EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF LIFE SAFETY AND STABILITY (EJLSS)
ISSN 2660-9630
www.ejlss.indexedresearch.org Volume 16, 2022 ||

The Influence of Valence on the Peculiarities of the use of Marked and Unmarked Adverbs

Alisher Isomiddinovich Nabiyev
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Teacher of the department of English Philology

Abstract: *this article deals with the influence of valence on the peculiarities of the use of marked and unmarked adverbs, author provides several examples on valence and gives notions of prominent linguists.*

Keywords: *addressee, valence, valence structure, syntactic valence, semantic valence, active valence.*

Date of Submission: 6-03-2022 ***Date of Acceptance: 7-4-2022***

Valence, the ability of a word to be combined in a text with another linguistic unit, primarily with another word. The term was introduced into linguistics by L. Tenier and was originally applied only to verbs [1]. For example, the verb to ask suggests that it may indicate the petitioner (the one who asks), the subject of the request (what or what is being asked for) and the addressee of the request (the one who or from whom is being asked). Therefore, it is said that the verb "to ask" is trivalent (who, whom, about what); cf.: the duke asked the king for mercy. The set of valences of a verb forms its valence structure. The valences, as they say, are "filled in"; the placeholders of the valences of a word are called its actants. In principle, a word can be valent not only to another word, but also to a phrase or even a sentence, cf.: to ask to pardon all relatives or to ask him to pardon all relatives of the executed.

Valences are usually ordered by numbers: the first is called the subject, the second is the valence of a direct object, and the subsequent order is freer. However, if there is no "canonical" first or second valence of the word, its number passes to the valence following in order; so, for the verb to laugh, the first will be the valence of the subject (who laughs), and the second will be the valence of an indirect object expressing an incentive to laugh (at whom /what laughs).

In the beginning, when the term "valence" was just entering linguistic terminology, it was applied to the description of the superficial, syntactic connections of the verb. In general, in world linguistics, where the term "valence structure" is not widely used (cf. the competing term "argumentative structure"), this understanding has mostly been preserved until now, but in the tradition of the Moscow Semantic School, the concept of valence has received significant development.

Firstly, within the framework of this theory, it is believed that obligatory connections, similar to verb ones, are inherent in other parts of speech – in particular, adjectives (cf. angry who, at whom, for what: Pete returned, angry at me / for being late) and nouns (Herman's sister). Secondly, due to the fact that the syntactic connections inherent in the word may not be mandatory (this is especially true for verbs that are able to syntactically subordinate various kinds of optional circumstances –

time, place, cause, etc., cf. returned in the evening / with a friend / due to bad weather, etc.), the concept of optional valence was introduced. Thirdly, it became clear that the syntactic relations of a word are determined by its semantics. A word with syntactic valences always correlates with a situation that has a certain set of obligatory participants; these participants are expressed superficially with the word, filling in syntactic valences – thereby syntactic valences explicate those semantic relations that link the name of the situation and the names of its participants. It follows from this that we can talk not only about syntactic, but also about semantic valences of the word.

Semantic valences correspond to mandatory variables in the interpretation of the word. In turn, these variables arise in interpretation as "heirs" of semantic valences of simpler predicates included in the interpretation. Sr. builder = 'the one who builds'; the predicate to build is divalent ('who builds what') – the predicate name derived from it, the builder itself fills in its first, subject valence and retains the object one, cf. to build a subway – metro builders. The procedure of inheritance of semantic valences explains their nature, but the nuances of this procedure have not yet been studied on any representative linguistic material. In particular, the differences in the superficial design of the original and inherited semantic valences have not yet been explained, cf. the court as a derivative of the predicate name from the verb to judge, but to judge whom (over whom), but the court over whom (whom).

Unlike syntactic ones, semantic valences turn out to be semantically filled and differ not just by numbers, but by the type of semantic relation expressed and, thereby, appear to be analogous to semantic roles. At the same time, the number of semantic roles varies within a dozen – whereas in the now classic book by Yu.D. Apresyan, 25 types of semantic valences are distinguished, among which are the valences of the subject (the train is moving), the counterparty (to defend against the spaniel), the recipient (to give to children), the addressee (to inform the president), the result (to turn into water), period (vacation for two months), quantity (more per meter), etc. Such a list may contain a more fractional classification of types of valences – the degree of fractionality in this case is limited by the following condition: similar valences are considered different if they occur as part of the valence structure of one word. Such are, for example, the valence of the instrument and the means (to write with a quill pen in black ink), the counterparty and the intermediary (to buy from the company through an agent), etc [2].

Theoretically, all types of valences could occur with one lexeme – after all, the number of valences in a word is, in principle, unlimited. One valence has, for example, the adjective beautiful, which requires specifying only the bearer of the attribute (who is beautiful). Meanwhile, the average number of valences of a word is rather 3-4. The "multivalent" verb is considered to be a six–place verb to send (who, whom, from where, to where, for what purpose, for what period) and other verbs of causation of displacement, cf. to take (who, whom / what, on what, from where, where, on what route, why), however, the number of mandatory semantic valences allocated with them does not exceed. At the same time, superficially with this word and these seven do not necessarily have to be expressed all at once. Namely, semantic valence may remain unexpressed for the following reasons. Firstly, it can be filled anaphorically, cf. – Where is the firewood from? – From the forest: the father, you hear, is chopping, and I take away where the valence of the starting point (from the forest) and the valence of the object (firewood) of the verb to take are expressed in the previous sentence, and the valence of transport is even earlier (I look, a horse carrying a load of brushwood is slowly climbing the mountain). Secondly, the valence can be filled deictically – this is the valence of the final point in the example just given, understood as 'taking home', i.e. to the place where the speaker thinks of himself. Thirdly, valence may not be expressed as insignificant in this situation, cf.: he took the child to school, where transport is implied, but not expressed precisely as insignificant for the speaker. Finally, the valence can be filled once and for all in the interpretation itself, and therefore not be expressed superficially (in such cases, they talk about a fixed or

incorporated actant – see actant for more details), cf. the verb to take (took money from the safe), which implies that the money was in the hands of the one who took it.

It follows from this that the relationship between semantic and syntactic valences does not mean their obligatory one-to-one correspondence: a word may have fewer syntactic valences than semantic ones. However, there may be more of them – due to the effect, which is commonly called valence splitting.

With this splitting, the verb receives an additional syntactic valence, which corresponds to the semantic valence of one of its actants. Thus, the valence on this actant is split into two, one of which is expected for this verb, and the second is "superfluous". For example, the word scratch has an object valence, which is usually filled with the names of body parts, cf. scratching the ear/ back, which, in turn, have a valence on the "owner" of a body part – a person or an animal. As a result of splitting, scratching gets not only a direct object, but also an indirect one in the dative case, expressing the owner affected by the action (scratching the cat's ear, cf. also another distribution of syntactic connections in this splitting: scratching the cat behind the ear). Examples of other verbs that allow splitting of valence: stroking a child on the cheek stroking the cheek of a child; comparing a new and old car by power, comparing the power of a new and old car; looking into her eyes, looking into her eyes; checking seeds for germination, checking the germination of seeds.

In a sense, the syncretic expression of valences is opposite to splitting: in this case, one form combines the expression of two semantic relations. For example, transport in the verb to go (to go by car) combines a place and a means of transportation, and the prepositional combination about a towel in the verb to wipe combines an object and a tool.

Thus, the syntactic valence structure is not a simple reflection of the semantic one. In confirmation of this, adjectival combinations of the ripe peach type are also considered, in which the predicate word is an adjective – it has a semantic valence on the carrier of the attribute, and this valence is filled with a noun (peach). But syntactically, on the contrary, the adjective is subordinate to the noun. Thus, it turns out that in such cases syntactic relations are in no way connected with deep semantic ones. To resolve this contradiction, we can introduce the opposition of active and passive valences. Active valence is the valence of the subordinate word. Everything that has been said so far about the properties of valences concerned active valences, because by default, valences are understood as the connections of the subordinate word. At the same time, the connection of the subordinate word with the subordinate can also be called valence – only passive. Then, when describing adjectival combinations, certain continuity between the syntactic and semantic valence structure is preserved: at the semantic level, the ripe has an active valence, and at the syntactic level it retains it, but as a passive one. (Another way to "align" the syntactic and semantic representation in this zone is to use instead of the concept of "syntactic valence" the syntactic concept of scope introduced by I.M. Boguslavsky, which includes every fragment of the syntactic representation that fills the semantic valence) [3].

There are differences in the structure of marked and unmarked adverbs. Marked adverbs are derivatives and are formed by adding the suffix ***–ly***. Unmarked adverbs, which are discussed in this paper, do not have this suffix-marker. Because of these structural differences, the marker makes it relatively easy to identify a part of speech as an adverb. Unmarked adverbs devoid of this feature are distinguished due to their syntactically functions in the sentence and due to their semantic meaning.

Both marked and unmarked adverbs can perform various syntactic functions in a sentence. From a functional point of view, adverbs of place, time, mode of action, measure and degree are distinguished. There are also interrogative and connective adverbs that are important for constructing interrogative and complex English sentences.

Adverbs with a null marker usually form more syntactic connections (especially in the adverb–adverb combination), that is, they have greater compatibility with other parts of speech than marked ones. Probably, the best ability of unmarked adverbs to act in valence bonds is explained by their semantic features.

There are a number of theoretical and practical problems related to structural, functional and semantic differences in the use of marked and unmarked adverbs. Marked adverbs are easier to distinguish due to the peculiarities of the structure (suffix – ***ly***), but in practice their functions and semantic meaning vary less often than those of adverbs with a zero marker. Formed from adjectives that already have a rather limited and definite meaning, marked adverbs are less dependent on context than unmarked ones. Therefore, it is necessary to identify the causes of not only external, but also internal differences between marked adverbs and adverbs with a zero marker.

Many adjectives and adverbs (mostly short and commonly used words) completely coincide in form. Both marked adverbs with the suffix –ly (weekly – the adverb "weekly" and the adjective "weekly") and adverbs that do not have a marker can have a structure similar to adjectives. The main property that helps to distinguish an adverb from an adjective similar in form is the compatibility of an adjective with a noun and the attribution of an adverb to a verb, that is, the main differentiating feature of adverbs with a zero marker in this case is their valence.

In English, there are a number of single-root marked and unmarked adverbs, which differ both in their morphological structure and in the features of syntactic functions. Adverbs with a zero marker do not form valence bonds with all verbs of the English language, but within a limited group of verbs they give a greater number of semantic connections.

Thus, the peculiarities of the use of marked and unmarked adverbs are directly dependent on the valence semantics of the attached units.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Теньер Л. Основы структурного синтаксиса. Пер. с франц. М., 1988
2. Апресян Ю.Д. Лексическая семантика: Синонимические средства языка. М., 1974
3. Богуславский И.М. Сфера действия лексических единиц. М., 1996