

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2022 Issue: 03 Volume: 107

Published: 09.03.2022 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Nabira Karjaubaevna Kerimbayeva

Karakalpak State University

teacher of the interfaculty Department of Foreign Language

Ziyada Marat qizi Kaliknazarova

Karakalpak State University

second course master

SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION OF DIVALENT AND MONOVALENT ACTION VERBS IN ENGLISH

Abstract: One can talk about the semantic valence of the verb, as well, where valence here refers to the number of semantic arguments that a particular verb can take, and semantic analysis, semantic Analysis. Semantic analysis is one of primary techniques that lead to the understanding of natural language. Syntax is the grammatical structure of the text, where as semantics is the meaning being conveyed.

Key words: Grammatical structure, primary techniques, natural language, semantic arguments, valence, semantic analysis, Syntactic Semantic Analysis.

Language: English

Citation: Kerimbayeva, N. K., & Kaliknazarova, Z. M. (2022). Semantic classification of divalent and monovalent action verbs in English. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 03 (107), 190-192.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-03-107-11> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2022.03.107.11>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

Monovalent verbs are “verbs that open up space for a single companion, which is the subject”. This model can be represented by the following diagram:

Syntax Structure 1: Subject + Verb (S-V)

Monovalent verbs are usually called “intransitive” and the class of such verbs seems to be very large. However, we will have to exclude from this class those verbs which open a position for a second satellite but may omit it, with or without the possibility of recovery. It is more expedient to consider such verbs as bivalent or having mixed valency. In fact, true intransitive verbs have not even hundreds, but only dozens of examples in the English language.

The semantic range of monovalent verbs is limited to a small number of types. In general terms, “the meanings of intransitive verbs reflect the actions that any one object (or group of objects) can perform without interacting with anything or anything.” A number of actions performed by animate objects are indicated by monovalent verbs reflecting physical actions, such as bark, blink, cough, curtsy, faint,

graze, howl, neigh, sleep, smile, sneeze, sweat, run, urinate, vomit, yawn, and also some more specialized verbs of intellectual activity, such as matriculate, prevaricate. Inanimate objects are more limited in their actions: thus we find, on the one hand, verbs with a more specific meaning, such as abate, elapse, flow, tinkle, for each of which a certain subject is assumed, and on the other hand, verbs with a general meaning, which can be attributed to a large number of active objects, for example, a verb such as waste. Some verbs that have an even more general meaning, such as the verbs collapse, decline, reappear, vanish, which can be applied to both animate and inanimate subjects.

In Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, the following examples of this syntactic structure were selected:

Every savage can dance.

Sir John smiled.

Mr. Dean bowed.

Jane sighed.

I should imagine not.

I am not sleeping.

Transitive verbs are those that express actions

Impact Factor:

SIRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

that are directed directly at objects. In a sentence, transitive verbs are usually followed by nouns or pronouns denoting the objects to which these actions are directed. These nouns (pronouns) act as a direct complement to the transitive verb and answer the question of whom? what? Transitivity is a grammatical category of a verb that expresses its aspect. From this point of view, the transitive verb is two- or more valent.

Transitive verbs open position for a direct object in a sentence. Thus, the syntactic structure of such sentences will look like this:

Syntax Structure 2: Subject + Verb + Object (S-V-O)

This syntactic structure, with a direct object, is undoubtedly very common. Therefore, it is not surprising that in its relation we will find many semantic examples. Here are some of the most common transitive verbs in English: answer, attack, begin, believe, break, call, carry, cause, change, collect, continue, dig, draw, drive, end, feel, find, follow, get, grow, hold, keep, know, leave, like, light, love, move, need, open, own, pass, question, run, see, touch, win. Some of these verbs are of mixed valency and therefore may appear in other patterns: for example, verbs such as begin, break, etc. also used as intransitive (in Syntactic Structure 1).

In *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen, the following examples correspond to this syntactic structure:

Mr. John made no answer.

I honor your circumspection.

The girls stared at their father.

The Lucases had several children.

A variation of this syntactic structure is the following structure, which also occurs quite often:

Syntactic structure: Subject + Verb + Predicative (S-V-P)

In its composition, the subject and the verb are accompanied by a predicate, which can be either an adjective phrase (adjective phrase) or a nominal phrase (noun phrase).

Mr. Darcy looked rather sad.

How can you be so teasing?

The notion of semantic original valency comes from the fact that verbs require certain contextual partners with manifestations of meaning manifestation, while other contextual partners with some revealed meanings are found.

Thus, it can be explained, for example, that a sentence like Peter sometimes dies, despite a syntactically flawless construction, semantically impossible, because the verb "to die" is a single exact event, which, on one occasion, cannot be associated with an adverb that closes the action. Moreover, semantic valency allows for "tolerance" or "intolerance" signs of the meaning of the verb and its participants.

Unlike logical and semantic valency, syntactic

valency implies the obligatory or optional filling of "empty cells" in accordance with the growth and appearance of the participants".

Of course, these different types of valency are closely adjacent to each other. But they don't affect. For example, the English verbs "help" and "support" have both meanings in terms of semantic content, but they have different meanings in syntactic realization - help + dative case, support + accusative case. The same majority of game consoles show up with other languages.

Semantic valence allows the combination of vocabulary units in the presence of one specific semantic feature in a word, lexical valency allows the combination of words only with a certain number of words, syntactic valency refers to the ability of individual vocabulary units to control others or be controlled.

When determining lexical and semantic valency, one cannot limit oneself only to stating a strict selection of lexical material. It should be noted that lexical valence is associated with such extralinguistic factors as the logic of thinking and the "sense of language".

"Sense of language" does not have a single definition, and those that are present in linguistics are vague. Therefore, it seems that in a complete characterization of lexical and semantic valence, it is necessary to mention not the "sense of language", but the lexico-semantic tolerance of vocabulary units.

B. M. Leikina expands the concept of valency, referring the latter not only to the word, but also to other linguistic elements. She distinguishes between linguistic probability and valence. "Valency is a fact of language. It is not the possibilities of connections that appear in speech, but the connections themselves - the realization of valency.

V. Admoni considers both concepts synonymous. Indeed, the connections themselves appear in speech, i.e. implementation of valencies. But we should not forget that "when analyzing a word (dictionary unit) for valency, we mean not only "realization", or rather realized valence, but also the one that is "dormant". Thus, in a complete analysis of the valence of any dictionary unit, one should also talk about the "potential realization of valency". This may be a little used or even only a possible fact of the realization of valency.

Considering valence from the position of three types (logical, semantic and syntactic), we mean a verb. This preference for the verb is justified by the fact that the verb is, as it were, a core unit around which the other members of the sentence are concentrated.

The functions of the verb and its nature lies, as it were, in the center of attention. Therefore, the questions of the valency of the verb today are developed especially fully. But this does not exclude the possibility of considering valency and other parts

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 6.317	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582	PIHII (Russia) = 3.939	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 9.035	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

of speech.

References:

1. Slesar, H. (2011). *Succes Machine*. (p.104). London, A-starBooks.
2. Stem, L. (2002). *The lovely lady and other stories*. (p.56). Moscow; Prosveshenie.
3. Telegin, L.A. (1992). *Non-affix transposition and influence on the derivation process in modern English language*. Dissertation of Doctor Philological Sciences. Abstract. (p.37). Samarkand.
4. Thompson, A.J., & Martinet, A.V. (1972). *A Practical English Grammar for Foreign Students*. London: OxfordUniversityPress.
5. Turniyozov, N.K., Turniyozov, B., & Turniyozova, Sh. (2011). *Uzbek language derivation syntax*. "Navruz"publishinghouse, (p.3). Tashkent.
6. Turniyazova, Sh.N. (2010). *Derivative features of the text formation of the text language in modern Uzbek*. Dissertation of Candidate Philological Sciences. Abstract. (p.46). Tashkent.
7. Wors, D.S. (1962). Transformational analysis of constructions with the instrumentalcase in Russian. *New in linguistics*, Vip.2, Moskow: Progress, pp. 98-114.
8. Voynich E. (2013). *The Gadfly*. (p.373). United States: Hard Press Publishing.
9. Xrakovskiy, V.S. (1972). Transformation and derivation Text. Problems of structural linguistics. (p.599). Moskow.
10. Yartseva, V.N. (1968). *The relationship between grammar and vocabulary in the language system*. Research on the general theory of grammar. Moskow: Progress.
11. Yusupov, U.K. (2007). *Theoretical bases of comparative linguistics*. (p.125). Tashkent: Science.