

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LEXICAL AND GRAMMATICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF STATIVE VERBS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Kholmurodova F. B.

2nd year student of master's degree

faculty of English linguistics Karshi State University

Abstract: This article aims to analyze the distinctive lexical and grammatical features of stative verbs in both English and Uzbek languages. Furthermore, the usage of stative verbs in progressive tenses was explored in a deep way.

Key words: stative and dynamic verbs, progressive tense, lexical comparison, semantic unit, communicative context, grammatical difference, inchoative.

Based on English grammar principles, a stative verb characterizes a state of existence rather than an action, contrasting with dynamic verbs which represent actions. This distinction lies in stative verbs portraying unchanging situations, while dynamic verbs depict processes involving change over time. Various languages differentiate between these verb types grammatically. English, for instance, categorizes verbs into stative or dynamic, where a significant difference is noted: stative verbs are generally incompatible with the progressive aspect. The situations where such verbs appear in progressive form are often attributed to shifts in verb meaning. Another perspective on the progressive suggests that it can convey diverse meanings, with distinctions made between aspectual and subjective interpretations. In this paper, we advocate for a functional-semantic perspective, proposing that all verbs typically classified as stative can potentially be used in the progressive form. Furthermore, we argue that the grammatical morpheme "-ing" possesses a core meaning that remains constant across contexts, allowing for a range of aspectual and expressive messages when employed in the

progressive construction to suit the speaker's communicative intentions and the context. In English and other languages, there exists a distinction between stative and dynamic verbs regarding their compatibility with the progressive aspect. Dynamic verbs, like "come" can be used in the progressive form (e.g. "I am coming to my school"), while stative verbs, such as "love" typically cannot (e.g. "I am loving this girl"). When a verb has both dynamic and stative uses, it generally cannot be used in the progressive form when conveying a stative meaning. For instance, it is not idiomatic to say "I am going to work every day except from weekend." However, in some languages statives can be used in the progressive aspect. Additionally, in English, a verb denoting a state can also signify the initiation of that state, known as the inchoative aspect. The simple past tense is sometimes inchoative. For instance, the present-tense verb in "She understands her classmate" is stative, whereas the past-tense verb in "Suddenly she understood what he said" is inchoative, indicating a change in understanding. Conversely, the past-tense verb in "At one time, she understood him" is stative. In English, the distinction between stative and inchoative verbs is typically conveyed through modifiers, as demonstrated in the examples provided ("suddenly" and "at one time"). Similarly, ancient Greek employs the aorist tense to signify the initiation of a state, as in "ebasíleusa" meaning "I became king," alongside its use to simply express the state itself without emphasis on its commencement, as seen in "eíkosi étē ebasíleusa" meaning "I ruled for twenty years." Stative verbs are often categorized further based on their meaning or structure. Semantic distinctions often involve verbs denoting mental states or properties, although these concepts can also be expressed using alternative linguistic mechanisms, notably adjectives. Linguists vary in their precise categorization. For instance, Huddleston and Pullum categorize stative verbs into groups such as verbs of perception and sensation (to see, to hear), verbs of physical sensation (to ache, to itch), stance verbs (to stand, to sit), and verbs of cognition, emotion, and perception (to believe, to regret). Alternatively, Novakov proposes slightly different categories, including verbs representing sensations (to feel, to hear), reasoning and mental attitudes (to believe, to understand), positions or stances (to lie, to surround), and relations

(to resemble, to contain). Syntactic divisions pertain to the types of clause structures in which a verb can be used. In the Uzbek language, voice serves as a distinctive grammatical category that encompasses the entire verb, including all its microsystems. The concept of verbs lacking voice does not apply, as voice is regarded as an inherent grammatical attribute, constituting a semantic feature of the verb. Voice represents a category formed by contrasting sets of morphological forms, each indicating different aspects of the relationship between the semantic subject, action, and semantic object. The classification of verbs into transitive and intransitive forms is closely linked to the concept of voice. These forms denote varied relationships between motion (or state) and the subject and object. In one voice form, a direct connection between the motion (or state) of the logical subject and the object is expressed, while in another, the motion (or state) of the subject is encapsulated within it. Both the object and subject of the state are processed simultaneously. For instance, consider verbs like to give, to take and to stay. According to A. Hojiyev, altering the voice form of a verb will also alter the relationship between the movement and the subject and object involved. However, irrespective of the relationship between subject and object in terms of movement (or state), this movement (or state) remains confined within the sphere of the logical subject and object, perceived as inherent dynamic or static attributes. In conclusion, we propose the following points:

- Speakers will employ the progressive tense with stative verbs when the message necessitates it, unless prescriptive concerns override this choice;
- The messages conveyed through the progressive construction ultimately adhere to its fundamental meaning;
- Using the progressive tense with stative verbs does not alter the verb's meaning;
- The simple and progressive verb forms are not interchangeable;
- The progressive construction does not inherently convey directionality;
- Aspectual and subjective messages coexist within utterances;
- Many interpretations of the progressive tense in literature are pragmatically influenced rather than encoded in its fundamental meaning.

As observed, the majority of stative verbs can be used in the progressive tense when the communicative context necessitates it. The infrequent usage and restricted occurrence of certain stative verbs in the progressive tense indicate that the situations prompting their use are less common and conventional. In other words, there are fewer life scenarios that would prompt the need for such messages. Furthermore, although these instances may not occur frequently enough to be statistically significant, the most noteworthy thing is that such messages, unless dismissed as errors in performance, occur any time.

References:

1. Azar, Betty Schramper. 2002. *Understanding and Using English Grammar* (3rd edition). Pearson Longman.
2. Bailey, Charles James Nice. 1996. *Essays on Time-Based Linguistic Analysis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press.
3. Binnick Robert I. (1991). *Time and the verb: a guide to tense and aspect*. New York: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0195062069.
4. Börjars, Kersti & Kate, Burridge. 2001. *Introducing English Grammar*. London: Arnold Publishers.
5. Brinton, Laurel J. 2000. *The Structure of Modern English: A Linguistic Introduction*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamin.
6. Huddleston Rodney, Pullum Geoffrey K. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. <https://www.perfect-english-grammar.com>