

Comparative Study of Stative Category in English and Uzbek Languages

Tukbayeva Malokhat Bahodirovna

Scientific researcher of Samarkand state institute of foreign languages

ABSTRACT

The current article examines the analysis of the state category in English and Uzbek languages, specifically focusing on the preferred lexical choices for expressing indicative units, syntactic placement of indicative elements in dual language context, classification of state-describing words, and other related issues.

KEYWORDS: *linguistic units, category of state, syntactic levels, syntactic units, sentence structure, linguistic methods.*

The analysis of the state category in English and Uzbek languages, specifically focusing on the preferred lexical choices for expressing indicative units, syntactic placement of indicative elements in dual language context, classification of state-describing words, and other related issues. Furthermore, investigating relevant examples associated with this category necessitates not only an exploration of its structural aspects, but also an in-depth description of the changes in state brought about by the phonetic-semantic, morphological, and syntactic levels through the implementation of linguistic methods.

In world of linguistics, the stative category has been always in a constant focus of attention of scientists such as L.V.Shcherba, V.V.Vinogradov, B.I.Ilish, B.S.Haymovich, B.I.Rogovskaya, O.E.Filimonova, who conducted research on the basis of English, Uzbek and Russian language materials in the study of this category. Researches of linguists such as Andrew Koontz, N.Sweet, A.A.Abduazizov, U.U.Usmanov are noteworthy.

It is possible to observe the presence of various manifestations in the category of the adverbial modifier when conducting research on the categorization of adverbs. Specifically, there have been various debates regarding the independence of the adverbial modifier within certain linguistic communities. B.I. Ilyish suggests that adverbial modifiers are often associated with verbs in many cases [2;31], while B.S. Khaimovich and B.I. Rogovskaya argue that they can also serve as complements to the "adlinks," or adverbial complements [3; 65]. V.V. Vinogradov, on the other hand, emphasizes the descriptive nature of the adverbial modifier close to adjectives and suggests that sometimes it can be used in its place.

Considering the lack of investigation on the utilization of stative verbs as syntactic units in place of other words, as well as their acquisition of specific meaning in other syntactic structures the present study examines the morphological aspect of categorical status in different subsystems of subordinate languages using a transformational method.

In the current linguistics, the use of stative category in the English and Uzbek languages, particularly in the field of grammar, is a significant issue when it comes to compare them. The category of status, or grammatical category, in the English language refers to the expression of the current state of a subject or object, whether it be a mental or physical condition, or a direction towards a specific purpose [2,22]. The category of status in the English language encompasses a wide range of meanings, which are reflected in the expression of the subject and object's state.

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

For instance: I read aloud from Howard Pyle's book of Pirates.....(Ernest Hemingway).

The issue of expressing the category of the state in the English language grammar is discussed from several perspectives. Specifically, V.N. Zhigadlo and L.S. Barkhudarov divide the state of affairs according to the lexical-grammatical structure into four groups: psychic state, physical state of a person, physical state of an object, and the state of an object in space

1. Psychic state of a person (afraid, ashamed). **I should have been ashamed to come today(Dickens)**
2. Physical state of a person (astir, afoot). **Loader was afoot in an instant (Merry.)**
3. Physical state of an object (afire, ablaze). **The house afire.**
4. The state of an object in space (askew, awry) [5,170].

In English, constructions of stative categories are build up with a prefix «a-»,

for example: *awake, alone*

However, according to syntactic function, it is possible for words to express the meaning of state both with and without affixes like «a-», in such a case, they can also express the state of the subject or object in the way it is spoken.

Example: the predecessor **alive**- the living predecessor;

Curiosity **agog**- eager curiosity;

The house **afire** – the burning house;

A raft **afloat** – a floating raft;

A door **ajar** – a half- open door;

Ropes **aslant** –slanting ropes;

A man **awake** –a vigilant man;

Cases **alike** – similar cases;

A crowd **astir** – an excited crowd;

The particular linguistic unit has not been sufficiently discussed and explained in Uzbek grammar despite the fact that this category is crucial in the formation of verb functions. The main function performed by verbs in sentence structure is to act as a predicate. In order to fulfill this function, verbs need to occur in certain specific forms. These forms are referred to as verb correspondences.

The grammatical category of statives is expressed in the Uzbek language through the use of verb form, which incorporates personal, temporal, modal, and aspectual characteristics. Any action can be performed in this form, allowing the verb to fulfill its functional role as a predicate [7,73].

Example: Улар хонага кирганда бир **қалқиб тушиб**, ўзимизни ўнглаб олар эдик (Қ. Раҳимбоева).

The phenomenon of expressing the category of state can be observed in the structure of a verb through the manifestation of its lexical-grammatical characteristics. In Uzbek language, this category is commonly referred to as the category of state, which denotes the movement of a person or an object.

In the field of Uzbek grammar, there is no a division in stative category while it has in the English language. Specifically, when it comes to identifying the forms of verbs in Uzbek grammar, we categorize them into groups that correspond with how they are articulated.

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

1. Verbs of movement: In particular, the verbs of movement indicate the state of movement that occurred as a result of the physical activity of a person or thing [8,31].

Example: югурмок – югуриб толиқди - У тоғ томон югуриб толиқди.

2. Verbs of state: It refers to the internal experiences of individuals and the transition of things from one state to another [7,31].

For example: to sleep, to laugh, to cry, to grin, to rush, to laugh, to blush, to get fat, to swell, to be offended, to be happy, to laugh, to be afraid, etc.

When it comes to comparison of stative categories in English and Uzbek languages, this category is expressed differently in the grammar of the two languages. In particular, in the Uzbek language, this category is manifested in logical groups that are divided according to how verbs express actions and situations.

- ✓ **Verbs of speech activity:** to speak, to whisper, to speak, to ask, to beg, etc.
- ✓ **Verbs of mental activity:** to think, to think, to imagine, to judge, to imagine, etc.
- ✓ **Verbs of physical activity:** to draw, to write, to make, to create, to paint, to erase, to clean, to crawl, etc.
- ✓ **Mood verbs:** to tremble, to shake, to rejoice, to smile, to revive.

Although the stative category can be also expressed by other verbs. The current linguistic unit in Uzbek differs from English in due to the fact that it cannot express action in other word groups. In English grammar, the case category is defined by the 3 components that determine the grammar of the English language and participate in the development of its categories in a complex process, i.e. syntactic, phonological and semantic components [3,15]. where other word groups can also express.

Example: “ She was crying, she replied “ Lemel is stranger and I don’t want to marry a stranger ”.

In analyzing it is easy to detect that the used "was crying" in the sentence is serving to express the state of the subject which proving the stative category in English can represent not only action categories, but also pronouns.

Example: ” I wish I could manage alone” .

In the above provided example, we can show that the state can be used as a personal pronoun by expressing that it can take charge by himself/herself through the implementation of the word “alone”.

The English linguist B.I. Ilish gave the following description on the discussed linguistic categories in terms of other word groups usage in their places. According to him: "The words representing the category of status do not only express their meaning when they enter the category of adverbs, but become the complement of the sentence and expand its meaning" [2,31] .

English linguists have expressed their opinion that the syntaxes showing the status category can sometimes be verbs, nouns, adverbs, and adjectives.

Syntaxes meaning “state” have been divided above mentioned groups. Taking into account their linguistic implications of lexemic meanings of independent word groups, the stative category is included in the sentence in the form of an accusative adjective. For example: agog, afraid, ablaze, adrift.

If these words are generalized in general grammar, they were called "attributive adjectives", and sometimes referred to as "words in the form adverbs"- равиш таркибидаги сўз. Its usage in speech can vary, sometimes as a predicate, sometimes as a characteristic used in place of a noun.

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

The concept of describing unexperienced states and their predicative conditions in word formations was analyzed by Russian linguists L.V. Shcherba and V.V. Vinogradov for the first time in the Russian language. These two linguists coined the term "the category of state" to refer to this new word formation, and referred to the words that participate in the formation of this category as "words of the category of state".

In English language, B.I. Ilyish analyzed the lexical and grammatical meanings of the prefix "a-" in relation to the tasks and reasons for the use of syntactic structures that refer to relevant features and categories within the framework of the "category of state". This study was subsequently continued by other linguists. Initially a certain group of language units was in use with the term of "state category words" and occasionally referred to as "stative words" or "statives" based on their lexical and semantic meanings.

The study of the aspects of the category of state in linguistic terms has not only focused on its usage by language experts, but also on its corresponding and functional forms. Perhaps, the category of state is defined and explained in a clear and comprehensive manner in linguistic discourse by scholars such as B.S. Khaymovich and B.I. Rogovskaya.

Specifically, although the category of state is not considered a separate word form in English and Uzbek languages, there exist elements that constitute their lexical base. In the Uzbek language, expanding the lexical base of stative syntax involves adding a full complement of verbal forms from one to the second form of word formation. In such cases, adding an adjective to the verbal form is taken into consideration. According to the results of the study, it can be concluded that in both of these systems of languages, the expression of stative does not involve entering a special word formation group consisting of words or lexical units, but rather, it is accomplished through the help of various word formations.

The list of used literature:

1. Abduazizov A.A, Bushuy A.M, Bushuy A i dr. Istoriya latvisticheskiy tipologii. – Tashkent: NUU,2006.-176s
2. Bushuy T.,Safarov SH. Til kurilishi: taxlil metodlari va metodologiyasi. Toshkent: Fan,2007.-144-155b.
3. Karimova G. O‘zbek tilida grammatikalizatsiya xodisasi.- Toshkent, 2010.-36b.
4. Kayumova M.S. Ingliz va uzbek tillarida negativlik kategoriyasining sintaksem tadkiki \\
Nomzod. diss..avtoreferati. – Toshkent,2010-27b
5. Kubeysinova D.T. Sintaksiko- semanteskie osobennosti lichnykh mestoimeny v strukture predlozeniy sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyke \\
Avtoreferat.diss...kand.filol.nauk.-
Tashkent,2008-20s.
6. Muxin A.M. Funktsionalnyy sintaksis. Funktsionalnaya leksikologiya. Funktsionalnaya morfologiya.t Sank- Peterburg.SPb.-2007.-198s.
7. Safarov SH.S. Pragmatika. Toshkent: Uzb. Milliy Ennsiklopediyasi.2008.- 300b.
8. Usmonov O‘. Gap taxliliga yangicha yondoshuv\\ Xalkaro ilmiy anjuman materiallari. SamDCHTIning 10 yilligiga bag‘ishlanadi.- Samarkand: SamDCHTI nashri, 2004.-B.106-107.