

GRAMMATICAL FEATURES OF STATIVE VERBS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH: A
COMPARATIVE STUDY

Begmuhammadova Mushtariy Iqboljon kizi

Master student of Fergana State University

Abstract: This study explores the grammatical characteristics of stative verbs in Uzbek and English through a comparative-descriptive approach. Stative verbs, which express a subject's state rather than action, are examined for their behavior in tense, aspect, mood, and voice. While English stative verbs exhibit strict grammatical constraints, particularly with the progressive aspect and imperative mood, Uzbek demonstrates more syntactic flexibility. The study also highlights the potential for semantic shifts that allow stative verbs to adopt dynamic readings in certain contexts. The findings suggest that language-specific grammatical systems shape the way stative meanings are encoded and reveal important implications for linguistic pedagogy and typology.

Keywords: stative verbs, Uzbek language, English language, grammatical features, aspect, mood, voice, cross-linguistic comparison.

Introduction

Stative verbs constitute a distinct class of verbs that describe a subject's state or condition rather than an action. These verbs are semantically tied to perception, cognition, emotion, possession, and existence. In linguistic typology, both Uzbek and English languages possess such verb classes, although they exhibit distinct grammatical patterns. English stative verbs, such as *know*, *love*, and *believe*, generally resist progressive aspect usage, while Uzbek stative verbs like *bilmoq*, *tushunmoq*, and *sevmok* demonstrate more morphosyntactic flexibility. This paper investigates the grammatical features of stative verbs in both languages to identify commonalities and divergences, contributing to a deeper understanding of cross-linguistic verbal behavior.

Methods

This research adopts a comparative-descriptive methodology. Primary sources include scholarly literature on Uzbek and English grammar, native speaker data, and contextual examples from everyday discourse. The verbs were examined for their behavior in tense and aspect combinations, voice (active/passive), mood (imperative/indicative), and syntactic distribution. Comparative examples were used to illustrate functional similarities and differences. Data were also drawn from previous research findings, including stative verb classification by semantics (e.g., perception, cognition, emotion), syntactic compatibility, and pragmatic functions in communication.

Results

The comparative analysis yielded several notable grammatical features:

Tense and Aspect: English stative verbs generally do not appear in the progressive form (e.g., *I am knowing* is ungrammatical), whereas Uzbek equivalents may appear in continuous aspect in

informal or expressive contexts (*Men bilayapman*). Despite grammatical irregularity, Uzbek allows more contextual elasticity, reflecting colloquial speech dynamics.

Voice: Both English and Uzbek rarely use stative verbs in passive voice due to their non-action semantics. Constructions like *This is being known* or *Bu narsa bilinmoqda* are marginal or avoided. In Uzbek, alternative expressions such as *bu narsa ma'lum* are preferred, maintaining the stative implication without violating voice constraints.

Mood: Stative verbs are less compatible with imperative mood. Commands such as *Believe!* or *Bil!* are grammatically possible but stylistically odd. In Uzbek, imperative forms of stative verbs (*Sev!*, *Bil!*) are marked and rarely used, except in poetic or rhetorical contexts.

Semantic Shifts: Many stative verbs demonstrate context-dependent semantic fluidity. For instance, *think* in *I think she is right* (stative) vs. *I am thinking about it* (dynamic). Uzbek parallels include *Men seni tushunaman* vs. *Men seni tushunayapman*, where the progressive form conveys temporary cognitive engagement.

Verb Class Overlap: Some verbs transition between stative and dynamic classes based on meaning. For example, *see* in English is stative in *I see the problem* but dynamic in *I am seeing the doctor tomorrow*. Likewise, Uzbek *ko'rmoq* can indicate perception or active interaction, depending on context.

Discussion

The grammatical behavior of stative verbs in English is relatively rigid, particularly regarding aspectual constraints. In contrast, Uzbek allows more aspectual variation, reflecting its agglutinative nature and contextual reliance. The greater tolerance of Uzbek for stative verbs in progressive aspect (e.g., *Men o'ylayapman*) shows a language-specific approach to temporality and continuity. This flexibility is indicative of a language system that is semantically and pragmatically adaptive. The restricted use of stative verbs in passive and imperative forms in both languages demonstrates their inherent semantic nature—expressing conditions rather than actions. However, poetic or rhetorical contexts may override these norms, as seen in Uzbek literary language where *Sev!* (Love!) may be used emotively.

From a pedagogical standpoint, these findings underscore the importance of contextual awareness when teaching stative verbs to learners of Uzbek or English. Learners need to understand not only dictionary definitions but also the morphosyntactic behavior and constraints of stative verbs. For example, English learners must avoid *I am believing* unless stylistic context permits, whereas Uzbek learners should be cautious about informal uses like *Men seni yaxshi ko'rayapman*.

Moreover, the contrast between languages emphasizes language-specific grammatical systems and their role in encoding subjective states. The more permissive syntactic behavior of Uzbek stative verbs in continuous and imperative forms suggests a linguistic flexibility that may offer insights into morphosyntactic typology. Additionally, the ability of some verbs to shift between stative and dynamic categories based on context reveals the semantic complexity inherent in natural language use.

Pragmatically, stative verbs contribute significantly to politeness strategies, speaker stance, and epistemic modality. For instance, expressions such as *I think*, *I believe*, or *Men o‘ylayman*, *Menimcha* convey speaker uncertainty or diplomacy. The strategic use of such verbs in discourse strengthens communication by expressing degrees of commitment to a proposition.

Conclusion

Stative verbs in Uzbek and English share semantic foundations but diverge grammatically. English restricts their aspectual and modal deployment, while Uzbek accommodates broader usage, especially in colloquial contexts. Recognizing and teaching these distinctions can improve linguistic competence and cross-linguistic understanding. The morphosyntactic permissiveness of Uzbek compared to the constraint-oriented English model reveals different grammaticalizations of subjectivity and state.

Future research could explore corpus data to quantify these patterns, examine diachronic shifts in stative verb usage, and investigate psycholinguistic aspects of stative verb processing in bilingual speakers. Such research would contribute to a nuanced understanding of how languages encode and structure human experience through grammar.