JournalNX - A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal*, 6(10), 189–191.
2. Sokhibakhon Yakubovna Abdullayeva. (2021). THE EFFECTIVE USE OF VIDEO TASKS IN THE GERMAN LANGUAGE LESSONS. *Emergent: Journal of Educational Discoveries and Lifelong Learning (EJEDL)*, 2(08), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/QG2X7>
3. Hamidov, X. ., & Abdullayeva, M. . (2024). Alternative Versions and Functional Characteristics of Phraseologists in Uzbek. *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION*, 4(3), 51–54.
4. Djampulatova, N. (2023). THE ROLE OF THE COACHING APPROACH IN

TEACHING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE. *Journal of Academic Research and Trends in Educational Sciences*, 2(1), 191-195.

5. Yuldasheva N. K., Djampulatova N. M. TALABALARNING KOMMUNIKATIV RIVOJLANISHI KONTEKSTIDA KOUCHINGLIK MODELI //Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences. – 2022. – T. 2. – №. 11. – C. 915-920.

6. Djampulatova, N. (2022). Ways to improve communicative competence in English in creating an integrative learning environment.

7. Djampulatova, N. M., & Khazratkulova, O. A. (2021). SELECTION OF TECHNIQUES FOR THE COACHING APPROACH IN IMPROVING COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN MEDICAL ENGLISH. *Central Asian Journal of Medicine*, 2021(3), 142-149.

8. Teshaboeva, Ziyoda. (2020). Comparative Analysis Of English Translations Of Phraseological Units In "Baburname". 221-235.

9. Teshaboeva, Ziyodakhon Qodirovna. "A Cognitive Study of "Baburname"’S Translations and Principle of Compiling a Textual Dictionary." *Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results* (2022): 1994-2006.

10. Rakhmanberdiyeva K. S. et al. Technologies Of Organizing Independent Education In Teaching Students Foreign Languages (In The Case Of Non-Philological Universities) //Boletín de Literatura Oral-The Literary Journal. – 2023. – T. 10. – №. 1. – C. 4005-4010.

11. Shokirov, Polat Karimovich. "Effective Organization of the Science of Physical Education." *International Journal of Formal Education* 3.2 (2024): 399-402.

12. Makhsudakhon Abbasovna Saidova. (2021). DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS ' ORAL SPEECH IN GERMAN LANGUAGE WITH THE HELP OF PREZI PROGRAM. *Journal of Central Asian Social Studies*, 2(01), 75-79. <https://doi.org/10.37547/jcass/volume02issue01-a12>

13. Zilola, I., & Makhsuda, S. (2020). Modern teaching techniques in education. *International journal of Engineering Science and Computing*, 10(4), 25440-25446.

14. Abbasovna, S. M. (2022). Determine pragmatic competence by listening in practical sessions. *Journal of Academic Research and Trends in Educational Sciences*, 1(6), 139-142.