COUNTERAGENT VALENCE OF STATE VERBS (ON THE MATERIAL OF THE UZBEK LANGUAGE)

Ravshankhodja Rasulov
Professor, Doctor of Philology, Chirchik State Pedagogical Institute
Tashkent region, Uzbekistan
rasulovulugbek605@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The article is about the valence of the counteragent of state verbs. The counteragent is meant as a secondary performer, marked in the verb of situation. In this case, the counteragent and the agent, in essence, correspond to each other. The agent and the counteragent are realized as the performer of the situation. Adequate activity of the agent and counteragent has a specific meaning; therefore they are classified as different actants. The agent is the leader, and the counteragent acts as «imitating him». In relation to the agent, the counteragent will be «subordinate» and in relation to the actants (locality, object, addressee, etc.) – «dominant». In the state verbs the implementation of the agent in the nominative and the counteragent in the analytical form [model N + *bilan* 'together'] is typical. The realizer of the valence of the counteragent of state verbs, as a unit of speech consisting of an analytical form, semantically expresses a comitative relationship. It is characteristic that the compatibility expressed in the analytical form directly enters into a semantic relationship with the mutual voice of the state verb, which, due to the semantic possibility, attach the realizer of the counteragent are used at speech only in the main voice. It follows from this that only the state verbs in the main voice will have the valence of the counteragent. A state verb in a mutual voice logically requires more than one agent. This is an axiom, but the counteragent is in an analytical form regardless of the number of individuals directly related to the state verb in the mutual voice. Its semantic-morphological change is not necessary, because the counteragent is a secondary processor.

The counteragent as a person is observed in state verbs with integral semes «duration», «performance» and «physiological». These verbs of the state that have the valence of the counteragent – it is advisable to approach the object phrase from the point of view of the relation of control, since in the verbal control is distinguished the control between strong and weak.

Keywords: valence, counteragent, state verbs, agent, analytical form, comitative attitude, verb, verb control.

INTRODUCTION

The term *counteragent* [1] means a secondary performer marked in the verb of the situation. In the meaning of the word counteragent expresses the subject who exhibits the state (or action) indicated in the verb. In this position, the counteragent and the agent, in essence, correspond to each other. Indeed, such a parallel in the nature of the performer is explained by the existence of a logical basis. The state performer expressed in the verb is not only an agent (agent act), but also a counteragent (counteragent act). The agent and the counteragent are realized as the executor of the state of actant materializing the state in itself. The agent and the counteragent, being logical subjects, act simultaneously as an object. The adequate activity of the agent and the counteragent as the performer of the situation expressed in the verb has a specific meaning, therefore they are classified as different actants.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

According to Yu.D. Apresyan, «...the action of these two participants (agent and counteragent. – *R. R.*) do not coincide: the predicate describes completely only activity of the subject» [2], since the relationship between the subject and the predicate is the basis of the judgment. This relationship is determined by the relation between the grammatical subject and the predicate, i.e. a sentence, therefore the predicate characterizes the activity of the subject (agent).

I. Kuchkartaev, considering the difference between an agent and a counteragent, notes that «the person indicated by the valence of the counteragent is not independent, unlike the person designated by the agent valence ...» [3] Therefore, the counteragent is not considered from the standpoint of logical-semantic relations directly constituting the core of the judgment – sentences. Its communicative activity by itself acquires a secondary importance, which is especially consolidated in the case of semantic-syntactic relations. The counteragent valence realizer is syntactically independent as a separate speech unit (subordinate component) that characterizes the verb predicate. Syntactic constructions, consisting of a verb predicate having the valence of the counteragent, should reveal the state of the agent, note that it is the important (main) performer of the state which expressed in the verb. It is necessary to implement the features of the rhema inherent in the logical subject (agent) - the main member, in the nature of the theme, thereby concretizing the relation of the theme - rhema and give information about it. Thus, an active, strong connection appears between the agent and the state, while the connection between the counteragent and the state in relation will be passive, weak. The agent is the leader, and the counteragent acts as «imitating him». If the agent is considered the main,

leading actant in the focus of thought, then the leading position of the counteragent is relative. In relation to the agent, the counteragent will be «subordinate» and in relation to the actants (locality, object, addressee, etc.) – «dominant».

The counteragent's activity is manifested as a continuation of the agent's activity. The counteragent is characterized by «belonging» to the agent (by implementation with it together), i.e. the agent's state is characterized as an «example» of a counteragent. The agent's state is logically transferred to the counteragent, as if continuing in it, but not vice versa. In the verbs of the state of the Uzbek language, the implementation of the agent in the nominative and the counteragent in the analytic form (model *N+bilan*) is typical. The agent valence realizer is distinguished at syntactic relation by the function of the main sentence member and the counteragent valence realizer is of the secondary one.

RESULTS

The word that realizes the valence of the agent differs in speech in its use in preposition in relation to the valence of the counteragent, while the realizer of the valence of the counteragent is always used postposition. This position is for the seller of the counteragent valence «natural», regulatory [4]. If the agent is the subject of a state, expressed in a predicate (predicate combination), i.e. syntactically as an absolute dominant component in a sentence, then the counteragent is considered the subject of the state in the verbal predicate. At the same time, the counteragent syntactically acts as an absolutely subordinate component in relation to the predicate (object phrase). For an agent and a counteragent in relation to an active, main performer, it is advisable to use the term *main agent* [5], and in relation to a passive, non-main agent, a counteragent, use the term *secondary agent*, which completely coincides with its logical-semantic and syntactic essence.

The realizer of the valence of the counteragent of state verbs, as a unit of speech consisting of an analytical form, in a semantically expresses a «comitative attitude» [6]. The analytical form that implements the counteragent, means a person who jointly implements the agent's state, actively participates in this process. Compare: *Tojixon bolalari bilan turibdi* (A. Qahhor) 'Tojikhon stays with her children'. Here, the comitative relationship constitutes the semantic core of the counteragent realizer. In language, this is stated extralinguistically and semantic-syntactically.

It is characteristic that the meaning of c ompatibility, expressed in analytical form (valence of the counteragent), directly enters into the semantic relationship with the mutual voice of the state verb. The mutual voice of the verb, denoting the

meaning of consistency and the realizer of the comitative relationship are connected to each other in terms of content, which dedicating the problem of the relationship between the valence of the counteragent and the verb of state in the mutual voice.

It should be emphasized that state verbs, which, due to the semantic possibility, attach the realizer of a counteragent that has the meaning of compatibility, are used in speech only in the main voice, i.e. the valence relation is manifested depending on the implementation of the verbs in a particular form of voice. It follows from this that only the state verb in the main voice will have the valence of the counteragent. Compare: *Xotini o'lib, ikki yosh bola bilan qolibdi* (S. Ahmad) 'His wife died and he was left with two young children'. The relationship between the counteragent valence realizer with the state verb in the mutual voice is carried out theoretically. From a semantic-syntactic point of view, in these semantic syntagmas, it is natural to implement the state verb not in a mutual voice, but mainly, because the expression of the counteragent (analytical form) of the meaning of «compatibility» is manifested as a result of its formation in speech using the postposition *bilan* (with). The meaning of commitativity is not associated with the implementation of the state verb in a mutual voice. This gives the right to conclude that the counteragent is not the main agent.

The mutual voice of the verb correlates with the main agent, several of its types, because its important, main function is the description of the agent, the formation of its component rheme.

The use of the state verb in the mutual voice requires the participation not of the counteragent, but only of the agent's realizer in the plural form. The consistency of the mutual voice of the verb is measured directly by the quantitative superiority of the main agent. The mutual voice of the verb is characterized by the expression of the joint activity of subjects in the function of an agent. The meaning of the «compatibility» of the realizer of the valence of the counteragent, as mentioned above, manifests itself directly when formalized in an analytical form. The activity of the counteragent in relation to the activity of the agent acquires additional, secondary importance. At the same time, the meaning of «compatibility» in the counteragent realizer, when compared with the activity of the agent, is further specified, which indicates the passivity of the counteragent’s relationship, when compared with the agent, to the state expressed in the verb predicate. The activity of the counteragent is manifested through the activity of the agent and it considered through the agent.

DISCUSSION

The activity of the agent in constructions with the state verb, the «adaptation» of the counteragent to its leader and the use of the realizer of counteragent in the analytical form indicates that they are actants of the state verb, which, more than one, are not equal. As mentioned above, a state verb in a mutual voice logically requires more than one agent. This is an axiom, however, the counteragent in an analytical form - in a comitative relation – regardless of the amount of personality expressed in its realizer, is directly related to the verb of state in a mutual voice. Its semantic and morphological change is not necessary, because the counteragent is a secondary processor. Compare: *Turdi ikkita bola bilan turibdi* (F. Musajonov) 'Turdi stays with two boys' – *Turdi (va Ahmad) ikkita bola bilan turishibdi.* 'Turdi (and Ahmad) stay with two boys'. When a verb is used in a mutual voice, the valence realizer of the agent and the counteragent, adapting, attach to it semantic-syntactically, which in such cases leads to the disappearance of the counteragent. The component *bilan* (with) in analytic form is undergoes an ellipsis. The counteragent in syntactic terms in the form of the nominative case turns into an agent and in the sentence already as an agent is considered an absolutely dominant component on the part of the verbal predicate. In this case, semantic-syntactic equal, but more than one, active performers appear, and the words marking them form a homogeneous agent valence of the state verb in a mutual voice. Only in this case is the correct semantic-syntactic unit of speech formed, i.e. a sentence that completely coincides with the act of expressing a thought. For example, *U onasi bilan qoldi* (Mirmuhsin) 'He stays with his mother' – *U, onasi qolishdi* 'He, mother stay'. Therefore, when using a verb in a mutual voice, the agent must necessarily have the character of a polysubject, or the counteragent must go into the agent, syntactically fixing itself in the form of the nominative case. In this case, the activity of the agent and the counteragent (agent) is characterized by the joint manifestation and active execution of a certain state, which constitutes the semantic basis of mutual voice, which means the execution of a state by several persons. The disclosure of a state expressed in the form of a mutual voice with the participation of more than one person, in essence, refers to the agent – the syntactic subject.

It is characteristic that the words expressing the counteragent in the sentence will always be syntactically implemented. Any syntactic non-implementation of the counteragent in the sentence leads to a complete loss of the counteragent's valence, and the predicate, mainly due to the agent, cannot express a counteragent that is not noted at speech. Therefore, the syntactic implementation of the counteragent is imperative, absolutely necessary. In constructions with state verbs that have the

valency of the counteragent, the agent is sometimes not expressed. However, the missing agent can "restore" based on the content of the predicate, the verb expressing the action, the state of the personality. A syntactically unrealized agent, being a potential possibility, forms a presupposition in the character of the theme. Thus, the agent in such cases is expressed by a certain state of the verb predicate as its subject.

The counteragent as a person is observed in state verbs with integral semes «duration», «performance» and «physiological». State verbs of a given lexical-semantic group in terms of semantic possibilities differ in their connection with the counteragent (personality), in sentences they perform the function of the predicate.

The counteragent observed in state verbs with the integral seme «duration»: *o'tirmoq* 'to sit', *yotmoq* 'to lay', *qolmoq* 'to stay', *turmoq* 'to stand up'; «performance»: *qo'riqlamoq* 'to guard'; «physiological»: *qizarmoq* 'to turn red', *terlamoq* 'to sweat' is realized in the noun. A noun sometimes, taking into notice the meanings of the formants of plurality and possessiveness, can express the meaning of quantitative exaggeration and belonging. To connect the components of the object phrase, the seme «personality» performs the function of a class seme. For example: *Chol o'g'li bilan o'tiribdi* (O'zb.xalq ertak.) – 'The old man is sitting with his son'. *Divanda Shukur Alfiya bilan yotardi* (N. Normurodov) – On the sofa 'Shukur lays with Alfiya'. *U drujinasi bilan yo'llarni qo'riqladi* (H. G'ulom) – 'He guarded the roads with his squad'. *Savdogar ikki o'g'li bilan terlabdi* (O'zb. Xalq ertak.) – 'The dealer sweated with his two sons'. *U do'stining bolalari bilan birga ko'chada turibdi* (G '. Jahongirov) 'He stands on the street with friend's children'. In the sentence: *U onasi bilan birga qoldi (Mirmuhsin)* 'He stays with his mother together' in order to strengthen the comitational attitude, emphasizing the subject's attention to it, the word *birga* (together) is used together with the counteragent's valence realizer in the contact post position [7]. In such sentences, the valence of the counteragent (analytical form) is characterized by the expression of the concept of compatibility to the highest degree, where the meaning of «compatibility» also has the ability to express duration, since the word *birga* is realized with meanings such as «connecting», «uniting», «together» [8]. *Compare: Ular bilan birga maydonda turibdi* (Tosh.oqshomi) – 'He stays with them at the stadium'.

A noun denoting personality, in the function of a counteragent of the verb *yotmoq* with the integral seme «duration», acting in an attributive phrase as a definable one, is end owed with a defining feature (determine) with the meaning of a person. In this case, the combination «defining (determine) + defined» in the complex is considered to be the realizer of the counteragent's valence: *Mansur o'z o'rtog'i Slavka bilan qirg'oqda yotibdi* (Shuhrat) – 'Mansur is lying on the beach with his

friend Slavka'. The noun can realize the counteragent of the state verb *turmoq* with the integral seme «duration» in several word forms, each of which will have a meaning by the determine of the person. The counteragent (personality) implemented in such a syntactic construction is distinguished by belonging to the agent. This semantic relation is expressed by a word form with the affix of belonging as determined taking into account the semantics of the sentence. In such cases, the meaning of compatibility is enhanced: *U xotini Malika, o'g'li Qosim bilan tashqarida turibdi* (S. Yunusov) – 'He is standing outside with his wife Malika and son Kasim'.

The counteragent (personality) of the state verb *turmoq* can be implemented with a combination of pronouns: *Sen bilan turibman bu kun betme-bet* (A. Oripov) – 'I stand with you today face to face'. Sometimes pronouns also appear in the word form with the plural formant: *Ular bilan birga maydonda turibdi* (Tosh.oqshomi) – 'He stays with them at the stadium'.

The above-mentioned verbs of the state having the valence of the counteragent, it is advisable to approach object phrases from the point of view of the control connection, since in verb control the control is distinguished between strong and weak [9]. Given the strong and weak control [10], verbs of state (dominant component) with integral semes «duration»: *turmoq* 'to stand up', *qolmoq* 'to stay', *yotmoq* 'to lay', *o'tirmoq* 'to sit'; «performance»: *qo'riqlamoq* 'to guard'; «physiological»: *qizarmoq* 'to turn red', *terlamoq* 'to sweat' with the counteragent realizer (analytical form, subordinate component) will be included in the group of verbs with weak control, because «the relation between the dominant (state verbs. - R.R.) and dependent words (by the counteragent's realizer – R.R.) is not necessary, not due to the lexical and grammatical features of the dominant word as a relation necessary to realize its meaning» [11]. With weak control, ««««the relationship between rod and subordinate words is perceived as optional because the lexical meaning of the verb (*turmoq* 'to stand up', *yotmoq* 'to lay', *qolmoq* 'to stay', *o'tirmoq* 'to sit', *qo'riqlamoq* 'to guard' and *terlamoq* 'to sweat' – R.R.) does not depend on whether there is a subordinate word with it (for example, the counteragent's valence realizer. – R.R.) or it is absent [12]. Therefore, as A.M. Peshkovskiy correctly emphasized, this dependence of the noun on the verb should be called weak control [13].

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, 1) in the counteragent realizer, a personality is expressed that executes a state that is a secondary processor in relation to the agent. The formation of a word

that implements the counteragent of state verbs in the analytical form according to the model «noun (sometimes pronoun) + *bilan*» is typical; 2) an analytical form that realizes the valence of the counteragent expresses a comitative attitude; 3) state verbs having the valence of the counteragent are implemented only in the active voice; 4) the mutual relationship between the realizer of the counteragent valence expressing the comitative relationship and the mutual voice of the verb of state has a specific character; 5) the analytical form expressing the counteragent in the sentence will always be syntactically implemented, since its syntactic unrealization leads to the complete disappearance of the counteragent; 6) verbs of state in the Uzbek language with integral semes «duration», «performance», «physiological» have a counteragent valence.

REFERENCES

1. Look at.: Apresyan Yu.D. Lexical semantic. – In the book.: The synonymic facilities of language. M.1974. p.127.
2. There was. Look at the page. 127. Look at.: Slyusareva N.A. Problems of functional syntax of modern English. M.1981. p.107.
3. Kuchkartaev I. K. Valence analysis of speech verbs of the Uzbek language. T.1977. p.30.
4. There was. Look at the page. 31.
5. The term *main agent* was introduced by O.S.Akhmanova. Look at: Akhmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terminology. M.1966. p. 31.
6. Kononov A.N. Grammar of modern Uzbek literary language. M-L.1960. p.359. Look at: Akhmanova O.S. The book shown above. p. 200.
7. Look at: Kononov A.N. The book shown above. p. 299.
8. O’zbek tilining izohli lug’ati, Tom 1. M.1981. B.117.
9. Russian grammar,Volume 2. M.1980. p.250.
10. Peshkovskiy A.M. Russian syntax in scientific coverage. M. 1956. p. 285.
11. Rosental D.E., Telenkova M.A. Dictionary-reference book of linguistic terms. M.1976. p.500.
12. The modern Russian language,Volume 2. M.1981. p.13. 13. Peshkovskiy A.M. The book shown above. p.286.