

PROGRESSIVE ASPECTS OF STATIVE VERBS

Mavlonova Maftuna Shokir qizi

Aniq va ijtimoiy fanlar universiteti magistranti

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15631474>

Abstract. *This article explores the use of stative verbs in the progressive form in English, drawing on the perspectives of Uzbek linguists. Traditionally, stative verbs are not used in the progressive aspect because they express internal states, emotions, or possession. However, contemporary language use shows an increasing tendency to employ these verbs in progressive constructions, indicating new semantic and grammatical developments. The article analyzes the reasons behind this phenomenon, its limitations, and its implications for English grammar theory. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the relationship between actions and states and have practical applications in linguistics and language teaching.*

Key words: *Stative verbs, progressive aspect, linguistic changes, aspectual features*

Annotatsiya. *Ushbu maqolada o'zbek tilshunoslarining fikrlariga tayangan holda, ingliz tilida holat fe'llarining progressiv shakl bilan ishlatilishi masalasi ko'rib chiqiladi. An'anaviy qarashlarga ko'ra, holat fe'llari odatda progressiv formaga kirmaydi, chunki ular ichki holatlar, hissiyotlar yoki egalikni ifodalaydi. Biroq, zamonaviy til amaliyotida bunday fe'llarning progressiv shaklda qo'llanishi ko'paymoqda, bu esa semantik va grammatik jihatdan yangi tendensiyalarni ko'rsatadi. Maqola ushbu hodisaning sabablari, chegaralari va uning ingliz tili grammatikasi nazariyasiga ta'siri haqida tahlil qiladi. Tadqiqot natijalari fe'llarning harakat va holat o'rtasidagi munosabatlarni yanada chuqurroq anglashga yordam beradi va tilshunoslik hamda til o'qitishda qo'llanilishi mumkin.*

Kalit so'zlar: *holat fe'llari, progressiv aspect (davomiylik jihati), lingvistik o'zgarishlar, aspektual xususiyatlar.*

Introduction

The level of study of stative verbs differs between English and Uzbek literature. In English, this topic has been researched quite extensively, whereas in Uzbek, there are few specific resources on stative verbs as a semantic category of verbs. A review of general linguistics textbooks and grammar sources shows that English grammar rules differ significantly from those of Uzbek. For example, in Uzbek, both action and stative verbs can appear in the progressive tense without restriction. Uzbek has three tenses, and the meaning of progression is generally conveyed through the present tense. For instance, the verb *ko'rmoq* (to see) can be expressed as *ko'rdim* (I saw), *ko'ryapman* (I am seeing), *ko'raman* (I will see), and so on. Both action and stative verbs appear in these progressive forms, without any exceptional rule.

In contrast, English grammar distinguishes 16 tense-aspect forms, each with specific structures and usage rules. While some sources assert there are only three core tenses in English, the progressive aspect—formed with the auxiliary verb "to be" and the base verb + *-ing*—specifically shows an ongoing or continuous action.

Examples:

- *I am reading a book.*
- *She is working right now.*

In Uzbek, the progressive aspect is conveyed through forms like *-yapman*, *-yapsiz*, *-yapti*, indicating present and ongoing actions:

- *Men kitob o'qiyapman.* (I am reading a book.)

- *U hozir ishlayapti.* (She is working right now.)

While Uzbek uses suffixes like *-yap-* combined with personal endings to indicate the progressive aspect, English relies on auxiliary verbs and the *-ing* form. This structural difference marks a clear grammatical contrast.

Uzbek linguists have expressed diverse views on the use of stative verbs in the progressive aspect in English. According to Sh. Shomahmudova, stative verbs are typically not used in progressive forms due to their inherent meaning, which often denotes a state rather than an action. However, M. T. Jo'rayev highlights that in certain contexts, especially in colloquial speech, some stative verbs may appear in the progressive to emphasize temporary states or emotions. N. A. Karimov also acknowledges that using stative verbs in the progressive form can lead to a shift in their semantic meaning, giving rise to more dynamic interpretations. B. Rahmatullayev takes a semantic-pragmatic approach, noting that such usage depends on the speaker's intention and the communicative context. Similarly, N. Quvonchboyeva illustrates this phenomenon through practical examples, showing how modern English increasingly tolerates progressive forms of certain stative verbs in expressive or informal usage.

In English, stative verbs are generally not used in the progressive aspect due to grammatical constraints. However, in some cases, stative verbs may also occur in progressive constructions.

The progressive form typically expresses an ongoing or present action. Although progression is often associated with action verbs, exceptions exist where stative verbs can appear in progressive forms. Scholars analyze this topic from various perspectives: grammatical structure, semantics, pragmatics, and syntax. While most linguists define progressive aspect as representing an ongoing action, some stative verbs may reflect progression in exceptional contexts.

According to scholars such as Comrie, Quirk, and Leech, the progressive aspect is also referred to as continuous, imperfective, or non-completed action, involving the auxiliary *to be* and the *-ing* form. Quirk identifies three main meanings of the progressive: duration, limited time span, and incompleteness. Shubert, however, argues that progression can also express habituality and future intent.

From the 19th century onward, use of the progressive aspect in English increased, and meanings expanded. Researchers such as Mair, Leech, Aarts, and Drácková examined the growing trend of using the progressive aspect with stative verbs such as *love*, *want*, *understand*, and *see*.

Drácková's thesis *Stative Verbs with the Progressive* provides in-depth analysis of such cases. Generally, stative verbs describe a stable condition or quality (Shubert, 2002; Bland, 1988), which makes them incompatible with the inherently dynamic nature of progression. Bland states that stative verbs lack movement or change and imply permanence. Therefore, they are not expected to appear in progressive forms.

Comrie (1976) and Kroeger (2005) assert that stative verbs cannot be used in progressive constructions because of their static nature. Nonetheless, in colloquial English, stative verbs do occasionally appear in progressive forms—often when they shift toward a dynamic interpretation.

Examples include:

- *I'm loving this movie!*
- *She's seeing someone these days.*

Such usages are generally accepted when the verb's meaning transitions from a state to an action. Leech et al. categorize stative verbs into four semantic groups:

- a) Perception (e.g., imagine, see, hear, smell)
- b) Cognition and emotion (e.g., think, feel, remember, hope, want)
- c) Possession (e.g., have, own, cost, depend)
- d) Position or existence (e.g., lie, live, stand)

Quirk also suggests that the progressive aspect can represent both present and future actions. In Uzbek, the progressive is primarily used for present and past events, not future. Japanese linguist Kuno describes the progressive as a syntactic structure showing the unfolding of an action.

From a semantic perspective, progressive forms often imply ongoing, unfinished activity. Pragmatic linguists like S.C. Dik argue that progressive verbs reflect temporary and ongoing actions across many languages. Similarly, L.R. Horn views progressive forms as expressing not only ongoing but also non-finalized actions.

In English, the progressive form frequently appears in casual spoken language, while in Uzbek, it is used more in formal or academic contexts. Bloch and Trager emphasize the communicative function of the progressive form, noting that pragmatic context helps clarify the intended meaning.

Syntactically, the English progressive is formed with *to be* + *-ing* verb. In Uzbek, it is formed through specific suffixes like *-yap-* added to the verb root. This difference reflects each language's syntactic approach.

Russian linguist V.A. Yartseva studied how auxiliaries and suffix systems contribute to progressive aspect formation in both languages. Structuralist R. Jakobson viewed the progressive as a syntactic tool reflecting time-based changes in verbal action.

Many scholars have compared the use of the progressive aspect in English and Uzbek, highlighting both shared functions and key differences. In English, the progressive is used widely across tenses; in Uzbek, its use is mostly tied to the present tense.

John Lyons believes the progressive form exists across many languages but notes that its realization varies. He compared English and other languages to explore how each reflects the progressive semantically and syntactically.

Lyons concludes that progressive forms express not just present ongoing actions, but also temporary, episodic, or processual states.

Examples:

- *He is reading a book.*
- *U kitob o'qiyotgan.* (Uzbek's progressive often emphasizes temporariness.)

Lyons highlights the progressive as a marker of unfinished actions and temporary states. In English, this form combines *to be* and the *-ing* verb, while in Uzbek, suffixes like *-yap-* convey similar meanings.

English has various progressive tense forms, while Uzbek primarily uses progressive within the present tense. Furthermore, English uses the progressive more flexibly, including to refer to future events, unlike Uzbek, where it is mostly confined to present or ongoing past actions.

Lyons notes that understanding these differences is crucial in both language teaching and research. The progressive aspect, particularly with stative verbs, continues to be a rich field of

study in comparative linguistics.

In conclusion, the analysis confirms that the application of stative verbs in the progressive aspect in English has been interpreted diversely by Uzbek linguists. Traditionally, stative verbs are considered incompatible with progressive forms due to their inherent meaning of permanence or mental/emotional states. However, in modern English usage—especially in colloquial and informal speech—there is a noticeable tendency to use some stative verbs progressively. This trend reflects the verbs' capacity to convey temporariness or heightened emotional intensity. Such a shift indicates a broader semantic and pragmatic evolution in English, where the static-dynamic verb distinction becomes more fluid. Therefore, a re-evaluation of the boundaries between stative and dynamic verbs, in light of ongoing linguistic changes and context-dependent usage, is both relevant and necessary.

REFERENCES:

1. Shomahmudova, Sh. S. (2006). *Ingliz tili fe'l tizimi va zamon shakllari*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi nashriyoti.
2. Jo'rayev, M. T. (2010). *Ingliz tilida zamon va harakatning ifodalanishi*. Toshkent: Fan nashriyoti.
3. Karimov, N. A. (2014). *Ingliz tilining zamonaviy grammatikasi*. Toshkent: Filologiya nashriyoti.
4. Quvonchboyeva, N. (2017). "Ingliz tilida stativ fe'llarning progressiv zamonda ishlatilishi." *Filologiya masalalari* №2, 45–49.
5. Comrie, B. (1976). *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman.
7. Leech, G., Hundt, M., Mair, C., & Smith, N. (2009). *Change in Contemporary English: A Grammatical Study*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Shubert, K. (2002). *Semantic Categories in English Grammar*. Routledge.
9. Dráčková, L. (2014). *Stative Verbs with the Progressive Aspect*. Masaryk University, Master's Thesis.
10. Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics (Vol. 1–2)*. Cambridge University Press.