

RESULTATIVE STRUCTURES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

In this monograph, the perspective of studying the content formation of the syntactic structure and its semantic development within the framework of cognitive and functional grammar directions of modern linguistics is defined, the separation of lexical-semantic and grammatical means of expressing the meaning of result is determined by the possibility of using linguistic units in the functional-semantic field. In addition to the categories of grammatical tone and tenses, aspectuality studies action groups of verbs (dynamic, static, limited, non-limited) and their subgroups, i.e., beginning, duration, completion, iterative, perfective, transitive, resultative, expressed in the term actionsart (mode of action). At the same time, it investigates the difference between the components of the context that affect aspectuality, expressed using lexical and syntactic means that do not involve the verb.



Talented young scientist Davlatova Mukhayyo Hasanovna is the head of the English language department of Bukhara State Medical Institute after Abu Ali ibn Sina, associate professor. Experienced, famous and creative teacher. Her second monograph is being published.



Globe
EDIT

Globe
EDIT



DAVLATOVA MUKHAYO HASANOVNA

RESULTATIVE STRUCTURES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

RESULTATIVE STRUCTURES IN ENGLISH-UZBEK

DAVLATOVA MUKHAYO HASANOVNA

DAVLATOVA MUKHAYO HASANOVNA
RESULTATIVE STRUCTURES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK
LANGUAGES

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

DAVLATOVA MUKHAYO HASANOVNA

**RESULTATIVE
STRUCTURES IN ENGLISH
AND UZBEK LANGUAGES**

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

GlobeEdit

Imprint

Any brand names and product names mentioned in this book are subject to trademark, brand or patent protection and are trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective holders. The use of brand names, product names, common names, trade names, product descriptions etc. even without a particular marking in this work is in no way to be construed to mean that such names may be regarded as unrestricted in respect of trademark and brand protection legislation and could thus be used by anyone.

Cover image: www.ingimage.com

Publisher:

GlobeEdit

is a trademark of

Dodo Books Indian Ocean Ltd. and OmniScriptum S.R.L publishing group

120 High Road, East Finchley, London, N2 9ED, United Kingdom

Str. Armeneasca 28/1, office 1, Chisinau MD-2012, Republic of Moldova,

Europe

Printed at: see last page

ISBN: 978-620-6-79345-8

Copyright © DAVLATOVA MUKHAYO HASANOVNA

Copyright © 2023 Dodo Books Indian Ocean Ltd. and OmniScriptum S.R.L publishing group

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

**REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN
MINISTRY OF HEALTH, MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY
SPECIAL EDUCATION
BUKHARA STATE MEDICAL INSTITUTE AFTER ABU ALI IBN SINA**

In manuscript law

UDK: 811.113:512.133+87 '1 (575.1)

DAVLATOVA MUKHAYYO HASANOVNA

RESULTATIVE STRUCTURES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

Bukhara - 2022

INTRODUCTION

The world linguistics science of development present during language system different levels belongs to of structures formation and semantic expression researchers attention attraction by doing is coming The comparative-typological analysis of structures that gain effectiveness in the linguocognitive aspect and the emergence of aspectual semantics on arrival syntactic compounds task to determine is important.

Aspectual means separate structures in world linguistics systematic analysis of linguistic units forming meanings research is being conducted. The scientific substantiation of the spectality phenomenon in the linguocognitive and semantic aspects is considered one of the priority tasks in the field event used in the linguistic field separately meanings organize doer language units i , their semantic expression, syntactic relations and that's it basically harvest to be speech of structures cognitive-pragmatic features _ special attention is paid to lighting.

In this monograph, the perspective of studying the content formation of the syntactic structure and its semantic development within the framework of cognitive and functional grammar directions of modern linguistics is defined, the separation of lexical-semantic and grammatical means of expressing the meaning of result is determined by the possibility of using linguistic units in the functional-semantic field.

Monograph access, three bob, conclusion and used literature consists of a list and conditional abbreviations.

1 . THEORETICAL BASIS OF RESEARCH OF THE ASPECTUALITY PHENOMENON

1.1. Study of aspectual and action-like phenomena

Aspectuality accounts for most of the research on verb semantics. Aspectological studies developed on the basis of the grammatical category of view (form, appearance) in Slavic languages include not only the verb, but also the study of all language tools that affect the semantics of the verb. For this reason, determining the aspectual meanings, predicate and contextual elements entering the predication, as well as determining the effect of the secondary predicate and finding the meanings specific to the aspectuality of the secondary predicate have been attracting the attention of linguists. In general, aspectology - (Latin *aspectus* - appearance, image, Greek *logos* - word study) is a branch of grammar that studies all layers of verb forms and aspectual meanings, i.e. the tone (*vid*) that takes one or another expression in the language and the meanings close to it (B.H. Rizaev; 1999, 47) is interpreted as

In addition to the categories of grammatical tone and tenses, aspectuality studies action groups of verbs (dynamic, static, limited, non-limited) and their subgroups, beginning, duration, completion, iterative, perfective, transitive, resultative, expressed in the term *aktionsart* (mode of action). At the same time, it investigates the difference between the components of the context that affect aspectuality, expressed using lexical and syntactic means that do not involve the verb. According to similar signs of aspectual content, language tools of different levels and different purposes are united (Yu. S. Maslov; 1984, 7–8). Such tools include morphological (verb forms related to type-tense), lexical (semantic classification of verbs according to the method of action), syntactic phase (verbs indicating the beginning, duration, completion of an action; to begin, to go on, to finish) structures *made* with verbs , constructions that form within the verb argument, and in general context and even textual) means that create aspectual meaning can be included. Therefore, attention is paid to the study of aspectual semantics within the field theory

(V.Bondarko; 1985; 16–29). Based on this theory, the term aspectual field was also created. The field of aspectuality is related to "interacting language tools" (V.Bondarko 1983; 19) (morphological, syntactic, word-forming, lexical-grammatical, lexical-semantic combinations), as well as general semantic tasks belonging to different areas of aspectual relations. As the main components of aspectuality, as noted, the grammatical categories of the verb can be distinguished. They combine morphological forms into meaningful structures and include expressions of the verb type that are not completely grammaticalized, expressions made with phase verbs (indicating the beginning, continuation, end of the action), syntactic tools in the function of additional aspect, mode of action, structures that mean the change of state of the subject or object as a result of the action expressed by the verb covers

The concept of functional-semantic field is important for the study of general and comparative aspectology.

The theory of aspectuality is gaining importance in world languages in recent years. Because aspectuality is recognized as a universal phenomenon characteristic of all languages. Each language has tools that express the character of development in time and distribution in time (A.V. Bondarko; 1983, 76). Among the main components of the field of aspectuality, first of all, the grammatical category of the verb *tus* (*vid*) is shown. In this case, this category is understood as a system that unites a series of morphological forms with the same content. Then, in these components, the pre-grammatical types; verb combinations denoting the beginning of an action; syntactic tools with additional aspectual function ; lexical signs related to the case are included, for example: *long, immediately, constantly, slowly, suddenly, often*, etc. At the moment, in determining the composition of the aspectuality field, important importance is attached to which of the aspectual components have a decisive place in each concrete language, to the definition of the main category that unites the aspectual means in this language, and in general to the most important language means that mean aspectual meanings in the field of aspectuality.

In the study of aspectual meanings, the category of time studies the external nature of an action in relation to the process of occurrence of an event in a specific time period. In our research work, the term "actionality" is used in the classification of aspectual classes (boundedness/unboundedness) (Yu. Maslov; 1984, 28-29. Yu. S. Maslov; 2004, 312. B. Rizaev, 1988/1999. G'. Mirsanov, 2009) and the lexical-grammatical and also semantic combination of "action style" ("sposoby deystviya" in Russian and Aktionsart in English) (I. Ivanova, 1961; E.V. Petrukhnina, 2000) we apply to grouping the resulting aspectual meanings. Aspectuality, along with the mentioned concepts, is considered a grammatical category, actionality, and a generalized term of action type. That is why aspectuality covers its own levels. In particular, aspect is considered a grammatical level, and completion and incompleteness are contrasted based on morphological signs; actionability - divided into bounded/unbounded groups according to the lexical-semantic meaning of the verb; mode of action (known in the West as *aktionsart* , and in Russian as *sposoby deystvia*) - classification of the predicate based on lexical-semantic features; syntactic aspectuality - the beginning, duration, and completion of the action are determined by modifying phase verbs with other language units. Of these levels, the classification of action art remains one of the most controversial. It should be noted that in Uzbek linguistics, the term mode of action is interpreted in a completely different sense. In particular, there are studies of analytical forms with leading and auxiliary verbs as a mode of action (O. Shukurov, 2005). Therefore, in the following places, we found it permissible to use the term Aktionsart accepted in Western linguistics. The analysis of action art in English aspectology is mainly based on the classification made by Z. Vendler.

Z. Vendler's classification also provides an opportunity to determine the type of verb aspect: verbs expressing state and activity are imperfective, and verbs expressing action and result are perfective types. One of the features of Z. Wendler's classification that differs from other classifications is that for the verb to be perfective or imperfective, there should be an internal (performance) or external (achievable result) boundary of the action (activity - state) or not (Z. Wendler; 1967, 143–160) .

In its essence, this is similar to the concepts of the color characteristic of the verb formed in Russian linguistics. The second aspect is the duration or instantaneous occurrence of the action expressed by the verb. Scholars who have studied the concept of Z. Vendler put forward a system of tools that express the perfectiveness or imperfection of a sentence (W.Croft; 2012, 49. B. Kortman ; 1991, 27. CS Smith; 2003, 47). They argue that these tools depend on the structure of the sentence, the amount of the subject, the complement and the types of cases. In such a concept, the aspectual meaning is defined in the verb and its surrounding components, and there is no need to define the verb tense as a strict grammatical category.

The composition of the field of aspectuality depends on which of the aspectual components takes the main place in each concrete language, in particular, on the grammatical formalization of the tone category in this language. Within aspectology, aspectual features are not only related to the verb lexeme, but also to the situation with a predicative core. In this regard, depending on the grammatical and lexical indicators of aspectual meanings, semantic signs are distinguished within the framework of "aspectual phrase" and "actional phrase" (B.Rizaev, 1988). In this case, "aspectual phrase" refers to all language tools that represent the initial, middle, and final phases of the dynamics of movement, while the concept of "actional phrase" defines the limitation and non-limitation based on the minimal phrase that occurs through verb predication (B.Rizaev, 1988. G'.Mirsanov, 2009). The analysis of aspectuality is based on M.Krifka's views on homomorphism (homomorphism) "from object to reality", which is one of the theories widely spread in the West. When determining aspectual meanings, attention is paid to the quality, quantity, unit of measurement of the object (owner, complement, case) (M.Krifka; 2001, 31). This approach is also referred to as "aspectual compositionality".

The aspectual semantic field is interpreted as a way of describing different dynamic situations ("internal time indicator" of the verb lexeme). The semantic (aspectual) type of aspect and predicate is aspect and "performance of action". E. Paducheva, in the process of typological classification and cognitive analysis of continuous situations of aspectual predicates in Russian and English, divides them

into two large types: EXTERNAL "perioda nablyudeniya" (period of observation) and INTERNAL (systematic structure of the situation) (E.V.Paducheva; 2004, 46-57). In turn, the author cites such types as prospective, progressive, resultative, completive, punctual, limiting as the main indicators of the systemic structure of the situation. The author claims that the perfect is considered "weakened" resultative, and its main semantic development is immediate , experiential and evidential perfects . The author also divides aspect into types such as "primary" and "secondary" based on an unbounded process. If the primary type is durative (continuity over time) and progressive (development) , which means the internal phase, the secondary aspect is habitualis (habituality , repetition) , multiplicity consists of processes (E.V. Paducheva; 1996, 23). E. V. Taxonomic classes distinguished by Paducheva (object, object and substance, event, process, activity, state) (E.V. Paducheva; 2004, 54) takes the term ontological category.

In linguists involved in the study of aspect meanings, it is customary to divide verb units into stative and dynamic groups. In general, the same method is used to divide verbs into static and dynamic groups. This situation may not give the desired result when comparing the verb system of different languages. Because in some languages, the verbs denoting the state and entering into the state are separate lexemes (English, Russian languages), in other languages these two meanings are embodied in one lexeme (Uzbek language). Case and state entry are differentiated by the helping verb or context. English aspectologist B. Comrie divides verbs into such groups as punctual (durative, limited/unlimited (telic/atelic)), static and dynamic depending on their lexical possibilities (B. Comrie; 1976, 41).

B. Kortman applies the TAA (tense-aspect-action) trinity to the analysis of the English verb system. The main purpose of this triad is to determine the border between aspect and tense, and between aspect and action art. Aspect is described as static or dynamic, completeness or incompleteness associated with a situation, that is, a completed situation or an ongoing, "existing" situation at a given time (B. Kortmann, 1985). Actionsart is related to the semantics of the verb and predicate , and it is a semantics related to time possibilities. That's why action predicates are

considered compositional, that is, action is considered as a whole sentence, and sometimes as a pragmatic feature of the following conjunctions (Verkuyl, 1972. Declerck; 1979, 764. Brinton; 1988, 31).

Research on aspectuality started from a narrow morphological category and moved to an interdisciplinary level to include morphology, lexis, and syntax. This process of expansion is reflected in the development of the terminology of aspectual dynamics. As a result, *vid (tus)*, mode of action, aspectuality, aspect, actionsart, limitation, non- limitation, inchoativeness (beginning) , iterativeness (repetition) , progressiveness, intensity, perfect, resultativeness and many other terms arose.

Verb semantics has a syntactic-semantic relationship with all the tools available in the language. All the words and syntactic devices surrounding the verb reveal the meanings of the verb lexeme in reality. As noted by T. Laifrink, a separate word does not appear in a living, natural language in isolation, but is used in relation to another word in the text (T. Laifrink; 1972, 8). Of course, the categorical meanings of each lexical unit change at the syntactic level, and the lexical-semantic meanings are enriched. Syntagmatic differential distinguishing features of words and sentences in speech increase. The change of these differential signs, semantic-syntactic meanings in the language depends on the use of verbs. We know that the semantics of the verb leads to the control of the semantics of the sentence and the change of the content of meanings, in addition to the fact that the syntagmatic connection in the sentence is more effective than other lexical grammatical classes. The lexical-semantic field of verbs is distinguished from other word groups by the formation of various syntactic forms and the diversity of sentence semantics. The analysis of lexical-semantics of verbs plays an important role in revealing polysemantic issues, in determining the relationships between structural components in the semantic-syntactic field. Well-known Uzbek linguists R. Rasulov, S. Mukhamedova express their opinion about the meaning of words in one of their articles: "The meaning of a word, its meaning is made up of logical parts. To study the meaning structure of the word, to determine the logical parts of the meaning of the word, to determine the types of components, to clarify the place and importance of each sema in the meaning

(sema), to reveal its relation to other semas is to find a logical connection between the meanings. Accordingly, entering into paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations of words, creating a series of words, identifying and finding patterns that distinguish words in paradigmatic relation from each other (R. Rasulov, S. Mukhamedova; 2002, 26-29). It is known that a word is a linguistic unit. The lexical meaning of a word is also determined by its object relation. When determining the subject relationship of words, they can be grouped according to their meaning. Such a grouping helps to determine the contrasting features of the meanings in the words, the object relationship, their belonging to a grammatical class, the form of the material (movement, sound movement, method of movement, etc.). In particular, the structure of the verb helps to study the content of meanings, to reveal their occurrence in the speech situation. This, in turn, is important in elucidating the aspectual meanings of the verb.

Later, linguists pay attention to the semantic classification of predicates when solving aspectual problems. Because the variety of predicates is formed as a result of their combination with time and aspect indicators. The research of aspectual meanings at different levels (as a grammatical category, lexical category, field theory, especially the functional-semantic field), their division into various classifications (lexical grouping, lexical-semantic grouping, lexical-grammatical grouping (mode of action)) is the same in all languages it was pointed out that he could not reveal the essence of the matter. Of course, if it is more clearly visible that the mentioned directions of research are carried out within the framework of a language, the possibility that this approach is not compatible with the structure of another language is more clearly visible. In the next period, aspectual studies are conducted at the cognitive level (R. Langacker, 1999, T.V. Beloshapkova, 2008. G'. Mirsanov, 2009), discourse (M. Bittner, 2007), pragmatic framework (G'. Mirsanov, 2020). From the cognitive point of view, the conceptual bases of aspectuality, types of frames, prototypical bases of aspectuality are clarified, while attention is paid to the expression of aspectual content in the discourse. Pragmatically, the impact of the

aspectual semantics of referential units on the communication process and the expressions of aspectual content in this process are being determined.

T.G. Akimova analyzed the relationship of semantic signs within the framework of aspectuality and the tone-time series. Akimova (T.G. Akimova, 1984, 71-91). Analyzing the materials of the English language, he gives the following semantic signs of aspectuality: 1) whether the action is directed to the boundary or not; 2) whether the movement has reached the limit or not; 3) stasis or dynamism of movement; 4) effectiveness of action; 5) generalization of the fact; 6) a sign of the occurrence or non-occurrence of an action at a certain time (lokalizovannost/ nelokalizovannost); 7) the occurrence of an action at a certain time in a direction dependent or independent of something. In addition to the main features of the aspectual meanings emphasized in this classification, attention is paid to the specific features of the English verb system. This classification has the status of an action art and is based on the theories of aspectuality interpreted by Russian linguists.

I.P. Ivanova Analyzing the forms of tone-tense, I.P. Ivanova expresses the opinion that their aspectual meanings should be based on this tone-tense. Because the main forms of the Indefinite mean pure tense, the other forms around them are divided into tense-expressive functions. These are the functions of the verb expressing the continuous, perfect and perfect-continuous actions. In relation to the main group, they perform tasks that determine the activity. This color seems to be superior to some color indicators. Tus category, according to the authors of «Theoretical English Grammar», is usually defined as a nor all category. It represents the process of action. " A characteristic feature of the English verb form is that the verb form necessarily indicates a certain time when the action took place, so it is expressed within a certain time frame " (I.P. Ivanova ; 1961 , 180). Thus, the grammatical categorial feature of the mood category of the English verb is its mood ng the character of it is expressed in analytical forms.

Productivity within the framework of aspectuality¹ has attracted the attention of many as a specific semantic category. Synonymous and homonymous relationships of performance indicators in many languages have been sufficiently studied (V. Nedyalkov, 1983). The reason for referring to this issue in the framework of the research can be attributed to the fact that the research process of comparative comparison between the English and Uzbek languages has not been carried out to determine the aspects of semantic differentiation of the resultative structures, to determine the demarcation between descriptiveness, perfectiveness and resultativeness. It is necessary to recognize the existence of research conducted by J. Miller on the example of the English language directly related to this issue. He finds that the resultative and perfective constructions in spoken English form different subsystems and have an explicit appearance. According to this, it is concluded that resultative and perfect structures are characteristic of this language as a grammaticalized process (J. Miller; 2004, 229).

1.2. Basic theoretical approaches in the interpretation of the concept of aspectuality

The problem of separate study of the category of aspectuality in the system of different languages was first of all related to determining whether the morphological category of verb types exists or not in each language. In the research of the meaning of the verb, it is possible to achieve the intended goal only by referring not only to grammatically formed categorical units, but also to all linguistic tools that express aspectuality. That is why specific theories and approaches of aspectuality have arisen based on the structure of a certain language. This is the functional-semantic field theory in Slavic linguistics, while it is considered a compositional approach in Western linguistics (M. Krifka; 1992, 29). The functional-semantic field refers to a set of grammatical and lexical units and semantic units resulting from the combination of various lexical-syntactic tools (A.V. Bondarko; 1987, 11). It is also

¹There is a possibility to translate the concept of "resultativeness" into the Uzbek language in the form of "resultativeness" within the framework of the theory of aspectuality. But we found it better to keep the calcified alternative of the term resultative accepted in English linguistics.

related to general semantic functions belonging to different fields of aspectual relations. The compositional level is the phenomenon of generalization of all language units involved in the context and forming the semantic content. (D. Geeraerts; 2006, 39). At the compositional aspectual level, as a result of the influence of the nominative argument, the limited/unlimited (telic/atelic) groups of the predicate are determined (S.Rothstein; 2004, 20). In this case, the quantitative nature of the nominative argument is important. It seems that in the functional-semantic field, the influence of contextual elements on the predicate is important, while in composition, attention is paid to quantitative indicators of nominative units. Research on compositionality has been carried out, in particular, within the framework of the English language. Both approaches have arisen from the researched Russian and English language structures.

In linguistics, the main focus is on the verb as the constituent of the sentence, because its semantic essence or semasiological core is manifested together with tense and time. In addition, the verb is considered as a dynamic sign (V.L. Egorov; 1989, 86). The rest of the clauses in the sentence, i.e. possessive, complement, case, etc., are valid in integral connection with the action of the verb. Each participant in the sentence plays an important role in the expression of the action of the verb, its semantic differentiation, and the enrichment of the meanings of the verb. The famous Russian linguist A.M. Peshkovsky gives the following opinion about the verb: "Verbs are "living" words, they animate all the words that come close to them" (A.M. Peshkovsky; 1974, 96-99). From this point of view, the verb is able to change the meaning of any word in the context. Depending on the lexical-grammatical meaning of the verb, the possessive substance can be the doer of the action, the manager of the action, the recipient of the action. Also, the action of the verb expresses the state, character, manner, etc. of the possessor. The object depends not only on the lexical but also on the grammatical (transitive/intransitive) nature of the verb. The language units used in the function of the case in the sentence are used to denote the manner, space, time and similar features of the action of the verb.

Verbs occupy the most important place in the content of expression in any language. The lexical-semantic meanings of verbs are richer and more flexible than other words. When we say flexible, it is understood that the semantics of the verb can change depending on the lexical meaning of the component with the same form in the same situation. In many cases, verb lexemes can combine with other groups to form complex meanings. These meanings appear in different combinations in different languages. We can explain that the emerging meanings are manifested in the action, state and content of other signs of the components in the function of syntactic units, in particular, in situations related to the subject. Verb lexemes in the English language are distinguished by their morphological (infinitive, gerund, adjective) and syntactic (complex verb participle, secondary predicate) usage. The semantic content of English verbs is expressed differently in different combinations when they are combined with different prepositions. Such differences can be observed in the case of other languages. In particular, in the Uzbek language, we can see that verbs are the main constituents of sentences. Usually, in the study of the lexical-semantic meanings of verbs in the language, it is common to analyze them by dividing them into large groups such as action and state (A.V. Bondarko; 1983, 208, U.S.C. Maslov; 1984, 263, B. Levin and M. Rappaport; 1992, 247-269).

Elucidation of lexical-semantic and grammatical aspects of verbs is carried out in harmony with the study of their syntagmatic features. In linguistics, it is recognized by many scientists that the functional aspect of language affects its structure and development, because language lives and develops in speech (V.Z. Panfilov; 1977, 6). Therefore, the development of the language is also related to its functional side. The verb, which has an important place in the functionality of the language, has many meanings compared to other groups of words, its variety , richness, formation of compounds, and the ability to differentiate the meanings in them, as well as the ability to change the meaning, from a cognitive point of view, to illuminate the internal and external feelings of the subject, the processes taking place in his mind. differs from

Different approaches by researchers in the analysis of verbs, verb categories, and verb combinations at different levels show that, in addition to revealing the transformational and derivational properties of this object, research can be conducted within the framework of different directions of linguistics. The proof of this is shown in the study of the verb at anthropological, psychological, cognitive and other linguistic levels. In general, the wide possibility of classification of verbs from the lexical, lexical-semantic, lexical-grammatical, functional-semantic point of view can be considered as one of the reasons for the research of this category in the mentioned fields. In most cases, the basic verbs are modal, taxative, causative, passive, benefactive, aspectual, temporal, negation" (A.K. Ogloblin, V.S. Hrakovsky; 2001, 9-17) form grammatical categories.

It is known that the semantics of the verb enters into a syntactic-semantic relationship with all the tools available in the language. All language units and syntactic devices that are modified by the verb reveal the exact meaning of the lexeme. Of course, the categorical meanings of each lexical unit change at the syntactic level, and the lexical-semantic meanings are enriched. Syntagmatic differential signs of words and sentences in speech increase. The change of these differential signs, semantic-syntactic meanings in the language depends on the use of verbs. It is a product of the cognitive process, which is carried out in each language within the communication capabilities of the speakers of that language . We know that the semantics of the verb leads to a change in the content of meanings, in addition to the more effective syntagmatic connection in the sentence, in the speech than in other lexical-grammatical classes. The lexical-semantic field of verbs is distinguished from other word groups by the formation of various syntactic forms and the diversity of sentence semantics. The functional-semantic field plays an important role in revealing the issues of multiple meanings of verbs, in determining the relationships between structural components in the semantic-syntactic field.

In the analysis of the functional-semantic field category, it is important to distinguish the following: a) the structure of the functional-semantic category in the language system, that is, the distribution of differential semantic signs between "center

and periphery", periphery and core components, grouping, general microfield, principles of their construction; b) identification of a functional-semantic category in the functional process of language (interaction of the components of this category in speech: a combination of grammatical and non-grammatical tools in the context, creation of semantic complexes, creation of a functional semantic microfield in a specific phrase (N.S. Avilova; 1976, 35). In the functional-semantic field, aspectuality is focused on the analysis of meaning that is generalized under the influence of grammatical tone, action type, action feature of the verb, and temporal units. The concept of Aktionsart was introduced by Sigurd Agrell, which is based on different grouping and classification of verb semantics. If we look at the further history of Aktionsart, its research is also divided into two directions, that is, classification based on the verb's: 1) dictionary meanings (limitation/ non-limitation) (U.S. Maslov; 1984, 26); 2) classification of the semantic meanings of the verb in different combinations, under the influence of the text, with the help of object arguments. The second line of research is researched in Russian linguistics in the manner of "sposoby deystvie" (mode of action) (N.S. Avilova; 1976, 34). Because this kind of research can be done in any language system. Research on this topic began to develop about two centuries ago. The general concept of aspect has evolved over time, and seventy-five years later this concept has been divided into the narrow concept of aspect and the broader category of action art. This process took place under the influence of two directions, that is, Slavic linguists and Germanic linguists faced with different problems. The distinction between tense, aspect, and action art was developed based on the scientific work of Sigurd Agrell. He uses the concept of "aktionsart" as a supplement to the concept of aspect in his research on Polish verbs. Namely (Sigurd Agrell , 1908) was the first to explain in detail the difference between aspect and action part in the Slavic language. Although Sigurd Agrell's distinction between aspect and action art determined the development of aspectology, this situation did not guarantee its development in one direction. Later, the study of aspect was divided into two main streams: Germanic and Slavic streams. Agrell researched both of these streams, and the two streams interacted with each other. However, each stream has its similarities and

problematic aspects. The study of action features of verbs is inextricably linked with the category of aspect.

Although various aspectual contrasts (perfection and imperfection perfectivity/imperfectivity, completion and incompleteness, terminativity/terminativity, boundedness and unboundedness telicity/untelicity and boundless/unboundless) are felt to exist in every language, it is clear by generalization in linguistics. cannot be a reason to conclude. That is why some scholars think that it is a mistake to transfer the concept of aspect from the Slavic language to the Germanic languages. This view Zandvoort (RW Zandvoort; 1962, 1-2.) revived again after the critical opinion of He argued that "Aspect is a concept that does not exist in English." In general, Germanic linguists agreed that the distinction between tense and aspectuality can be expressed in different ways in different languages, and decided to systematically study aspectuality in Germanic languages. It was concluded that the concept of aspectual pair (telic/atelic) and action type should be considered separately. According to Sigurd Agrell, perfect and imperfect are determined by the presence of an aspectual pair. Each pair of this pair is considered as two forms of the same verb and they have the same lexical meaning. Of course, there is a semantic difference between the perfect and imperfect form of any verb. But this semantic difference is not considered a lexical difference. The difference between the scientist's narrow concept of aspect and action art is expressed in the idea that the change of aspect does not affect the lexical meaning of the verb, but the change of the action art variant of the verb leads to a change in the lexical meaning of the verb.

Smith, who performed a two-component analysis of the aspect. The work of Smith (Parametr aspekta, 1991) is also of great importance in the study of action features of verbs. Carlota S. Smith explains the difference between grammatical and lexical aspect, noting the difference between aspect and action art. As a result, the author emphasizes the importance of the aspect in English being carried within the whole predication and dividing the predicate into limited/unlimited groups. It also

indicates that a predicate can be analyzed in terms of aspect and action type (CS Smith, 1991).

Actionability, which is important in the analysis of aspectual meanings, is considered a limited and non-limited property of the verb. As noted, the action feature of verbs refers to the concepts of boundedness/unboundedness and limiting / neutrality related to verb semantics . Boundedness is a lexical-semantic feature of a verb, and if the presence of an internal complete boundary of a verb is considered, non-boundedness is understood as the absence of that internal boundary. Finiteness/unfiniteness of verbs is determined by their infinitive form and minimal conjugation (B.X. Rizaev; 1999. 20). Minimal conjunction means asking a question to the infinitive form of the verb. (to go - where, to walk - where). In the semantics of verbs with a limiting neutral feature, there are both limited and non-limited features. In turn, they can form a minimal combination (to walk - where, where) together with the expression of pure proceduralism.

Aspect researchers generally prefer to contrast verbs denoting state and action. In the course of our research, we also studied verbs in this way. Comparative study of action and state is usually done by comparing the finiteness and non-finiteness of the verbs belonging to the two groups. Different terms are used by scientists in relation to the action of the verb, for example, the semantic type of the predicate (T.V. Bulygin; 1982, 7), aspectual class (aktionsart), lexical type (B.Comrie, P.Vogel; 2000, 8), eventuality type (H.Filip Events and Maximalization: The Case of telicity and Perfectivity // plaza .ufl.edu/hfilip) taxonomic category of the verb (E.V. Paducheva; 2004, 46-57), boundness-unboundness, telicity-atelicity, terminativity-unterminativity (R. Boogaard, T. Janssen Aspects of Language - 31. Tense and Aspect // www.let.vu.nl/staf/thalm.janssen) and other terms are known. Yu.S. Maslov defines the action characteristics of verbs as follows: "It will not be correct to apply the concepts of limitation/non-limitation in relation to the verb lexeme. When determining the action character of verbs, it is necessary to take into account all their lexical-semantic features" (Y.S. Maslov; 1984, 50). A.B. According to Bondarko, actionability is a priority sign of the level of aspectuality in relation to the internal limit of action

(A.V. Bondarko; 1983, 80). Opinions are not the same as to what lexical, lexical-grammatical or syntactic level should define the category of verb limitation or non-limitation. For example, Yu.S. Maslov introduces limitation or non-limitation into the semantics of the verb and gives this opinion: "Limitability enters the semantics of the verb and is a reference to the internal limit of the given action in its nature . In this case, the movement tends to some limit and stops when that limit is reached. Limitlessness is the absence of that inner limit" (Y.S. Maslov; 1978, 4-44).

Grouping of verbs from an aspectual point of view is also widespread in linguistics. In particular, the grouping of aspectual meanings was carried out by O. Espersen among the first. Based on the semantic principle, the scientist distinguishes seven different types of verbs that occur in different languages and do not obey a single general rule: 1) aorist and imperfect; 2) conclusiveness or non-conclusiveness of the meaning of the verb; 3) completion or incompleteness; 4) representation of multiple or one-time activity; 5) duration or instantaneous occurrence; 6) expression of intended or unintended result; such as duration or variability (O.Espersen; 1958, 359).

Action art is usually considered as a lexical aspect. The lexical aspect is variously called by linguists: "situational meaning" (Comrie, 1976), aspectual class (Philip, Hana; 1993, 1991), situational aspect (S.S. Smith, 1991). Most linguists consider lexical aspect to be a linguistic term" (W. Comrie, 1976. S.S. Smith, 1991). If actionability (aktionsart) is a lexical concept, it should be determined based on the lexical meaning of verbs. First of all, it is necessary to define the characteristics of verbs as limited/non-limited based on their lexical-semantic features . Secondly, on the basis of these features of limitation/non-limitation, the verb should be studied in the "functional field" (A.V. Bondarko, 1987).

G. Virkyul comes to the conclusion that the structural categories of the aspect refer to the top of the sentence. In this case, the sentence consists of a "relatively simple formula, the subject is verb - object - instrumental complement - prepositional complement (Verkuyl; 1972, 52)" model. He focuses on creating formulas that allow us to determine aspect - perfect and imperfect (completed and incomplete) meanings. This opposition is based on the classification of verbs from the point of view of

semantics. In contrast to the classification based on action, process, state, Z. Vendler distinguishes semantic groups of verbs: 1) activities or homogeneous processes - Activities related to an indefinite period of time, meaning continuous action, for example: running. 2) execution of an action prepared as a result of a previous process related to a certain time interval (accomplishments); for example: running a mile. 3) momentary actions and results related to specific time points: (achievements-reaching the top); 4) the duration of state representation (states) in an uncertain time process (Z. Vendler, 1974). From the classification given by Z. Vendler, it is clear that the semantic groups have some common features: duration and performance mean certain processes, and mean continuation in a certain time interval.

The verb used in the speech process is the beginning, completion of the actions, represents continuous situations and brings about the harmony of the selected verbs. As a result, phenomena such as momentary and multiple occur. Instantaneous, repeated actions are created with the help of lexical items, words with these semantic symbols, and grammatical tools. These processes can be divided into several classes in the category of action style of aspectuality. In particular, based on the purely semantic and lexical properties of lexical units, as well as the instant or multiplicity that occurs through the contact of verb units with other linguistic means, that is, the meanings that are formed only through grammatical means, the semantic meanings that arise through the combination of grammatical properties and lexical units divided into types of behavior.

In the semantic analysis of the sentence, it is important to distinguish between the objective fact and the components that relate to it. In this, firstly, the concreteness of the situation is determined, and secondly, the objective fact in the elements representing the abstract situation is determined. The ontological and logical properties defined in the given elements can be both compatible and different. The abstract situation corresponds to the association of empirical situations as a product of direct communication. In such cases, situational ontological types are described together with logical types.

The aspect of the syntactic form in a given sentence is represented by the subject and predicate contained in the internal syntactic feature.

English linguist B. Comrie classifies cases related to the expression methods of perfectiveness in different language systems as follows:

1. Short duration. The perfective is characterized by a shorter duration than the imperfective.

2. Limited durability. In this case, the bounded perfective "bounded" (*telic, having a natural end*) is contrasted with the unbounded "unbounded" (*atelic imperfective: shut the door- started to laugh*).

3. Ingressive (inchoative) meaning. While the perfective indicates the starting point of an action or state, the imperfective indicates its progression. This meaning is usually used in the imperfective case with the verbs *begin* and *start* .

4. Productivity. Perfection is related to the result of the action: *shut the door*. (B. Comrie; 1981, 65-78).

A comparative study of lexical units in the language should be directed to the description of the same meaning in the use of lexical units and the laws of formation of "grammatical speech" (functional-semantic realization of certain meanings of the rules specific to each language) (Gak; 1977, 6-7, 10).

Conducting comparative research at the contextual semantic level is important in summarizing the formal structure of the language and the linguistic and non-linguistic features of knowledge. In particular, it is necessary to determine the imaginary situation of the action, situation, which is performed in the aspectual differentiation of contextual semantics . In this case, the completion of the action, its duration, the distinction between single or repeated events, and the evaluation of the objective situation are clarified. Aspectual meanings are carried together in conceptual content "knowledge based on experience and linguistic knowledge (R. Jackendoff; 1996, 104)". Each expressed action or state consists of certain phases. These are action execution, goal, completion, state entry, state change. In the analysis of these events, the finiteness/unboundedness of the verb is taken into account and contrasted with the quantitative and measurement characteristics of the noun in the

function of an argument (possessive or complement represented by a noun). This analysis is carried out within the compositional approach. This approach is also important in the analysis of secondary predicates. Because secondary predicates are also analyzed within the ontological category (object, object+substance, event, activity, state) (R. Jackendoff; 1990, 22. E. Paducheva; 1998, 142–156).

1.3. Study of productivity within aspectual studies

Aspectual semantic classification consists of a number of large and small groups. One of these groups is productivity. Resultativeness is an expression that usually means a change of state, the result of an event. According to the expression of resultativeness, it is distinguished by having morphological, lexical, semantic, and syntactic methods. It is observed that there are several ways of expressing resultivity in any language. V.P. Nedyalkov and S.E. According to the Yakhontovs, the type of diathesis, the scope of meaning of the resultative index, the existence of a specific verb lexeme with a resultative seme can occur in several ways (V. Nedyalkov, S. Yakhontov; 1983, 15). This situation is also important due to the fact that the grammatical indicators of the language are formed, the lexical units, in particular, the scope of meaning of the verb, are expressed in specific syntactic structures . In languages where the grammatical indicator is formed (English), this expression is formed using the syntactic-semantic feature of the grammatical meaning. This process takes place in the presence of an agent (A), a patient (R) and a transitive verb, as well as a single actant (S), which participates in an intransitive verb. In this case, (A) and (S) perform the task of causation (V. Comrie; 1981, 69, Kibrik; 2003, 126 - 132). Expression of productivity aging is a phenomenon common to all languages. This is related to the transitive verb, the subject of the action is the same as the object of causation, the result of the action. For example: *She opened the door / The door opened; He opened the door / The door opened.*

The term productivity entered science in the 70s of the last century. After that, this concept developed as a separate object of study of aspectual studies. The emergence of this concept as an object of research V.P. Nedyalkov (V.P. Nedyalkov,

S.E. Yakhontov; 1983, 5–41), O. Dahl (Ö. Dahl; 2000, 3–25.), B. Comrie (B. Comrie, 1976), (Y.S. Maslov; 1983, 41–54), V.S. Khrakovskii (V.S. Hrakovsky; 1980, 3-23), later this concept was used as a part of aspectology by B.Kh. Rizaev (B.Kh. Rizaev; 198, 121), Mc Cowley (Mc Cawley; 1981, 81–90), E.V. Paducheva (E.V. Paducheva; 1998, 142–156.) J. Lindstedt and I. Deparde (J. Lindstedt; 2000, 365-383., I. Depraetere; 1998, 597-613), V.A. Plungyan (V.A. Plungyan; 2011, 377-387), J. Carrier, J. Randall (J. Carrier; JH Randall; 1992, 173-234), D. J. Napoli (DJ Napoli; 1992, 53-90.), D.M. Nasilov (D.M. Nasilov; 1983, 118–123), M. Kozimi (M. Koizumi; 1994, 24–79), A. Memtimin, I. It was developed by Nevskaya (A. Memtimin , I. Nevskaya; 2012, 80–94.) and others in different language systems. According to the generally accepted interpretation of resultivity, the result is achieved as a result of the change of state of the bounded process. In this case, "within a certain limit" (lineyny) (V.A. Plungian; 2011, 377) attention is paid to the expression of the result of the action. It should be noted that resultativeness is a weakly grammaticalized verb form. Resultativeness is limited in form and is expressed in limited actional predicates. Also, this phenomenon is explained by the fact that the verb has a narrow aspectual semantic expression expressed by the lexical meaning (O. Dahl; 2000, 3-25). According to the difference of the language system, the expression of the resulting meanings and the formation of certain structures also differ depending on the language system. At the same time, the resultativeness is not only a characteristic of the verb (E. Schultze-Bernd , N.P Himmelmann ; 1988, 234). Because units other than verbs (adjectives, nouns, nominative forms of verbs) play an important role in the formation of result structures. Because of this, the resultativeness is also evaluated as a semantic meaning that refers to the change of state of the subject or object and is determined by lexical determination. Within its aspectuality, the means of expression are somewhat limited. The closeness of resultative and perfect meanings in many languages may also be the reason for this. But in some languages, notably English, the perfective and the resultative have a clear distinction. If this is judged by the grammatical form of the perfect, the

resultativeness is expressed in the structure that occurs in the secondary predicate in the complex complement combination.

Unlimited and neutral limitative (with two action features) (B.X. Rizaev, 1999) disputes about the differentiation of resultative and perfect in units belonging to the group of verbs are still ongoing (A. Nishiyama, J.-P. Koenig; 2010, 617). In many languages, it is argued that the difference between the resultative and the perfect depends not on semantics, but on discursive function (H. Lodrup; 2000, 171-188). Because both forms cannot fulfill the task of connecting events in a narrative expression. It should be noted that, in general, the comparative study of perfect and imperfect verb forms in English has become widespread (I.P. Ivanova, 1961), (Y.A. Lander; 2002, 300–312), (Maslov; 1983, 41–54). Focusing on the discursive function of the perfect form of the verb in grammatically developed languages can reveal the essence of the matter more fully (SG Tatevosov; 2001, 443–464).

There are views on the existence of special grammaticalized compounds in the works on resultativeness and the possessiveness (ownership) feature in them means the result and has a resultative meaning (S.Kim, J.Maling; 1997, 189-204. D.V. Sichinawa; 2008, 712). In particular, the combination have got in the English language is given as an example (V. Heine, 1997). Of course, in English, in addition to the have got structure, the verb have also means possession. But have, usually when used with abstract nouns, is distinguished by the semantics of permanent possession, and therefore the meaning of result is considered not to be a characteristic of this verb. In addition, during the analysis of the resultative structures in world languages, B. Heine points out that there are structures that do not fully form the resultative grammatical category of the verb, but have a possessive meaning. He contrasts the synonymy of "resultative possessive" and "inchoative possessive" (V. Heine; 1997, 130-131).

J. Miller points out that various possessive and resultative structures are characteristic of most transitive verbs. In this case, he points out that a transitive verb can be made by changing its characteristic to intransitive and gives the following example: *You have access to a vein gained and cardiac analysis done* (J. Miller;

2004, 239). The resultativeness represented by the adjective II forms of the verb in the example was shown as a transitive feature. An intransitive verb used in the adjective II form can also express an intransitive meaning. For example: *T here's something fallen down the sink; there's one person injured in the explosion (British corpora); Make that forehead to chin, she thought, forced, despite her highest heels, to look up* . (Liz Fielding, 9). The given examples show that the resultative meaning does not depend on the transitive or intransitive nature of the verb. That is why attention should be paid to search for this phenomenon from the aspectual aspects of the verb, such as dynamism/staticity, action (boundedness/unboundedness). Resultant meanings expressed by language units acting as a secondary predicate may depend on the transitive or intransitive nature of the verb forming the main predicate.

An example of a result structure is the structure built on the basis of the auxiliary verb *have* and the transitive feature of the combination *have got* : I have the letter written; I've got the letter written

But we cannot say that all events represented by transitive verbs can be formed by resultative structures . For example, the combination *to take the book off the table* does not mean the loss of the object's state of existence or the change of its state of existence, and does not indicate the semantics of achieving a result as a result of the subject's efforts. For this reason, we do not include such compounds as resultative structures. V.P., who conducted extensive research on productivity. Nedyalkov and S.E. The Yakhontovs use the term "possessive productivity". The authors apply this term to the semantics of possession expressed by a transitive verb and explain it through the example of *"ya vzyal shlyapu" / "ya derju shlyapu"* (V.Nedyalkov, S.Yakhontov; 1983, 17-18). In our opinion, this case does not represent the result of an action, so we refrained from accepting them as a resultative structure. In general, we do not think it is appropriate to use the term possessive resultativeness. We believe that such expressions are a typical feature of the transitive verb. The authors also use the term ergative type of resultativeness. In this case, subject and object productivity are considered to have two diathesis indicators (V.Nedyalkov, S.Yakhontov; 1983). The ergative type is used to refer to the singular actant of an

intransitive verb and the resultativeness of an object that has undergone a change as a result of a certain effect. In this case, the change in the state of the subject is considered secondary in nature (Comrie; 1981, 112-114) .

Another phenomenon related to resultivity is stativeness. Some linguists see resultativeness and stativeness as one grammatical synonymy. In particular, V.P. Nedyalkov said that it is difficult to distinguish between resultativeness and staticity, and it is appropriate to analyze them together (V. Nedyalkov, 1981: 161). As the main lexical sources expressing the resultativeness, the combination of the verbs denoting the state with adverbs, adjectives and nouns made of verbs is emphasized (V.Nedyalkov ; 1981, 164), (J. Bybee ; 1995, 425-455). Most of the lexical units meaning resultativeness are closely related to the meaning of situation. This case can be observed in the combination of the verb to be and the adjective II (P II) in English. This combination, which is considered as a formless ratio, constitutes a unique resultative structure. For example: *He was gone* .

In the Uzbek language, in most cases, the resultative meaning occurs in combinations of an auxiliary verb with stative semantics and a leading verb denoting a state. In this case, the semantics of the subject's position in the speech situation means a resultative meaning in relation to the previously performed action. For example: The smell of peppercorns soaked in water hit the stomach like garlic. I was devastated (G'. Ghulam, 114). - Your youngest son, Boriboivachcha, climbed a poplar tree and fell down trying to get a baby sparrow , he said "daddy" once and "squealed..." and died (G'. Gulom, 214).

The resulting meaning, which occurs with the help of certain lexemes, grammatical indicators, in most cases goes back to the lexical source. The relation of resultative verbs to the object can be divided into the following components: "achieving a target result" (X (subject) achieves resultability by changing the state of Y (object), for example; to destroy the files ; cut a carrot), "result related to time " (X (the subject) achieves causality by moving Y (the object) from one state to another before the speech situation, for example: *He spilled the milk ; the cat spilled the milk*), "causative resultality" X (the subject) to another person Z (another person)

physically or as a result of verbal influence, changes the state of Y (object), achieves effectiveness.

It is known that in the aspectual study of the English verb system, based on the classification of Z. Vendler, the analysis of predicates by dividing them into types such as activity, state, accomplishments and achievements (Vendler Z, 1967) has become widespread. In this case, any predicate belongs to one of these types. But there is no clear opinion on whether the semantics of resultivity should be included in any of these types. In particular, V. Croft, J. Carrier, J. Randall refer to the type of accomplishments (completion) (W. Croft ; 2001, 416; J. Carrier, JH Randall; 1992, 173-234), Mc Cawley, Rappaport Hovav, B. Levin, etc., achievements (J. Mc . Cawley, 1981; M. Rappaport Hovav, B. Levin; 2001, 766-797) are considered unique. And A. Goldberg puts forward the idea that the resultativeness itself is a phrase with a special limited feature (A. Goldberg; 2006, 188). According to the author, productivity is not a phenomenon that can be independently classified like accomplishments or achievements. As an example , he cites the verb *push* belonging to the activity group (*Terry pushed the door shut*). Resultativeness is the change of the state of the argument as a result of the action represented by the verb, the occurrence of a certain result (A. Goldberg; 2006, 188).

There are many conflicting opinions about the aspectual classes that form resultative conjunctions. For example, Van Valin puts forward the opinion that resultativeness occurs only in limited predicates (Van Valin, 1990), while D. Dowty and R. Jackendoff emphasize that it is characteristic of verbs with limited features belonging to the activity type (D. Dowty, 1991; R. Jackendoff, 1990). T. Hoekstra connects resultativeness with static verbs and the state resulting from static (T. Hoekstra, 1988). Usually, the connection of the result with the lexical-semantic meaning of the verb is widespread.

When using the lexical expression meaning resultativeness, the following semantic restrictions are suggested: both arguments that form resultativeness (agents and patients) perform the same function; there will be no time interval during the implementation of causation; the quality meaning productivity must be clearly

expressed; the quality denoting productivity is evaluated as an integral part of the structure. But these verbs do not have the same equivalent in all languages. In some languages, this phenomenon may be grammatically formed. As components that unite the semantics of verbs with a resultative feature, it is possible to cite such things as the complete change of the primary state of the object as a result, the total loss of the primary state of the object as a result of a causative process, action. Schemes are updated in different contexts, the rate of such an update is determined by the number of nodes (slots) it needs to be filled. Consequently, verbs and object phrases with the SVO pattern (subject) are composed of nodes (Sh. Safarov; 2019, 57). Also, one verb lexeme can have different semantic expression under the influence of different grammatical units. For example, the resultative meaning in English is a syntactic-semantic feature, but in Uzbek it is not always expressed by the same sema. Compare: *Meanwhile Mr. McGowan's smile faded to a look of perplexed gloom.* (O'Henry, 43) ; *My consciousness left me , my whole body became numb* (S. Ahmad, 29).

In the English example, the semantics of the verb *to fade* has a resultative sema. This verb means change of state. In the example of the Uzbek language, the complex verb combination "left" and the analytical forms "had become" meant a change of state, and a resultative meaning was created.

Productivity, in turn, is related to intentional actions. This caused the emergence of the term intentional result (H.Filip, 1993, A.Goldberg ; 2006, 28). As a result, a group of intentional resultative verbs was formed in English. The following verbs form the English intentional resultative sema group: *annihilate, demolish, ruin, wreck, break, shatter, smash, pulverize, cremate, consume, dissolve* v.h. _ k. *behead (decapitate) wreck – burn (consume, devour), disintegrate – crush , explode – break, burst – blast, dynamite – mine, melt – dissolve flatten* (J. Bowers; 1993, 591-656).

The syntactic-semantic properties of the verb are determined depending on the number of participants in the situation and the task they perform, the type of situation, and the adaptation of the predicate and arguments (possessor, complement). This content has a specific resultative expression, and resultativeness is explained by

the absence of the participating subject as an object. *A beam would fall and smash the tomb* (E.Schultze-Bernd, N.P.Himmelman; 2004 , 59–131). This example creates an XVcausYmodel.

Resultative structures are closely related to causative structures. The causative situation consists of such components as the person who carries out the causation, the causative action, the subject subject to the causation, the object that occurs to the causation, the situation caused by the causation (Alisova, 1971; Arutyunova, 1976; Balli, 1955; Zolotova, 1973; Nedyalkov, Silnitsky, 1969 ; Cheif, 1975, etc.). In this case, the semantics of the situation is explained by the fact that the subject destroys the existing state of the object under the influence of the causative verb. The loss of the existing state of the object creates a resultativeness as a known result. Participants (subject and object) perform the main task of clarifying the situation. For example, the person performing causation performs agentive, causative, initiative tasks, while the object participates in causative, instrumental, resultative tasks.

is considered as the result of influencing the object and changing the object under the influence of the semantics of cause and effect in the clause expressed by the verb (V.P. Nedyalkov, G.A. Otaina, AA . Kholodovich ; 1974).

Resultative structures are considered to be a phenomenon directly related to the action feature of the verb. In particular, the limited feature of the verb is explained by the presence of the action in the lexeme of the verb, which tends to the final point (Petrukhina; 2000, 24), and therefore it is important to refer to this phenomenon in the emergence of resultative structures. The action feature of the verb is the main source that forms resultative structures.

1.4. Theoretical views on the relationship between resultative and perfective

V.P. _ According to Nedyalkov, resultativeness is a grammatical meaning very close to the perfect (V. Nedyalkov, 1988). Resultativeness is a form that determines the change of the state of an object as a result of a previous action (V.Nedyalkov, S.Yakhontov; 1983, 7), resultativeness is the state of an object caused by a certain action in the past (J.Bybee; 1994, 53). The views of scientists on the relationship

between resultativeness and perfectionism are not always compatible. In particular, Yu.S. According to Maslov, resultativeness is considered the main source of the perfect [Maslov; 1983, 46], and Bybee defines that the perfect is the main indicator of a completed event with a grammatical basis, and resultativeness is a lexical-based event (Bybee J., 1994: 69-74).

Several diagnostic contexts distinguishing the resultative from the perfect are highlighted. According to this, the resultativeness is determined by the influence of some of the approaches in the text, the semantics of the language units in the case function. In addition, verbs that mean a change of state (*to break, to build*) are also resultative structures. The research on the issue of the nature of the limitation of the verb and the dependence of the resultative meaning was carried out by V.P. We can observe in Petrukhina's works (P.V. Petrukhina; 2000, 55 - 56).

There are different approaches to perfect analysis. In some cases, the perfect tense is interpreted as a grammeme belonging to taxis. In this case, it corresponds to the situation of the perfect speech, but is done before the beginning of the count (tochke otschyota) (E.V. Paducheva; 2004, 46-57) is considered as a reaction to the event. B. Comrie gives an experiential definition of the English perfect. According to the author's interpretation, the perfect is the result of an event that occurred in the past and has become the present (V. Comrie; 1985, 58). J. Baibi's views on the perfect are relatively different. According to him, it is a qualitative relation to an agent based on certain knowledge related to past experiences, for example: *Have you ever met my brother ?* (J. Bybee; 1994, 62).

Linguists who interpret the perfect as a pragmatic event reflecting new information (Mc . Cawley, 1971; O. Dahl, Hedin; 2000, 385-386) "*The king has arrived !*" is also available. In modern English, there are efforts aimed at semantically differentiating the meanings expressed by the constructions formed by combining the auxiliary verbs *have* and *be* into two forms of adjectives. For example, if it is emphasized that the combination of the two forms of the auxiliary verb *be* and the adjective in the sentences *He is fallen , He is gone to the market* expresses the

resultative meaning, the auxiliary verb and the adjective *have* are evaluated as two grammaticalized perfects and differ from the resultative.

V.A. According to Plungyan 's interpretation, the main task is the comparative study of the perfect and imperfect forms, while the remaining forms are functions specific to the pure tense (V.A. Plungyan ; 2011, 399). It is evaluated as a phenomenon that includes tense categories and shades expressed through personal forms of the English verb. He describes the perfect forms as tenses. The author interprets perfect and resultative as one phenomenon . However, resultativeness is not only a phenomenon related to syntactic combination, but it also occurs lexically and semantically.

In this regard, E.V. Paducheva cites the opinion that "in many languages, the perfect belongs to diachronic resultativeness, therefore, the grammaticalization of analytical tenses under the concept of "perfective" leads to the loss of lexical limitation in the formation of resultative structures" (E.V. Paducheva; 1998, 142–156) .

The grammatical form of the English perfect is taken as the prototype of the meaning of perfect. But the issues related to this category have not been sufficiently researched. Views on the meaning of English perfect forms differ theoretically and also in practical grammars (R.Hovav, B.Levin; 2001, 766 – 797). There are those who focus on the difference between perfective and resultative from a pragmatic point of view. For example, according to B. Comrie's definition, it means "the event that occurred before the perfect speech situation" (V. Comrie; 1985, 52), the result is evaluated in the manner of events related to the speech situation. In order to understand the factors of formation of meaning, on the one hand, it is necessary to take into account the features of language units, which are characteristic of a functional dynamic system, and on the other hand, it is necessary to consider them as a product of knowledge accumulated during human experience (Sh. Safarov; 2013, 97).

American English colloquial speech researchers (J.Lindstedt, 2000), (DJNapoli, 1992) say that the past tense (Past Indefinite) and the mixed form of the

perfect form or the form of the perfect form with *the* auxiliary verb have have gone out of circulation in American speech. That is why they believe that it is better to associate the event related to the situation of oral speech with productiveness.

When describing the perfect from a typological point of view, it can be seen that it is grammatically formed in English compared to other languages. In this language, the perfect can be taken as a prototype. Although the study of perfect forms in English has been conducted using various approaches, not all issues related to this category have been fully investigated. In particular, the semantic features represented by the grammatical category of the perfect, the lack of comparative study of the meanings of the lexical-semantic groups of the verb in this form, the analysis of its conceptual essence and pragmatic expression in the process of communication can be an example of this. The difficulty of determining the meanings expressed in the perfect form is also related to the semantics of "continuity". This situation is directly related to the communication process and the speech situation, and researchers call it the term "continuing relevance" (McCawley; 1971, 54). Formation of resultative and perfect meanings is also related to the action feature (limited/unlimited) of the verb (B. Rizaev, 1988; G'. Mirsanov, 2009). Expression of the resultative meaning in the perfect form is in most cases a phenomenon characteristic of verbs with a limited action character. The perfective meaning can be expressed in non-finite active verbs. It also plays an important role in the formation of perfect taxi relationships.

Resultativeness in most cases is related to the meaning of the change of state that occurs under the influence of the lexical feature of the verb. The perfect is based on many pragmatic factors related to the communication situation. According to O. Dall, the perfect, at first glance, seems to be compatible with resultativeness, but it should not be considered as an important form of resultativeness. Because this category is only a phenomenon that fits the situation in terms of appearance. Perfect refers to the pragmatic situation resulting from an event that happened in the past tense. There are opinions that the action feature of the verb plays an important role in differentiating between the resultative and the perfect. In particular, non-finite

characteristic verbs are considered to form the perfect (I.P. Petrukhina; 2000, 56. J. Bybee; 1994, 68-69. O. Dahl, E. Hedin; 2000, 385-402 . J. Lindstedt; 2000, 368).

Nowadays, in the United States and Britain, the study of English as a separate or comparative language is becoming widespread. This is due to the difference of many lexical units in the oral speech of these languages, phonetic disparity, differences in grammatical categorical signs (J. Miller, 2004). As mentioned, In spoken English in the United States, the perfect form is falling out of circulation. As a result, the perfect form of the verb is expressed by the past participle or two forms of the adjective. In modern African-American speech, *the auxiliary verb have has been replaced by the form done + preterit done ate (he ate)*. Differences in English perfect forms and the meanings they express are related to the emergence of such variations as Afro-American English, Indian English, Samanian English. For example, in the variant of the English language used in the Dominican Republic, *there is information that the auxiliary verb have has already left the speech (H. Lødrup; 2000, 171-188)*. Compare: *she has been married - she has been married* or *I have been to New-York - I done been to Miami ' .*

E. Dal and E. Khedin analyze the concept of "continuing relevance" from a pragmatic point of view. According to the researchers, it is not the result of the event in the example of *A bank has been robbed , but the aspects of this event that are related to the current reality are important for the communicators . (O. Dahl, E. Hedin; 2000, 391-392)*. Of course, in this case, it is assumed that the speaker does not provide information about the incident, but also information about other incidents that occurred as a result of this incident. It can be observed that this, in turn, leads to a change in meaning. It can be observed that a semantic change related to the time interval is taking place. We can witness that the perfect form becomes an indicator of the near and far past relative to the speech situation in the given variations (J. Miller; 2004, 233). However, there are also those who adhere to the definition of "the perfect is a weakened resultative resulting from the completion of an action" (V.A. Plungyan; 2000, 299). In our opinion, perfective and resultative appear as separate phenomena. Some resultative meanings expressed in perfect forms are built on resultative

structures. (MERitz; 2012, 889) That is, the resultativeness depends on the lexical property of the combination, not on the form. In distinguishing between the perfective and the resultative, it is necessary to pay attention to the semantics of case and action. In particular, the semantics of the perfect should be considered as a phenomenon related to event completion. And the resultativeness is considered the semantics of the situation. Although the perfect has a resultative meaning in certain situations, it should be evaluated not as the result of a change of state, but as the result of an event. It is directly based on the lexical meaning of the verb and creates pragmatic relations in a given communication situation. E. According to Dahl, the use of the perfect depends on the imagined situation ending with some result. That is why the author evaluates the perfect as a phenomenon that creates pragmatic result. The occurrence of a result or situation is related to an event that occurred before (O. Dahl, E. Hedin; 2000, 392).

In the Uzbek language, the meaning of the perfect forms the present tense with the help of the past tense and the auxiliary verb "to be". Productivity occurs in Uzbek mainly in some auxiliary verb combinations. In particular, auxiliary verbs such as " to be ", " to come out ", " to finish " in the Uzbek language mean the completion of the action expressed by the leading verb and its result. For example: *After healing, one of his legs became limp* (Said Ahmad, 205). *One day, when I come back late, my mother is sitting on the porch crying. " Masuda fainted on the way and fell down, they took him to the hospital, he is in a serious condition"* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 141).

It is important to distinguish between the resultative and the perfective . Although there are works on aspectuality in Uzbek linguistics, in them there are works on perfect and resultativeness. the difference is not reflected. In Uzbek, auxiliary verbs combine with the leading verb to create different meanings. In some cases, it may be thought that they have similar meanings, for example, to *finish reading a book*, to *finish reading a book*, and to *finish reading a book* at first glance have the same meaning, that is, it means that the reading process has ended. But they differ from each other in aspectual meaning as they are used in the text. For example, the phrase "*to finish reading the book*" means that the process of reading the book has

been completed. The meaning of *reading the book* is understood by the reader. The combination "*he finished reading the book*" implies the completion of the reading process as a result of a certain action (and finally). The question arises as to which of these combinations is perfect, resultative or complete. In our opinion, the combination of *having read a book* has a certain connection with other events in the text. Therefore, this compound can be connected with the perfect. And the construction of *reading a book* is related to the completeness, the result. Therefore, this combination can be evaluated as a characteristic of productivity.

Based on our analysis, we can emphasize that resultativeness has a number of grammatical, lexical, syntactic, and contextual expressions, unlike the perfect. But since the language system and structure are different from each other, it is necessary to pay more attention to semantic differences in their research. Therefore, the perfect can cause certain difficulties in grammatically formed English. The grammatically formed analytic perfect forms in English do not always imply weakened resultatives. Paying attention to the action feature of the verb (B.Rizaev, 1999) can give certain results when differentiating the resultative and other expressed meanings in these forms .

The difference between the resultative and the perfect is directly related to the change of state. In particular, performance represents a definite change of state. However, some events are also associated with productivity. For example, "if a person dies, in a narrow sense, the fact that he left this world is evaluated as the result of the event (H. Meral, Mesut; 2005 , 134 - 135)". If the resultativeness means the change of the concrete situation that occurs under the influence of the lexical meaning of the verb, the perfect can mean the meanings explained by the pragmatic "resonance consequences (O.Dahl, E.Hedin; 2000, 392)" related to the concrete communicative situation.

The semantic feature of resultativeness is directly related to the action feature of verbs. In particular, the limited feature of the verb is an example of this. In finite characteristic verbs, there is usually a sense that the action has reached an end point and thus the action is completed. In addition, these verbs are also used in relation to

verbs that mean change of state, transition from one state to another. The result of reaching the end point of the action has an important place in the result. That is why the expression of this category is related to the action feature of the verb. At this point, it should be noted that actionability is only a semantic feature of the verb lexeme, while resultivity is a lexical-grammatical phenomenon.

Chapter summaries

As a result of the analysis of studies related to the theory of aspectuality, the following conclusions were reached:

While the phenomenon of aspectuality is universal, it differs from language to language according to the ways and means of expression. At present, the research of aspectual meanings is mainly based on the theory of the functional-semantic field and the theories of the compositional approach.

Although aspectual semantics is evaluated as a characteristic of verbs, their expression is influenced by all the linguistic means involved in the context. For example, in English, aspect is not only interpreted as an event associated with the verb. The meaning of the aspect is specific to the whole predicate and is realized depending on the quantitative properties of the argument. In the Uzbek language, analytical forms of the verb, complex verb combinations are considered the main linguistic tools that mean aspectual meanings.

The ways of expressing aspectual meanings in each language, differences in language units, differences in the types of meanings expressed in the classification of action art, the presence of specific types of structures that create aspectual meanings caused the difference in the use of terms related to the aspectual field.

Means of expressing aspectuality in English and Uzbek differ lexically, syntactically, morphologically and semantically. This is direct It is also a characteristic of language means that means productivity.

In English, the difference between the resultative and the perfect comes down to pragmatic factors. Many linguists evaluate the perfect as a phenomenon related to pragmatic reality. Resultativeness is recognized as a lexical-semantic feature. In the

Uzbek language, there has been no work aimed at determining the different aspects of resultative and perfective meanings. Nevertheless, we came to the conclusion that the perfect and the resultative can be distinguished by the use of auxiliary verbs and the relation of the text.

Within the framework of aspectual semantics, productivity occupies an important place in special studies according to the variety of methods and means of expression. Because productivity is distinguished by the possibilities of being expressed in specific units and structures. This led to the selection of productivity as a separate research object.

II CHAPTER. LINGUISTIC OCCURRENCE OF RESULTATIVE STRUCTURES

2.1. Different aspects of resultative structures according to their linguistic essence

Structures (construction) plays a central role in the study of the relationship between syntax and semantics. The term construction (structure) is applied to a linguistic expression with a plan and content of expression (E.V. Rakhilina; 2010, 18). Language units and compounds of any level with content and form are considered structures, and its elements can be morphemes, words, compounds, sentences (Ch. J. Fillmore, P. Kay; 1997). Thus, causative expression, ratio, relative compounds, resultative, inchoative, iterative expressions can be examples of aspectual structure. Our analysis focuses on resultative, causative, passive, descriptive structures. Since these structures are close to each other in form and content, they form a large group. In resultative, descriptive, causative structures, the lexical base and syntactic connection of the verb have the same appearance. Resultative, descriptive, causative structures are very close to each other in form, but they differ in their expressive semantic features. In some cases, the meanings of causativeness and resultativeness or causativeness and descriptiveness can be

embodied within the same structure. Structures are considered the basic unit that gives the practical expression of every language. In the formation of structures that make up certain phrases, if an element is semantically independently connected to the possibilities of another, it is a structure (A. Goldberg; 1995, 10).

In the constructional approach to the study of language units, the types of analysis covering causative actions, purposeful transformation, causality resulting from causation, and complex complementary meanings are understood. It is obtained as a specific pattern with the help of certain morphological, syntactic, lexical connections. For example, in transitive verb structures, the tasks performed by the agent, patient, and addressee, as well as which verb class they are associated with, are important. In general, indirect complements are not directly evaluated as verb arguments, but are considered as structures (A. Goldberg; 2001, 117).

In many languages, structures related to causality and resultativeness have been studied separately syntactically and semantically. Researchers distinguish causativeness and resultative expression depending on their intentional, functional, physical and linguistic characteristics (V.P. Nedyalkov, 1983). The expression of causativeness and also resultativeness differs according to the morphological and syntactic formation of each language. In some languages, these phenomena are morphological indicators, syntactic has a form, while others have a lexical character. The lexical feature is also a feature of morphologically formed languages. Because sometimes causativeness and resultativeness occur directly in connection with the lexical and semantic properties of the verb. Morphologically and syntactically, they are considered characteristic of certain languages. In these structures, the expression of the verb can mean causative, descriptive and resultative, depending on whether it subordinates an additional argument. For example, causative verbs in English subjugate a complex complement or form special causative and resultative structures through the combination of certain adjectives related to changing the state of the object.

Resultativeness, in turn, is related to the static character of the verb, where the static predicate forms resultative structures. Mas a lan, *The lake froze solid*. It is also

necessary to distinguish between the resultative and descriptive structures expressed in the predicate. In resultative structures, the relationship of the action represented by a predicate with time makes it possible to distinguish them from descriptive structures. This situation is clearly visible in the Uzbek language. According to D. Nasilov, the static form of the verb in the Uzbek language is important in the formation of result structures. The author *hangs a rifle on the wall* as an example brings combinations. In this case, it is suggested that the static quality has formed resultative structures in the function of predicate. Next and in the example of *a rifle hanging on the wall*, it is noted that the perfect meaning of the passive participle verb is formed (D. Nasilov; 1983, 119).

In syntactic typology, the term "resultative" is applied to the secondary predicate in consecutive structures. For example: *The lake froze solid, He shot her dead* (S. Wechsler, 1997; R. Washio, 1999; Li, Chao, 2009). The term "resultativeness" refers to the expected result of transformative processes (V.P. Nedyalkov, 1983; A.A. Kholodovich, 1974).

Resultative and descriptive structures are close to each other in form. The descriptive meaning expressed in the part of the sentence is usually formed in certain semantic groups of the verb denoting state, change of state, action. Also, the descriptive expression is reflected in the description of the physical and psychological state of the person represented by the noun participle. For example: *He felt love in his heart. The room was dirty and messy.*

Descriptive expression means semantically related to the state of a person. Another aspect that distinguishes the descriptive from the resultative structures is that it does not form a complex structured section. And resultative structures in most cases consist of primary and secondary predicates. They are semantically related to the person and resultativeness also differs from the descriptive in that the action or state expressed by the primary predicate results after a certain period of time. For example: *He pulled his tie **tight**. She snapped her bag shut* (S. Wechsler, 1997).

Resultative meanings limit an action and indicate its result. Compounds with this meaning began to be called resultative structures. Because these structures are

directly related to the predicate, they are a part of the main predicate, that is, they have no syntactic function (D.Napoli, 1994).

constructions in the passive participle in English date back to the history of the development of grammatical forms. These structures are considered the products of the passive ratio form associated with the change of state. As some indicators of resultative devices in the Uzbek language, we can give an example of constructions made with an adjective form . Compare: *The windows of the brown-stone mansions were packed with the most opulent creations of Flora, the sister of the Lady of the Lilies. (O'Henry, 272) . Avaz noticed that the newspaper was still folded in his hand when he went to the pulpit. They licked their wet lips with their tongues and tried to suppress themselves (Pirimkul Kadirov, 256).*

There are also synonymous groups that form result structures . They are expressed using certain analytical forms, and the role of auxiliary verbs is important in the formation of their synonymous group. Auxiliary verbs in English and Uzbek have their own functions, form, and meaning. In these languages, auxiliary verbs are functionally different. The role of auxiliary verbs in the formation of resultative structures and their comparative analysis will be discussed in more detail in the following chapters.

In the comments on the perfect in practical English grammars, there are cases where the difference between the perfect and the resultative is not distinguished, such as "an action with a known result" (FRPalmer; 1987, 36). Formally, this is considered a semantic difference, and the resultativeness is considered a reality-related phenomenon belonging to the present time (V.Nedyalkov, S.Yakhontov; 1983). It is known that affectivity inherent in ignorance is related to state change (B.Comrie, 1981). In general, many languages do not have a specific form to represent resultativeness. In particular, in English, the expression of resultative structures with a secondary predicate in the framework of a complex complement exists as a separate phenomenon. But this phenomenon is expressed using a number of lexical, syntactic and semantic tools. Therefore, all forms that reflect the resultative meaning are included in the analysis. In particular, attention is paid to the analysis of the lexical-

semantic feature of the verb, passive relative structures, the adjective form of the verb, analytical compounds, complex verb compounds, and some syntactic compounds. In particular, the difference between resultative and causative structures , resultative and descriptive structures , resultative and perfective differences in English and Uzbek languages are included in the scope of analysis. When analyzing resultative structures, they usually focus on the following examples and analyze them directly as resultative structures:

- 1) *He wiped the table clean :*
- 2) *He hammered the metal flat (S. Wechsler ; 2005 , 255-273) .*
- 3) *The river froze solid;*
- 4) *Bill followed the road into the forest (A. Goldberg, R. Jackendoff ; 2004) .*
- 5) *Ethan photographed Nathan happy (H. Rapoport , 1993).*

In the first and second examples given, *wipe* and *hammer* verbs have semantically completed the resultative structure . In these examples, the resultative and causative structures are combined. In the third example, resultativeness has arisen in the combination of verb semantics and adjective meanings. In the following fourth and fifth examples, it can be observed that descriptiveness and resultativity are implemented within the same structure.

There are many views on the expression of productivity and its definition. V.P. Nedyalkov and S.I. Yakhontov gives the definition that result is a new state resulting from a previous action (V.P. Nedyalkov, S.I. Yakhontov; 1983,7). According to the authors, the effectivity is a phenomenon related to the passive ratio. V.S. Hrakovskiy connects resultativeness with the action feature of the verb. He considers the two adjectival forms of finite characteristic verbs to be indicative of this meaning (Khrakovsky; 1991, 151). It should not be forgotten that this feature cannot be considered characteristic of all languages.

T. Hoekstra, in the process of analysis of actions, which means resultative and causative structures , includes the actions expressed in the group of resultative structures regardless of the changes that occur in the patient (T. Hoekstra; 1988, 101

- 139). According to the author, resultativeness means a change in the locative and qualitative state of the object. T. Hukstra interprets resultivity and causation as two different forms of semantic meaning expressed within a single structure. He includes in the locative type of resultativeness the devices that mean the change of space caused by the impact on the object with a certain movement: *...he pushed a ball into the hole* (T. Hoekstra ; 1992, 45 - 75). It seems that the inclusion of certain structures that are semantically close to resultatives formed by transitive verbs in the group of resultatives also indicates that the issue is still controversial and shows the need for typological study of these structures. In the framework of structural linguistics and semantic syntax, attention is paid to solving the problem by delimiting the resultative structure within the secondary predicate (Kim Soowon, Joan Maling; 1997, 189-204). In these directions, the secondary predicate (adjective, noun, impersonal forms of the verb) participating in the composition of the complex complement is recognized as an element with a resultative meaning, and the semantic, resultative feature of the verb in the main predicate is also recognized. In this approach, the effect of the verb on the agent and the patient is neglected. Therefore, in our analysis, all lexical, morphological, lexical-semantic tools that mean result, in addition to being expressed in the structure of the complex complement, are included. Because resultativeness is not only a feature of the secondary predicate, but also a property of verb semantics as part of the classification of aspectual semantics. Also, in the typological analysis, the structures of one language can appear in a different composition in the second language, and vice versa, the result structure of the second language can be expressed in completely different combinations in the first. In addition, as noted above, it is also necessary to distinguish separate or close meanings of resultative, descriptive and causative structures. In terms of syntactic content, these structures have the same structure, but semantically sometimes the meanings of descriptiveness, only causativeness or only resultativeness arise. In other cases, both meanings (depictiveness + causativeness, causativeness + resultativeness) are accompanied. Verb semantics plays an important role in such cases.

2.2. Regarding the interaction of the resultative and causative meanings

The concept of causation is considered as the result of influencing the object and changing the object to a different state under the influence of the semantics of cause and effect in the clause expressed by the verb (V.P. Nedyalkov, 1969). The semantic structure of words can include meaningful components as well as grammatical forms, so it belongs to several thematic classes. They can be verbs of the emotional-causative class, meaning physical and emotional impact, or expressing an object, subject relationship, with certain grammatical indicators. Thus, it is possible to classify verbs at different levels, take into account the signs of dynamism, staticity, reveal their internal semantics and analyze them through actional semantics and the proportionality of grammatical forms. The lexical-semantic system includes issues such as the meaning-content relations of lexical and phraseological units, the specific characteristics of the groups they form, the character of interrelationship (lexical-paradigmatic) and aspects related to other subsystems of the language, and the variability in the semantic change of language units. This relationship means that it is possible to classify semantic groups of verbs at different levels of the language. In this regard, the group of verbs with causative meaning is important. Causative verbs, while having their own lexical meaning, have an object and subject relationship, enter into a relationship by means of certain grammatical markers, and also affect the formation of resultative semantics in the object relationship. As a result, a resultative-causative structure is formed. These structures have been studied by some linguists as a separate frame (M. Rappaport Hovav, B. Levin; 2001, 766-797. W. Croft; 2012, 448. B. Heine; 1997, 359).

Resultant structures can also play an important role in frame semantics. Also, within frame theory, they also serve to establish the relationship between syntax and semantics. Through this, it is clarified to what extent the semantics of the frame is implemented at the syntactic level. In these resultative structures, the elements of the frame, such as the one who implements the causation, the object of the causation, the patient, and the result (resultativeness) are distinguished. These structures are often mixed with causative structures. That's why we found it better to name the main

predicate as "causing event" (J.Simpson, 1983) and the secondary predication as "resultative event". We pay attention to the following examples: *The furniture was chipped and bruised; the couch, distorted (resultative event) by bursting springs, seemed a horrible monster that had been slain during the stress of some grotesque convulsion. (O'Henry, 77) ; That snowstorm sure fixed us [causing event + resultant event] with a fine lot of achievements apiece. By the time the snow melted [resultative event] , if you had stepped up to me suddenly (O'Henry, 106) ; the room was dead [resultative event] . The essence that had vivified it was gone [resultative event] . The perfume of mignonette had departed. In its place was the old, stale odor of moldy house furniture, of atmosphere in storage. (O'Henry, 79) .*

In these examples, the causator is the person who implements the causative event, while the causative object is changed under the influence of the causator and plays an important role in the occurrence of the resultative event. The frame elements of these structures differ at the syntactic level. Compare:

Doors banged somewhere; the elevated trains roared intermittently; a cat yowled miserably upon a back fence (O'Henry, 77);

The door opened . Katy walked in carrying a small hand satchel. John stared at her stupidly (O'Henry, 124) .

causative structures makes their description difficult. Research findings are often based on the personal analysis of the author or researcher rather than a reliable source. This is reflected in the misinterpretation of grammatical considerations, lexical and stylistic aspects, and contradictory relations at the semantic level. Later, we can witness the analysis of causative structures based on corpus data.

He makes me laugh.

I always tell jokes that make them laugh (Gilquin G., 2010 ; 347).

A given causative event can mean different outcomes in different contexts. It is directly related to the intended use of causation and its result. If we take the example of *He made me laugh (he made me laugh)*, the occurrence of laughter cannot be predicted in advance, and a particular joke may make one person laugh, but may leave another person surprised or not understand the joke at all. Therefore , it is

necessary to pay attention to pragmatic features along with the text in the analysis of the resulting meanings generated by causative structures.

If we pay attention to the studies devoted to causative structures, we can see that they were conducted in different directions. For example, Carrier and Randall (2010) studied these structures from a diachronic perspective, while V. Croft (2012) conducted research within the context of spoken American English. O. Dall and E. Khedinlar (2000) distinguished its four types through a qualitative approach to the study of causative structures. These linguists and researchers paid attention to the syntactic formation of causative structures. They did not pay attention to the semantic differentiation of causative structures. Some studies are devoted to the analysis of one (Kemmer 2001 on causative *make*) and sometimes several causative structures in English. There are also many views on the cognitive aspects of these structures (RWLangacker, 1999; T. Beloshapkova, 2008). These studies suggest that a cognitive approach has a useful basis in the study of causation. Because causation is evaluated as a phenomenon that corresponds to the fundamental categories of consciousness. These researchers recognize causation as a "transcendental notion (the basis of thinking on experience)". A cognitive approach to the study of causation creates new opportunities to determine their nature.

Compounds involving causative verbs can appear in different forms (pronoun+noun, adjective+noun, determiner+noun+relative clause). In these combinations, adverbs or other language units involved in the sentence can be surrounded by a causative verb and a language unit loaded with the meaning of result.

The analysis of the formal structure of the resulting structures is observed in the works of N. Chomsky (Chomsky, 1965), Fried (Freed, 1979), Palmer (Palmer, 1988), Roshen (Rosen, 1993). For example, *I had a book stolen* (an example given by N. Chomsky), can be understood in several different ways, i.e. "*I caused someone to steal a book for me*" - "*I had a book stolen for myself*" (causative construction), "*It happened to me that someone stole a book of mine*" – "*Кудрум кимбаїїбді*" (experimental construction), "*I possessed a book that had been stolen*" – "*Більні біку білі мілі білі міні міді*" (lexical meaning) or "*I succeeded in stealing a book*"

– “*I owned a stolen book*” (conclusive perfect) (Chomsky, 1965). It should be noted that the lexical meaning and grammatical formation of language units are also important in causative structures involving the verb *have*. The resulting causation causes the meaning to change depending on the lexical meaning and grammatical formation of language units acting as an indirect complement. For example: *I had the boiler going* (R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik, 1982). The authors interpret this example as a structure with existential meaning.

In a broad sense, causality is understood as the interdependence that occurs in complex relationships such as cause, purpose, conditionality, and consequence, and in a narrow sense, it is interpreted as an expression of cause and effect. The category of causativeness is considered to have controversial semantics, which is formed by the connection of causal, resultative and intentional meanings.

In addition, there are controversial views on causal content and aspectual content. While most linguists (V.A. Plungyan, 2011; C.Tenny, 1994) include units of causal expression in the aspectual composition, there are also those who interpret them as a separate category (J.Simpson, 1983. V.P. Nedyalkov, G.A. Otaina, A.A. Kholodovich, 1974).

The aspectual content usually represents the nature of events in time (G'.Mirsanov, 2019), i.e. in which direction (beginning, duration, completion, repeatability, duration, productivity, intensity, etc.) are implemented. This shows that aspectuality is a direct verb phenomenon. Causal content is related not only to the verb, but also to the realization of the meaning expressed by the noun. Talmy refers to this phenomenon as causal structure or force-dynamic structure (Talmy 1988/2000). Causal content occurs in the mutual causal relations of language units involved in the expression of events. Causality means implicit in the agent-patient relationship. V. According to Croft, causal content is the main semantic feature in the expression of noun meaning (W. Croft, 1991).

As noted, sentences involving verbs that form causative constructions can often have multiple meanings. These meanings can be distinguished by referring to the context of the sentence, taking into account the criteria of causation and

experientiality, as well as the semantic possibilities of the language units involved in the sentence. Let's focus on the following examples:

a. *John had his daughter accepted at Dawson College* . [Derived from experimental analysis]

b. *John paid fifty dollars to have his daughter accepted at Dawson College* . [derived semantics of direct causation].

In both examples, the adjective form II is used as a secondary predicate. Exactly, the adjective form II used in the role of patients meant that the subject was accepted to college, the result of his previous behavior (hard training). In our opinion, this structure is closer to resultative than causal.

a. *Sherry had George water her plants* [causative analysis performed].

b. *Sherry had George overwater her plants* . [derived from experimental analysis] Ritter, Rosen (1993: 526).

In example (a), causation is done with a causative verb. However, in example (v), the preposition " *over* " in the infinitive form " *overwater* " as a secondary predicate means an action performed with "over" from the lexical point of view. Therefore, the meaning expressed by the secondary predicate in this example is characteristic of resultativeness. In these cases, we use the term resultative-causative structure in relation to them, since causativeness and resultality are expressed within one structure.

In determining the semantic distinctions expressed in causative structures, the definition of the type of language units of causative verbs (*cause* , *get* , *have* or *make*) and resultativeness (*infinitive* , *present participle* or *past participle*) has become widespread. That is why many researchers focus on the joint analysis of all the structures that are formed within one verb. For example, (X *get* YV *to* -inf), (X *get* Y *Vprp*) and (*get* Y *Vpp*) formed by the verb *get* are interpreted as different structures. In our opinion, it is appropriate to divide these structures into causative and resultative structures according to the lexical-semantic meanings, pragmatic function, and cognitive basis of language units participating as arguments .

In causative-resultative structures, it is not enough to analyze the meanings formed by the differentiation of a single causative verb and the infinitive or adjective that acts as a complement to it. To get a complete picture of the data, it may be appropriate to use a 'recovery mechanism (Granger 1997)'. The restoration mechanism is focused on determining the amount of meanings according to the pragmatic function of the language units involved in the resulting structures, thereby determining the percentage of the language units that make them up. In this process, it has been emphasized by some linguists that examples collected mainly from the corpus are effective for analysis (S. Wechsler; 2005 , 73–255).

In English, the verbs *to get*, *to have*, *to make*, *to cause* take a place in the center of analysis as a participant of causative and resultative structures in compound structures with a complex complement. Causativeness is a phenomenon directly related to the valence feature of the verb, while resultativeness is related to the semantics of the verb. Some linguists include resultative structures in the category of idiomatic expressions . They claim that the resultativeness results from the combination of a single lexical unit meaning *God smote him dead/ *half-dead/ *black and blue or a number of lexical units with an idiotcentric meaning. He drove her crazy/ bonkers/ over the edge/ to the brink of lunacy/ *happy* (J.Carrier, J.Randall; 1992, 184).

In the Uzbek language, causativeness has both lexical and morphological expression. This phenomenon (causativeness) is included in the category of verb level in "Grammar of the Uzbek language" (1975, 445). In this work, causative verbs with lexical characteristics such as *to place, cut, break, torture, wipe, pour and so on are combined into the group of verbs of the personal level. In most of these verbs belonging to the verb level category, it is possible to observe the existence of the meaning of resultativeness along with the meaning of causation. To determine this, it is necessary to refer to pragmatic relations. As an example let's compare the verbs to cut and break . These verbs are causative as well as resultative. In the first sentence in the examples He cut his hand and He broke his hand, the cutting of the hand was caused by a sharp object. The result of the amputation of the hand is a productive*

event. In the second example, there may be several reasons for causation. In particular, causation is created in the event that the subject falls due to carelessness, the impact of a technical tool during the work process, and similar events. A broken arm is considered as a result. In English, the verbs *to raise*, *to close*, *to open*, and in Uzbek *to raise*, *to close*, *to open*, and similar verbs belong to the type of psychological and mechanical causation. Compare: *closed eyes* - psychological causation, *closed the door* - mechanical causation, *opened his eyes* - psychological causation, *opened the door* - mechanical causation.

In many cases, it is difficult to determine the resultative event only through the causative verb. In these cases, the participation of the object is considered important. Psychological or mechanical causation occurs not only in a single verb, but in a pair of verb+causation object. For example: Davlatbekov, *who recently shaved his mustache and made it look better, entered through the Gate and seated a man in a gray hat in front* (Primkul Kadirov, 114).

In this example, *it has been polished* in the structure, the categorical suffixes -*lat*, -*tir* mean a causative expression, while the suffix -*gan* means the result of an event and reflects the resultative reality.

In most cases, it is difficult to determine the resultative event only through the causative verb. In these cases, the participation of the object is considered important. Psychological or mechanical causation occurs not only in a single verb, but in a pair of verb+causation object. For example: *Too angry, he also hit his other hand with a ruler. Avaz, who saw this from the desk on the other side, came running and took the ruler out of his brother's hand and broke it* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 15). *The white breath of the morning melted the morning like a piece of ice, and the leaves on the tips of my poplars are shining like silver. He grabbed my hand and dragged me* (Said Ahmad, 103).

The broken point in the first example given represents physical causation. In this case, as a result of the action of the subject, we witness the change (broken) of the qualitative state of the object. The fact that the object has a new appearance is evaluated as a result. In the following example, the compound *dissolves* expresses

mechanical causation and object abstraction occurs. The qualitative change (melting) of the object in the course of a mechanical event has a productive meaning.

Russian aspectologist V.S. According to Hrakovsky, the resultative semantics of the adjective belongs to the paradigm of the finite characteristic verb. All forms represented by one lexeme have equal properties. In particular, actional and resultative passive refer to different parts of a given situation (V.S. Khrakovskiy; 1991, 151). In the Uzbek language, there is a resultative structure formed by a specific combination of a leading and an auxiliary verb, which means a change of state of the subject. This structure meaning can be evaluated as a reality related to the present time. For example: *a tall, thin driver, dressed in overalls, with flowing hair and shiny temples, came to Ahmadjon carrying the necessary things on his shoulder* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 96). *Beyshenali grunted and lay down with a sheet over her head. He fell asleep without his head touching the pillow* (Said Ahmad, 112). In the first example, mechanical causation and qualitative changes represent causative-resultative semantics. In the next example, the structure *fell asleep-stayed* is a resultative representing a change in the state of the subject. In these examples, productivity is the result of entity management. In the resultativeness resulting from subject management, the case change of noun or adjective-noun combinations by the subject and the semantics of the verb form the basis of resultivity. In addition, there is also an object-directed resultative structure, and the **resultativeness** is expressed by means of auxiliary verbs of the adverbial form, *to do* and *to be*, and the adjective corresponding to them. Object-oriented performance implies transitive actions. For example: *After unloading the load and going home, Avaz tries not to think about anything other than the beautiful lambs in the lap of these majestic mountains* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 13). *After Avaz fought with his older brother Artiq because of Hulkar at school and became a shepherd, Hulkar began to think and miss him a lot* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 31).

It should be noted that in the Uzbek language, resultativeness, as well as causativeness, occurs under the influence of context. In this case, resultativeness or causality together with the main predicate acts as a complex participle. The action of

the subject as an organized event is related to the completion of one action and the execution of another action. It acquires a more pragmatic character (reliability of the performed action) and the achievement of one of the actions performed by the subject encourages the implementation of another. In this text, the resultativeness refers to the first predicate expressed by the adverbial form **-ib** . For example: *He washed his face in the gurgling water of the stream, wiped his wet beard on his belt and sat on the bench* (Said Ahmad, 50). *He went this way, this way, he entered the house. He put out the tea and left* (Said Ahmad, 241).

In these examples , structures such as *washing his face, wiping his belt, and putting it out* mean actions in real reality. Here, the sequence of actions is expressed, and the primary performed action (the subject washes his face, wipes his belt, pours out the tea) is counted as the result. Further actions (*sat on the platform expressed by the main predicate, left*) can be evaluated as an event that led to result . In these analytical structures with auxiliary verbs, the verbs expressing resultativeness and expressing the main predicate retain their lexical properties and represent two or three actions. In this case, the effectiveness of one action depends on the realization of another. For example: *Avaz placed the bullet , wiped his hand on his pants, took the pillow from the couch and put it on the bed, next to Hulkar's pillow:*

"Look, your task is done," they joked (Pirimkul Kadirov, 59).

Consequentiality is not a situational analysis or a metaphorical expression associated with a situation, but information that represents a characteristic of the situation by the observer. This indicates that resultativeness can be synonymous with descriptiveness, staticity, and in some cases causativeness. There are also opinions about the synonymy of resultative with the perfect (M. Rappaport Hovav, B. Levin ; 2001, 766–797. Yu.A. Lander; 2002, 300–312).

Resultative structures can include a certain group of verbs that represent a change of state as a synonymous event. In both languages, this is evaluated as lexical resultativeness, that is, it is considered a characteristic of certain verbs. Verbs reflecting the result of an event are included in the lexical result. This phenomenon can be found in every language. For example , *alter, improve, arise, die* and similar

verbs that mean a change of state in English have resultative meanings. In the Uzbek language, you can add verbs and complex verbs that mean *a change of state, to change, to die, to happen, to arise*, etc. to the resultative structures. For example: *A meeting in Hyde Park in 1926 was attended by 1,000 people and ended with a fight with communists demonstrators.* (Source: KCX)

*'Mr. Behrman died of pneumonia today in the hospital. (O'Henry, 194) ;
Meanwhile Mr. Mc Gowan's smile faded to a look of perplexed gloom. (O'Henry,54);*

Gavryushev committed suicide last year (S. Ahmad, 57).

After a while, they lifted the unconscious Dadajon out (S.Ahmad, 48).

The ghosts of snow that were visible in the morning here and there on the high slopes have now disappeared. The wind brings the smell of rustling juniper trees (Pirimkul Kadirov, 13).

In English, resultative and causative structures are close in form. In some cases, causation and effectivity can be expressed in the same structure. This is the case the verb in the main predicate that forms them is syntactically related to taking a complex complement. Resultativeness and causativeness are determined according to the secondary predicate semantic expression and morphological sign of the elements in the complex complement (infinitive, adjective I, adjective II, quality). In particular, the use of secondary predicates of quality, adjective II are considered resultative structures. In addition, we can find resultative meanings in the passive form of limited action verbs, the use of some connecting verbs in the predicative function, and the use of limited feature verbs in the adjective II form.

Predicates of resultativeness and descriptiveness are distinguished by time characteristics. In particular, the resultativeness is expressed by the change of state caused by the completion of the action represented by the main predicate, while the descriptiveness is the pictorial representation of the action that is being performed or has been performed in a certain period of time. The meaning of resultative and descriptive structures differs depending on the actional (bounded/unbounded) type of predicates. Resultative meaning is mainly expressed in finite and transformative predicates. For example : *The idea of touching people in the crowd touch him was*

something that had not occurred to him, but to be beautiful and that remote – you have got to get a crowd to touch him because that was what really got them wild (source : AB5).

In the study of the fundamental basis that ensures the connection of syntax and semantics, the main attention is paid to "the factor that determines the meaning of the sentence, that is, the predicate" (Levin, Rappaport, 1996; 1). Ch. Fillmore emphasizes the importance of the lexical meaning of the verb in determining the position of the noun in the sentence (Ch. Fillmore, 1975). The syntactic-semantic connection of arguments in the sentence is also related to the transitive/intransitive nature of the verb. Charles Fillmore points out that although the English verbs *hit and break* are both transitive, they have different syntactic expressions in causative use. Let's focus on the examples given by the author:

John broke the window // The window broke;
*John hit the window // *The window hit ;*
I hit his leg // I hit on the leg ;
*I broke his leg// *I broke him on the leg (Ch. Fillmore, 1975) .*

Although in these examples the verb has come to mean causation as a result of taking an indirect complement, the expressed meaning refers to the result of the action. This, in turn, indicates that causation and effectivity are expressed in one structure.

2.3 . Semantic properties of resultative structures in English

At the center of grammatical studies in any language is the representation of events as linguistic units and the interrelationship of the units involved in the sentence. These types of grammatical analysis are known by many terms in the history of linguistics: grammatical relations, syntactic functions, subcategorization of frames, argument-containing structures , argument dependence, etc. One of the main issues related to each branch of grammar is the choice of the correct relationship of similarities and differences within that language and in the context of other languages. Possessives, participles, complements are usually included in formal

categories as purely grammatical relations. But through the interaction of these categories, a huge semantic difference occurs in the process of expressing events. In addition, if the cross-section of languages is compared, not only the syntactic tasks in them, but also the scope of meaning expressed by formal indicators differ. In particular, in English, participles and complex complements form specific structures. These structures are used to express resultative and causative meanings from a semantic point of view. These meanings are also interpreted as separate categories in English. In particular, causativeness and resultativeness have many ways of expression as complex, comprehensive categories. They also reflect the relationship to the objects of the external world. In these relationships lies the concepts of cause and effect that exist in the mind. Within the category of direct causation, there is also the concept of causality, and it is necessary to distinguish between the relations that they perform. Since our research is not focused on causation and causality, we will not dwell on these relationships. Due to the occurrence of resultativeness and causality in structures close to each other, structural and semantic differences in them are analyzed.

Resultant structures are considered a semantic feature that occurs in secondary predication. In particular, the American linguist S. Rothstein includes secondary resultative predicates in the aspectual event type from the point of view of their relation to the event represented by the main predicate (S.Rothstein; 2006, 209 - 233). The author claims that secondary predicates have descriptive and resultative semantic properties. He cites the following examples to illustrate the difference between them:

a. *John drove the car drunk.*

b. *John painted the house red* (S. Rothstein; 2006, 209 - 233).

The given example (a) has t asviral predication. It has the meaning " *John drove drunk* " and contains the information about the incident. Productivity in this sentence is expressed in the secondary predicate *drunk in the adjective II form* . Content: " *John was drunk before he got behind the wheel* ." But in the Uzbek language translation, the resultative expression is not visible. In the next example (b)

, the statement " *John painted the house red and the house became red as a result* ". It obviously represented the result of the action taken. Therefore, this example is evaluated as a resultative predication. Such ideas can be found in (D. Dowty, 1991), (J. Carrier, JH Randall; 1992).

There is a debate between many English linguists (S. Wechsler, 1997 , B. Levin, Rappaport Hovav; 1999, 2001. Dj. E. Miller, 1997) regarding the direct separation of the resultative and descriptive meanings expressed in the secondary predication or their acceptance as the same structure . conducted. According to them, the secondary predicate restricts the activity of the unmediated complement. Therefore, they come to the conclusion that there is no need to divide these structures into descriptive and resultative types according to their semantic characteristics. In our opinion, since the combination of indirect complement and secondary predicate is a combination specific to the English language, it is appropriate to accept them as a special structure . Such an interpretation can shed light on their semantic features. We focus on the following examples of authors:

John laughed sick.

John laughed himself sick.

John sang the baby asleep.

In these examples, the adjectives *sick* and *asleep* have a resultative meaning as a result of the change of the state of the subject as a result of the action expressed by the verbs *laugh* and *sing* . *The study of* secondary predication structures is usually carried out syntactically and semantically. In our opinion, it is necessary to cover both aspects in their analysis. The analysis of language units (adjectives, nouns, impersonal forms of verbs, etc.) that function as secondary predication is expressed in the form-syntactic approach. The compatibility of the language units used in these structures with the object is considered a syntactic factor. The meaning expressed in these structures results from the combination of the lexical meaning of the language units in the function of secondary predication and the meaning of the language unit in the function of the object. For example: *Then, when that offer wasn't leapt on with grateful thanks, 'Or I can arrange to have it delivered.'* (Liz Fielding , 33); *They*

reined up with a plunge at the Casino entrance. The cab doors flew open. (O'Henry, 59) . In the first example, the lexical meaning of the verb *arrange* is supplemented by the adjective delivered in the secondary predicate . The *flow open* combination in the second example was a unique constructive phenomenon. The resulting meaning is related to the lexical property of the compound. The use of the adjective in the secondary predication directly adapts to the meaning expressed by the verb in the primary predication. This case indicates the close connection of syntactic and semantic factors. Therefore, it is required that the syntactic and semantic relationship has a basic, primary predication in each sentence and is justified. The resultative structures that arise through the use of the adjective in the function of the secondary predicate mean to affect the object. In this regard, R. Washio divides resultative events into strong resultatives and weak resultatives in the process of typological analysis (R.Washio; 1997, 1999, 2002) . The author states that in the strong resultative, the meaning of the verb and the meaning of the adjective are independent of each other, and object-oriented causation means ergative resultativeness. As evidence, the author gives the following examples: a) *The horses dragged the logs smooth ; b) The jockeys raced the horses sweaty.* (R. Jackendoff; 1990, 226. R. Washio; 1997, 39. R. Washio; 2002, 689). In the case of weak resultativeness, he connects the change of the state of the object under the influence of possible causation with the feature of the verb and gives the following examples: a) *He wiped the table clean ; b) He sharpened the pencil pointy* (R. Washio; 1997, 227).

In our opinion, the classification of resultativeness into a strong or weak type is directly based on the actional semantics of the verb. The verbs **drag**, **race**, used by R. Voshio , have a feature that is not limited from the action point of view, precisely under the influence of this semantic feature, these structures have expressed an ergative resultative meaning. The verbs **wipe**, **sharpen**, which express weak resultativeness, are actionally limited in nature, and the meaning they express is the resultativeness that occurs as a result of a change in the state of the object. In this case, R. Voshio connected the change of meaning with the fact that it is a feature of

the verb, but he does not pay attention to the fact that it is an action feature of the verb.

Resultative structures in the English language have a special place at the syntactic-semantic level. They are of the form NP1 VP (NP2), where the action denoted by NP1 produces a certain consequentiality by causing NP2. In this case, the third component or secondary predicate gives rise to the resultative structure. For example: *Herman hammered the metal flat.* (E.Schultze-Bernd, NP.Himmelmann; 1988, 235).

structures in the form NP1 VP (NP2) cited are specific devices found in English grammar. We believe that they should be studied within the frame of aspectual modifiers because they are built depending on the semantics of the verb and represent a new event.

In addition, the adjectival form of finite characteristic verbs can express different meanings within the context. Let's focus on the following example: *For a while he'd been dazzled too. Then completely blinded* (Liz Fielding, 67). The two forms of *the adjective dazzled* in the given example did not mean a resultative meaning, but expressed the process of changing the state. The conjunction *Then completely blinded* in the next sentence has a resultative feature as a result of a change of state. This example is formed in the form of NP1 VP structure.

Resultative structures are more common in English than in other languages. The following morphosyntactic forms can be found:

1) resultative compounds expressed by quality. For example: *I wiped the table clean* (British corpora).

structures in which quality participates in the structure of the complex possessor. For example: *Your son could have been born clever* (British corpora).

3) resultative structures formed with the help of ravish and ravish compounds: *I left behind the tree into pieces* (British corpora).

4) resultative structures expressed by an adjective: *People drank spirits and got drunk* (British corpora).

Resultativeness differs across languages according to the modes of expression. In particular, language units expressing productivity in English can be divided into three groups. The first of them, and the main one, are structures that enter into special secondary predication; the second is a lexical expression, characteristic of some finite characteristic verbs, and the third is a phenomenon characteristic of predicativeness. *John painted the house red, Mary drank her coffee hot. Mary believes/considers John foolish (British corpora) .*

In the examples analyzed below, attention is paid to lexical productivity. Lexical resultativeness combines with the content of the argument under the influence of the lexical meaning of the verb. The action expressed causes the state of the argument to change. In this case, resultativeness is expressed in the passive form of limited feature verbs.

A sudden fear seized Soapy that some terrible enchantment had rendered him immune to arrest. (O'Henry, 46) ;

I guess already that you have been stuck in the ribs with a knife. I have many times told you those Dagoes would do you up.'(O'Henry, 43) ;

As this dark mass had been transformed from a bright and love-endorsed flower to an ignominious vegetable, so had her summer hopes wilted and perished . (O'Henry, 66) .

In the English language, the lexical-semantic features of the verb and the grammatical form (passive case, adjective II form) are the elements that make up the resultative structures in English. When the adjective II form is used as a secondary predicate in the cases where causative verbs receive a complex complement, the semantics of the action verb used in the main predicate changes the status of the nominative argument. when it comes (the semantics of the change of state is imposed on the semantics of the quality in the secondary predicate), it is expressed in complex cross-sectional devices representing the state of the subject.

2.4. Semantic features of Uzbek language resultative structures

When it comes to productivity in Turkic studies and, in particular, in Uzbek linguistics, it is possible to cite a number of works carried out in this regard (V.P. Nedyalkov ; 1983, 23., V.P. Nedyalkov , G.A. Otaina , AA Kholodovich; 1974. 232–251. V.G. Guzev; 1990, 165., D.M. Nasilov ; 1983, 118–123., S. Mukhammedova; 2007. 225-226., A.T. Tybykova ; 1988, 52–67. I. Nevskaya ; 2008, 275–295. IA Nevskaya ; 2014, 305–313). These works are based on the researches of productivity in Russian linguistics. In the previous chapter, we thought about the fact that resultative meanings can be found in all languages in one form or another. As we have seen in the analysis of examples of the English language, in English, resultativeness is expressed in specific structures, and therefore it is studied in linguistics with the term "resultative structure (construction)". We have made sure that in English, the resultativeness is not expressed only by certain structures, but in some cases it can be expressed depending on the lexical feature of the verb. It can be observed that descriptive-typological analyzes on the scale of Turkic languages have been carried out (I.A. Nevskaya; 2011, 171-175). I.A. In her article, Nevskaya focused on the comparative analysis of the semantic structural aspects of descriptives representing secondary predicates in Turkic languages.

In the Uzbek language, there are complex participles consisting of more than one element, and the meanings of result can be found in these combinations. The compound participle consists of two predicates represented by a noun or a noun category and a personal verb. For example: *the man grew up; swore* _ In these compounds, the verb component is syntactically independent, while the noun component is subordinate to the verb. These predicates are connected not only with the subject, but also with other components of the sentence, in particular with the object. For example: *The sun melted the snow.*

The noun-related component involved in the complex sentence has a predicative character and in most cases has a figurative expression. The verb, in addition to completing the figurative expression meaning of the noun component, also creates certain semantics such as state, change of state, performance of action.

The noun-related component in the complex participle has a figurative expression, and serves as a complement to clarify the physical and psycho-emotional state of a person. For example: *But Qumrikhan was a different woman. She stood by that fire and vowed to avenge her husband. He killed fifty-five young men and massacred the printing press* . (Said Ahmad, 96).

In the Uzbek language, resultativeness is expressed in the predicate. Also, in the Uzbek language, special suffixes such as *-an* , *-in*, *-il* (labeled *an-di*, *in-di*, *bajar il-di*, *iyalgyshtir ild-i*) can be accepted as indicators of effectiveness. Because these suffixes serve to indicate the result of the action represented by the predicate.

Effectiveness expressed by the quality can be evaluated as a weak feature . For example, a change of state is expressed using the verb *do* (*he cleaned the house*). In the Uzbek language, resultativeness is also expressed in the form of an adjective. In this case, effectiveness is a phenomenon that occurs as a result of a change of state. For example: *A nimchi woven with crimson velvet is not worn* (Said Ahmad, 39).

In this example, the expression of the meaning of productivity is made using an adjective and an adjective with the suffix *-gan*: *it is woven beautifully*. In the Uzbek language, analytical forms of verbs and complex verb combinations can have a wide range of meanings. In particular, a number of analytical forms of the verb can have a resultative meaning. The resultativeness expressed by means of analytical forms of the verb differs from the resultativeness expressed by the adjective according to its syntactic function and lexical meaning. The resultativeness expressed by the adjective acts as a reference to the meaning of the predicate. For example: *For some reason, Ortik felt sorry for him and became sad. Then he picked up his bucket and set off slowly* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 248). When the minister took the jacket, *he was fascinated by his strong body, bulging wrists and broad shoulders* (Said Ahmad, 96).

In the given examples, the analytical form " *became* " means a change in the person's state. It is the lexical meaning of the auxiliary verb " *stay* " that has a state expression. That is why the lexical meaning of the verb has an important place in the result expressed by means of analytical forms.

Resultativeness in Uzbek also has morphological indicators. Including, - *han* adverbial adjective and *edi* incomplete verb combinations form specific resultative structures. For example; *Shirimbetov was so stiff that his legs were bent* (S. Ahmad, 31.; *Azizkhan had not laughed like that for a long time. He held his stomach and bent over* (Said Ahmad, 142).

In the analytical forms of the auxiliary verb, the resultative and the main predicate lose their lexical meaning in a certain sense and express two types of action. In this case, one action is evaluated as the result of another. For example: *Your poor father bent his back; now you do not burn* (Said Ahmad, 255).

The co-occurrence of resultativeness and staticity can be evaluated as a grammatically related synonymy. Because, in this case, productivity is considered as the main meaning, while static is a derived expression. The reason for the word derivation is that the occurrence of the situation is built on the basis of the adjective form. For example: *An old woman is sitting on the porch on the sunny side of the courtyard with cracked walls, buttoning her vest* (Said Ahmad, 262). It seems that in the Uzbek language, we can evaluate resultativeness and staticity as phenomena close to each other in some cases, and it is possible to determine the difference between them only by referring to the context. In this regard, the well-known linguist D. Nasilov expresses the following opinion: "The meaning of the resultative and stative forms do not negate each other, so they can exchange places in a certain environment (in this case it is expressed in the form of the resultative perfect)" (D. Nasilov; 1983, 118 - 120).

can include the structures formed by combining the verbs expressing the situation with the adverb, the adjective and the noun of the action (Bybee J., 1994: 53). For example: *The next day in the evening, Kholmat came to Oykol with his horse drenched in sweat* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 244). The lexical features of resultativeness in most cases are related to the change of state, the emergence of a new state. The common lexical type of resultativeness in the Uzbek language can include the combination of some auxiliary verbs with the verb " *become* " (*became*) or compound verbs formed with the verb " *become* " (*became-became*). There are also

cases of resultative meanings being formed by combining auxiliary verbs with static meaning with nouns or adjectives. For example: *In one pass, Ikramjon's height was bent* (Said Ahmad, 289). The occurrence of a new situation is carried out using the adjective form or the passive participle form. In this case, the transitive verb is evaluated as the result of a dynamic action that took place in the past tense. *For example: the shop-mustache driver, who opened the hood of the car and cooled the engine, closed the hood, and when Avaz approached, the driver saw the lambs on his shoulder:*

He grabbed his collar. (Pirimkul Kadirov, 5). It seems that the lexical properties of resultativeness depend on a number of lexical units, in particular, verbs, as well as grammatical indicators. The expression of resultativeness can also be seen in transitive verbs with the meanings of possession or achievement. For example: *Avaz, who had unloaded the load and was going home, tried not to think about anything other than these majestic mountains and the beautiful lambs in the forest* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 13).

In the Uzbek language, resultativeness is also expressed by the adjectival form of transitive verbs. For example: *a broken chair, a pile of material*, etc. In resultative structures, the unit subject to the adjectival predicate performs the syntactic functions of the result-achieved feature of the unit in the function of determination, i.e., resultative expressions. Resultativeness is also expressed in limited and transformative action verbs of predicates.

Chapter summary

The resultative meaning expressed within the main predicate is related to the lexical meaning of the verb forming the basis of the predicate. In this case, the resultativeness that occurs as a result of the change of state is directed to the agent, it is caused by the change of the qualitative characteristic or state of the nominative unit used in the possessive function.

The adjective involved in the resultative structures is the main morphological feature that indicates this meaning and is recognized as the main element that makes

up the syntactic structure. Therefore, in some cases, it is also referred to as a resultative phrase.

As a resulting structure, the following were distinguished:

1) the verb participating in the structure affects the state of the nominative argument, there is a possibility of causing a change of state;

2) the executor of the action is not expressed, even when expressed, it appears in a facultative way;

3) in the formation of resultative structures, the use of a complex filler as an object (specific to the English language) is of great importance;

4) in English, the resultative structures have clear morphological signs, including the adjective, adjective II, actional feature of the infinitive, the element in the function of a secondary predicate;

5) the resultative structures in the function of compound filler interact with causative and descriptive structures, in most cases one structure expresses two different meanings, resultativeness and causativeness, resultativeness and descriptiveness;

6) in the Uzbek language, resultative structures reflect the action performed in relation to the locative, instrumental noun;

7) in the Uzbek language, resultative structures are formed when the adjectival form of the verbs " *to be* ", " *to do* " means the change of the case of the nominative unit in the leading and auxiliary roles;

8) the role of analytical forms in the expression of resultative meanings is incomparable;

9) in both languages, resultative structures are formed with the help of grammatical forms specific to passive voice. In these cases, the limited actional feature of the verb is important;

10) the participation of agents and patients in the result structures is important.

The adjectival form II of finite characteristic verbs in the English language acts as a secondary predicate of a complex complement, as a linguistic tool that establishes a change of state and the result of an action in the determining function.

Although the resultative and the perfective are close to each other in terms of content, they differ in semantic realization according to the content of the expression. In particular, in English, perfect and resultative have certain grammatical formations, and their differences are clearly visible in the aspects of pragmatic expression and the sequence of events. In the Uzbek language, perfect and resultative meanings can be defined only in the context, taking into account aspects of pragmatic expression.

The form of the adjective -gan, which takes part in the resultative structures and has an important place, means the necessary meaning in cases depending on the actional nature of the verb and the lexical meaning. When verbs of state are used in the adjective form, we can observe the occurrence of a state or process in which the subject state is equal to the speech state. It is necessary to recognize the influence of the action feature of the adjective formed from the verb as the main feature in the formation of resultative structures of the adjective. Based on the analysis based on specific examples, it can be said that verbs with limited characteristics lose the meaning of action or process in the form of adjective (II) and express the resultativeness caused by a change of state.

In English, resultative structures have grammatical status. They depend on the transitive nature of the verb, and the participation of the agent or the patient in the framework of the structure is important. Resultative devices involving transitive verbs and intransitive verbs also differ in terms of transitivity. Transitive verbs take an indirect object and the object in question undergoes quality change. Also, the content of this structure directly depends on the lexical meaning of the verb.

III . EVENTS IN THE RESULTANT CONTENT LINGUISTIC AND COGNITIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPOSITION

3.1. Regarding the types of resultative structures represented by the secondary predicate

American linguist S. Rothstein considers the main predicate and the secondary predicate as semantically related phenomena. In order to clarify the reasons for the occurrence of the secondary predicate, the author asks the following questions and tries to answer them:

1) Is it possible to semantically analyze the events expressed in the main predicate by separating them in the secondary predicate?

2) Why are intransitive expressions not found in secondary predicates? For example, the secondary predicate represented by the form *"I sang the baby asleep"* is used synonymously in the sentence following it, such as *"I sang while the baby was asleep"* ?

3) Why do secondary predicates mean resultative and descriptive?

The author answers these questions that the time of the events represented by the secondary predicate and the main predicate may be equal to each other. According to him, both predicates complement each other in terms of meaning (S. Rothstein; 2004, 68-69). G'.Mirsanov states that secondary predicates act as pointers that clearly express the aspectual semantics of the main predicate (G'.Mirsanov; 2018, 55). Also, the author evaluates productivity as a slot (node) belonging to the framework of completion (G'. Mirsanov; 2019 , 108-109), although productivity and completion are considered separate phenomena. Because productivity forms its own structures. Therefore, the comparative study of productivity as a separate phenomenon can have its own effect. But we approve of the author's inclusion of

resultativity as a type of aspectual semantics. Another reason why we analyze resultativeness as a separate structure is related to the fact that the passive participle in English is formed with the auxiliary verb *to be* and *the participle II form*. But the resultative expression in the form of *he is gone* is also recognized as a separate structure. In addition, it is customary to contrast these compounds with the perfect form. For example: "*He has fallen*" grammatical perfect form means that the action has been performed until the present moment of reality, "*He is fallen*" expresses the resultative meaning, the given information means the result. Such occurrences are characteristic of linking verbs in English, such as *to fall, to set, to go, to do*.

The sun is set/has set "The sun has set" / He is gone to the market

According to G. Mirsanov, finite transitive verbs have a resultative meaning in the sense of changing the state of the object: *But all that ended when they moved the first shovel* (Stone, 275) (G'. Mirsanov; 2019, 106). In our opinion, in this case, in addition to the transitive form of the verb, it also depends on the number indicator and quantitative indicators of the unit that acts as a complement. In particular, if we transform this combination into a plural form (moved several shovels), the resultativeness scheme disappears by itself.

The resulting meaning represented by a certain verb lexeme is constructed depending on the semantics of the aspect form and the actional (bounded) type of the verb (C.Smith; 1991, 1997). This device is related to the participants participating in the language expression of any event and the ontological feature reflected in the predicate in the form of action classification. Events that are expressed in a certain way appear in grammar in the form of specific devices. In English grammar, such structures are expressed in two types: resultative and causative structures (A. Goldberg; 1995, 2005; W. Croft, 2001) . These structures are distinguished by their specific meaning. For example: *She sneezed the napkin off the table*.

In English grammar, the possibility of two different meanings (causative and resultative) of such structures, which are made within a certain group of verbs, has been the cause of many disputes. Many linguists involved in verb semantics and cognitive semantics interpret it as a causative structure (F.Palmer, 1988; J.Carrier,

J.Randall; 1992, 173–234). Those who deal with the aspectual semantics of the verb evaluate it as a separate phenomenon that means resultative semantics (D. Dowty, 1972, Z. Vendler, 1967; C. Tenny, 1994 ; M. Krifka, 1998). The verbs forming these structures are called periphrastic causative verbs by G. Gatenneli (G. Gilquin; 2010, 37). The author says that each periphrastic causative verb can express one type of meaning in several structures. For example, with the verb *get*, structures such as [X *get* YV to -inf], [X *get* Y Vpp], [X *get* Y Vprp] are formed. Representatives of the field of constructive grammar say that if structures differ from each other in form, they should be evaluated as separate structures. Because they can have different meanings from a semantic or pragmatic point of view and therefore tend to be analyzed separately (A. Goldberg, 1995). We pay attention to the following examples: *The door banged behind her and John Ryan saw, through the bedroom window, his wife ran across the small foot bridge opposite the pub* (Maeve Binchy, 4). In the example given, X adj. reflexive V prp pattern formed a resultative structure, and its expression served as a reference for subsequent events.

In certain types of combinations, the general semantics of the subject of causation and the object of causation is reflected in the verb part. This is a characteristic of the English language. For example: *And every evening while she was getting supper she made him take me out on the end of a string for a walk.* (O'Henry, 49) *Last time we got them filled we got them from down here, thirty odd quid Yeah ;* (Source: KCX) . In the first example given, the resultativeness of the secondary predicate was formed under the influence of causation in the structure X make V inf. In the second example, the causal-resultative structures X got YVpp, X get Ypp are expressed. We can observe a slightly different situation in the Uzbek language, where the state of the object changes under the influence of causation. The causative expression is formed by adding a morphological suffix to the verb, and the subject performs the task of performing the action. For example: *The desert wind blew and howled in the reeds, the girl straightened her hair and covered her eyebrows* (Said Ahmad, 362). In this example, in the structure V cause +it -Y, causativeness is

expressed by the suffix *-it* . Under the influence of causation, the state of the object (*hair, eyebrows*) has changed, the resulting meaning is expressed.

In English, there are structures consisting of two predicates that are close to each other in terms of meaning. These structures are divided into types such as resultative, causative, descriptive. In particular, the primary predicate expresses the action of the subject, while the secondary predicate expresses the result of the predicative action, the state of the subject, the image of the subject's action. Resultativeness and causativeness complement each other in a sense. In some cases, resultative and causative meanings can be expressed together within the same structure. Resultativeness is observed in the use of impersonal forms of verbs such as adjectives and infinitives as a secondary predicate. How the descriptive action and situation are realized can be observed in the structures expressed by the adjective or adjective. These signs make it possible to distinguish performance from descriptive in superficially similar structures.

1) resultative differs from descriptive in the type of action related to the situation: *He left the party angrily // He was upset of the party*. The first example describes how the person left the night. Depictiveness in the structure of *the party angrily* in the example is expressed by the expression *angrily* . In the next example , the state of the person caused by the situation of the night created the result;

2) resultativeness and descriptiveness occur depending on the lexical-semantic meaning of the impersonal verb participating in the secondary predicate. *The cold made his nose run // The smell of the roast beef made Willy realize that he was hungry*. In the first example, causation and effectivity are expressed in one structure. Causativeness is characteristic of the causative verb in the main predicate, while resultativeness is expressed in the secondary predicate represented by the infinitive of the device *his nose run* . In the second sentence, causativeness and descriptiveness are reflected in one construction. In this example, causativeness is considered a characteristic of the verb in the main predicate, while descriptiveness is understood from the meaning of the secondary predicate and the complementing clause. Resultative, causative or descriptive in Uzbek structures have close expression.

Causation is logically understood. Resultativeness and descriptiveness can be expressed in the same structure. Resultativeness is the meaning characteristic of the entire structure, while descriptiveness is evaluated by its informational nature. For example: *He was still looking through the broken glass with a smile* (Said Ahmad, 294). *The fire burned the withered reeds from one end* (Said Ahmad, 319).

In these examples, effectiveness is evaluated as the result of a new state or action that has occurred as a result of a previous action. Resultativeness sometimes has a grammatical form related to the meaning of the situation, and in other cases it has a lexical-semantic character. The resultativeness in the cited examples belongs to the secondary predicate. In the lexical-semantics of the verbs *to break, to break into pieces, to crumple as a secondary predicate, there is an orientation towards result*. It is precisely in the system of languages that are prone to lexical-semantic methods that the expression of resultivity is subject to certain grammatical forms. As grammatical indicators of resultativeness, it is possible to cite passive or adjectival forms of verbs that mean a change of state.

Structures play an important role in the analysis of verb semantics. In this case, the combinations that occur within a certain verb class are separated and evaluated according to the possibilities of forming a structure. As a result, there are several ways in which the meaning of the verbs belonging to a certain group is related to the meaning expressed by the speech structure. As a result, the meaning of the verb does not directly reflect the meaning of the structure in which it participates. The structure of structures does not always have the specified order. This is due to the differentiation of structures belonging to each language family. In cross-linguistic comparison, we can see that the morphological features of verbs influence the formation of the structure. For example, linguistic concepts such as possessive, applicative, causative are evaluated as features of the verb lexeme in English. In other languages, in particular, in Uzbek, the categorical change of the verb depends on morphological signs. Additions added to the verb root, auxiliary verbs that form analytical forms can semantically divide the verb belonging to a certain class or group into subgroups. In such cases, the act of distinguishing structures based on

lexical occurrence may not work. That is why, in the definition and analysis of structures, relying on all lexical, morphological, syntactic tools leads to certain results. Unlike the Uzbek language, some groups of verbs in the English language form the basis of structures. We can observe this in the combination of a finite characteristic verb with a descriptive adjective. For example: *The door closed shut* (O'Henry, 364). Resultant structure in the example It is formed by the semantic relationship between the action feature of the verb *close* and the quality *shut*.

Resultativeness is related to the change of state caused by the action of the verb, and is a phenomenon characteristic of argument semantics. The argument acts as a patients in such cases. Therefore, in English, resultative constructions can occur after both transitive and intransitive verbs. Resultative constructions that are formed after transitive verbs have an indirect complement. For example: *"I had brushed my hair very smooth."* (Ch. Bronte, *Jane Eyre*);

"You killed it stone-dead." (Somerset Maugham, *"Altogether"*).

These examples can be evaluated as two types of result structures according to syntactic-semantic formation. In the first example, the transitive verb and the resultative phrase are combined in meaning. In the second example, the resultative meaning refers to the semantics of the verb.

In English, it is also observed that resultativeness is formed with the help of an intransitive verb. Events expressed using an intransitive verb are called "intransitive resultative structures". Compare:

- a. *The joggers ran their Nikes threadbare.*
- b. *The kids laughed themselves into frenzy.*
- c. *He sneezed his handkerchief completely soggy.*
- d. *The boy cried himself sick.* (Rothstein S., 1992; 127)

In example (a) "*The runners wore out their shoes by running*", in example (b) "*The children lost themselves laughing*", in example (c) "*He wet his handkerchief with a limp*", and in example (d) "*The child cried has become ill*". The resultative meanings in these examples are formed as a result of compositional pictorial

expression. The semantics of resultativeness arose as a result of the combination of a verb and an instrumental complement.

Resultative constructions are also expressed in the passive sense or passive relative forms semantically linked to the possessor. For example: "*I charged with them, and got knocked silly for my pains.*" (Rider Haggard, "*King Solomon's Mines*" , 93);

The tools were wiped clean. (O'Henry, 78)

There are also aspects of resultativity that relate to the composition of events, the subject or the object's space. This indicates that the possibilities of expression of productivity are not limited. Spatial effectivity is the result of a change in the position of an object, that is, transitive effectivity. For example: *The door banged behind her and John Ryan saw, through the bedroom window, his wife ran across the small foot bridge opposite the pub* (Maeve Binchy , 4);

What could they be doing that made them stay when all the others had gone? (Maeve Binchy , 14);

He believed that basically most people were very good. This made him a nice change from many other parish priests in the country who believed that most people were intrinsically evil. (Maeve Binchy , 18);

Dara hopped around on one leg and looked through the door that they were meant to keep firmly closed, to see how big the audience was. (Maeve Binchy, 22).

In these cases, the resultativeness has a meaning related to the change in the spatial position of the events. Resultant structures are also expressed in dynamic events. In such cases, it is necessary to pay attention to the lexical meaning of the language unit that reflects productivity. It is worth noting that the resultative meaning in some cases arises as a result of emotional expression. For example: *They preferred to sell whiskey already bottled.* (Maeve Binchy , 30);

'Oh I know that, I'm not disputing it, Eddie would have your heart is scalded. (Maeve Binchy , 77);

He tapped gently. She came to the door fully dressed. (Maeve Binchy, 80).

Constructivist grammarians argue that if structures differ from each other in form, they should be treated as independent structures. Because they can have different meanings from a semantic or pragmatic point of view and therefore tend to be analyzed separately (A. Goldberg, 1995).

causative structures is visible in the semantic and stylistic features of causative verbs. Because the meanings of the causative verbs *get*, *have*, *make*, *cause* and the causative constructions formed using the forms Ob+inf, Ob+gerund, Ob+PI, PII, Ob+adj, Ob+prp are determined through cognitive activity. But representatives of constructive grammar analyze several structures as the same phenomenon in form (A. Goldberg, 1995). In our opinion, devices that are in some sense identical in form can be differentiated semantically or pragmatically. From this point of view, each construction formed within a causative verb should be analyzed separately.

Her fair hair was curled carefully, and she wore a little lipstick but not enough to do any damage (Maeve Binchy , 27).

Resultant structures can also play an important role in frame semantics. Different result structures do not merge into a single frame within a frame, but express the meanings of these structures in the same generalized form. Also, within frame theory, they serve to establish the relationship between syntax and semantics. Through this, it is clarified to what extent the elements of the frame are implemented at the syntactic level. In these resultative structures, the elements of the frame, such as the one who implements the causation, the object of the causation, the patient, and the result (resultativeness) are distinguished. They are often mixed with causative constructions. That's why we think it's better to name the main predicate as "causing event" (Shibatani, 1976), and the secondary predication as "resultative event". Let's focus on the following examples: *Will I make [causing event] her do [caused event] handstands? Declan was interested now. (Maeve Binchy , 39); Oh I know that, I'm not disputing it, Eddie would have [causing event] your heart scalded [caused event] (Maeve Binchy , 77).*

In the given examples, the causer is the person who implements the event, and the object is changed under the influence of the causer and plays an important role in

the occurrence of the resulting event. The frame elements of these structures differ at the syntactic level. Compare:

I had the boy leave.

The technician had the video working.

The emperor had the slave imprisoned .

In the first and second examples given, the first person possessive pronoun and the noun acted as causative. Causatives are units that act as an indirect complement. It is the action performed by language units in the function of complement that is the resultative expression. In the third example, the passive complement has taken the role of patients. The subject acting as the causative is left unexpressed (*The emperor had [his guards] prison the slave - The emperor ordered (his guards) to imprison the slave*).

R. Lengaker emphasizes that the use of result structures is a direct cognitive phenomenon. According to the author, "resultative structures arise from the initial source of energy in the sequence of actions" (Langacker; 1991, 408).

Action dependence is interpreted as a sequence of individual events. But resultative structures represent the final result of these events. In texts involving resultative and causative structures, the initiator of the sequence of actions is the causative. The causative action expressed by the verb is directed to the object, which is the first element, acting as an indirect complex complement. The result of the action is understood in the impersonal form of the verb, which is the second element. The interdependence of all elements involved in these phenomena is characteristic of the conceptual level. In most cases, in the relation of agent and patient, causation is understood by means of a verb. Resultativeness is imposed on the meaning of the second element of the complex complement. These events are distinguished by Radden using the examples *The Queen killed Snow White // The Queen caused Snow White to die* (Radden, 1992: 516) . In the first example given, he emphasized the action of the "Queen", that is, the causation. In the next sentence, the element " *to die*" means the result and is reflected as the main element of the resultative structure . It seems that although the resultative meaning of the verb and the resultative structure

represent the same phenomenon, they can be interpreted differently in terms of usage and composition.

constructions with the form of the passive participle in English go back to the history of the development of grammatical forms. These structures are considered the product of the form of an unknown proportion, which is associated with a change of state. For example: *His shoes and clothes were wet through icy cold (O'Henry, 194) .*

Resultative constructions are made using certain verbs. An example of this is the English verb *find* . For example: *Turning, she found her view blocked by a broad chest, broad shoulders encased in a white linen shirt (Liz. Fielding, 9).*

Many resultative constructions in English have a causative meaning. As noted, in most cases, such structures are also referred to as transitive (transitive verb) result structures (J.Carrier, H.Randall; 1992, 173).

The resultative structure is an independent phenomenon, and the meaning expressed by a certain verb in combination with an argument is counted. When determining them, it is necessary to pay attention to the change of state of the agent and the patient, who participate in the role of argument. Already, this meaning is determined by the participation of arguments. In particular, it is required that the meaning of the verb participating in a given structure matches the function of the argument in the structure . Thus, a verb is evaluated as a structure if its meaning results in participial arguments . As an example, we can cite the English verbs *wipe, sell* . For example: *He wiped the table clean. They preferred to sell whiskey already bottled. (Maeve Binchy, 30).*

Resultative constructions have a specific argument structure independently of the verb. Some verbs have their original meaning of resultativeness. They mean resultative meaning under the influence of the meaning of the argument verb that is part of patients. In this case, resultativeness is involved as a part of the word combination formed with the verb. We can observe this in the following example. For example: *She became accustomed to working the bar (Maeve Binchy, 7 0).*

In this example, the verb **became** formed a phrase with the adjective **accustomed** II, which means resultative . The given structure acts as a provider of

productivity. In addition, there are a number of lexical units that form resultative structures. W. Green enumerates the following adjectives as units forming resultative structures: "asleep/awake," "open/shut," "flat/straight/smooth," "free," "full/empty," "dead/alive," "sick," "hoarse," "sober," "crazy", *He drank himself funny/happy*.

He wiped it damp/dirty (Green W., 1972).

Resultative structures are more common in English than in other languages. The following morphosyntactic forms can be found:

1) resultative structures represented by quality. For example: *I wiped the table clean* (British corpora);

structures in which quality participates in the structure of the complex possessor. For example: *Your son could have been born clever* (British corpora);

structures formed by means of adverbial and adverbial compounds: *I left behind the tree into pieces* (British corpora);

structures expressed by an adjective: *People drank spirits and got drunk* (British corpora).

Resultativeness differs across languages according to the modes of expression. In particular, language units expressing productivity in English can be divided into three groups. The first and most important of them are structures that enter into special secondary predication; *John painted the house red, Mary drank her coffee hot. Mary believes/considers John foolish*.

After this sentence, I became quite calm (G'. Gulam, 115);

In this way, the young man killed me like licking the fat of an indomitable snake, turned my head around (G'. Gulam, 115);

My child's bottom is also swollen (G'. Gulam, 121);

Even to my son, who is still despised and despised, no one cares about the wind, keeps him above his mother and respects him (G'. Gulam, 123);

As for my son, he remains a white boy who walks on his feet (G'. Gulam, 124);

was very confused when I unexpectedly entered the tea in the morning (G'. Gulom, 137).

In the Uzbek language, resultativeness is expressed through certain verbs and analytical forms. Depending on their meaning, they can be divided into strong and weak productive groups. In particular, the transition of the argument represented by a noun to another state is expressed using the auxiliary verb қалмиқ. For example: - *Hey, you kid, what are you saying? When my son came here, did I become a help to you, my child?* (G'. Ghulam, 120); *One day, I took out my pooch's fur from hiding and beat him. One of his front legs was broken and he was crippled for life* (G'. Ghulam, 161).

In the given examples, the conjunctions "I became a brain", "I was lame for a lifetime" do not have temporal or modal properties. They have a resultative character and mean the result of the event.

In the Uzbek language, resultativeness is expressed in the predicate. Also, in the Uzbek language, special suffixes such as *-an, -in, -il* (certain *an di, qil in di, bajar il di* *perform ild i*) can be taken as indicators of effectiveness. Because these suffixes serve to indicate the result of the action represented by the predicate.

Effectiveness expressed by the quality can be evaluated as a weak feature. For example, a change of state is expressed by combining the *verb* to do with an adjective (*he cleaned the house*).

It should be noted that in the Uzbek language, resultativeness is also done with the help of the adverbial adjective: *broken bowl, old fashioned*. The resultativeness expressed by means of analytical forms of the verb differs from the resultativeness expressed by the adjective according to its syntactic function and lexical meaning. The resultativeness expressed by the adjective acts as a reference to the meaning of the predicate. Also, resultativeness in Uzbek has morphological indicators. In particular, the adjective with the suffix *-gan* and the incomplete verb combinations *edi* form their own resultative structures. For example: *Shirimbetov was stiff as he bent over and his legs were bent* (S.Ahmad, 31); Among the children who came out of the school, he ran in front of the tea house where tea drinkers were sitting in the attic, and he went to the doctor's office with white curtains on the windows (O'tkir Hoshimov, 35).

In the analytical forms of the auxiliary verb, the resultative and the main predicate lose their lexical meanings and express two types of action. In this case, one action is evaluated as the result of another.

In the Uzbek language, resultativeness is also expressed by the adjectival form of intransitive verbs. For example: It is said that a person *who burns his mouth by drinking milk also blows yogurt and drinks it*. In resultative structures, the unit subject to the adjectival predicate performs the syntactic functions of the result-achieved feature of the unit in the function of determination, i.e., resultative expressions. Resultativeness is also expressed in limited and transformative action verbs of predicates.

Synonymous forms that form resultative structures in the Uzbek language can be expressed in synthetic and analytical combinations from a morphological point of view. This phenomenon is used when the adjective is expressed independently of the main predicate. In particular, it applies to the nominative forms of the verb. For example: *when he was commanding a partisan detachment in the forests of Belarus, he was a young man who had a large scar on his right temple when a shrapnel hit his head* (Pirimkul Kadyrov, 104).

The resulting meaning is also expressed in analytical forms formed by the combination of leading and auxiliary verbs. Analytical forms need to be distinguished from descriptive ones in order to determine their productivity. Resultativeness is related to the present time signified by the main predicate, and the situation changes under the influence of the meaning expressed by the main predicate. For example: *I looked at his open eyes. In the darkness of the night, I couldn't tell what kind of expression froze in his eyes* (Said Ahmad, 49).

Productivity has not been extensively studied in Turkic languages. D. Nasilov partially dwells on some units meaning result in the Uzbek language (D. Nasilov ; 1983 , 118-123) . A. Memtimin and I. Nevskaya analyze resultativeness and descriptiveness in Uyghur language in certain contexts (A. Memtimin , I. Nevskaya; 2012, 80–94). According to the authors, descriptiveness is represented by the main predicate from the semantic point of view. Resultativeness is evaluated as a

characteristic of the secondary predicate. The Uzbek language, as you know, belongs to the Turkic language family. Turkic languages do not fundamentally differ from each other in terms of syntactic structure and grammatical forms. In particular, the Uyghur language is very close to the Uzbek language in terms of lexicon and grammar. So, in the Uzbek language, resultativeness and descriptive expression are very close to each other. Therefore, when distinguishing these two phenomena, it is necessary to pay attention to the lexical-semantic features of the units participating in the structure. Let's focus on the following examples:

All sides are covered with blue grass. Fruit trees leaning over the walls of the fortress are surrounded by white and pink flowers, and bees collect honey from each flower (Said Ahmad, 16);

The breath of spring is everywhere. From the branches of apricots leaning over the wall to the street, flowers were scattered on the roads. Apricot flowers also flow on the surface of gurgling streams (Said Ahmad, 62).

Descriptive and resultative structures can be found in both examples. In particular, structures *covered with blue-blue grass, surrounded by white and pink flowers, and the wall leaning over the street* are examples of descriptiveness. After all, they meant a visual representation of a certain situation. In the following example, the adjective *spilled* in the structure of *the flowers spilled* is an example of resultativeness. The resultativeness in this structure is explained by the fact that the verb form of the adjective *spilled* means *the result of the movement (flowers spilled, transition from one state to another)*.

In the Uzbek language, as in other languages, productivity can be expressed with an adjective. Unlike the compared English language, in Uzbek the resultative meaning is not related to an adjective or a noun, but to an adjective forming a secondary predicate. In these structures, quality acts as an indicator of productivity. For example: *The wolf threw a freshly washed towel on his shoulder (Uncle Murad, 21);*

Aziz Khan became a taciturn, he did not talk openly with anyone, he would go out to the highway with his bag in the morning, and he would not come back until he entered the tent in the evening (Said Ahmad, 167);

anger and embarrassment disappeared from his face , smiling Ali quietly listened to the words of the wrestler (Said Ahmad, 186).

In these examples, the resultativeness is expressed in the change of state represented by an abstract noun such as *clean, poor, shy, embarrassed in the context. Analytical compounds that have been washed away, remained, and left traces of* these structures are the main indicators of productivity.

The analysis of the given examples shows that in the Uzbek language, the resultative structures are formed by taking the adverbial form of the adjectives and the verbs to be, and the adjectival *forms of the auxiliary verb -gan* .

In the collected materials, there are many examples of the resultative structure that has the *accusative form and is formed with verbs*. It can be concluded that these two auxiliary verbs can be evaluated as the main elements in the formation of resultativeness in the Uzbek language. I analyzed descriptive constructions in the Uyghur language. Nevskaya thinks that the auxiliary verbs *polip / bolup / boop* are subjective descriptive, and the auxiliary verbs *edip / qilip form objective descriptive* structures (Nevskaya I. , 2008; 275-295). It is known that the Uzbek and Uyghur languages belong to the same family, and the grammatical structure of verbs does not differ much from each other. That is why the resultative and descriptive structures in these languages have the same form and content.

In the Uzbek language, resultativeness is a characteristic of nominative forms of verbs such as adjectives and adverbs. In the Uzbek language, adjectives and adverbs in the nominative function of the verb differ in form according to their syntactic function from the resultative expressed by the impersonal forms of the verb or the resultative they form. In English resultative constructions, the impersonal forms of the verb are used as a secondary predicate. A verb that participates in resultative structures in Uzbek and does not perform this task. In the Uzbek language, resultative meanings arise depending on the lexical meaning or actional nature of the

verb used as an adjective or adverb. For example: *The chairman got up after pouring two bowls from the yakhna brought by the samovar.* (Said Ahmed 44); *The willow leaves turned white with flour* , and the chickens that were scavenging the spilled grains, looked sad. (Said Ahmad 93).

In addition, in the Uzbek language, the resultativeness in some cases has an instrumental character, while in other cases it is expressed in the analytical forms of the leading-auxiliary verb. In this case, the resultativeness is related to the finite nature of the auxiliary verb. For example:

Nigora's eyes sparkled and opened (Said Ahmad 91);

He was very pale, his eyes were sunken, and his voice sounded sad (Said Ahmad, 176)

In the first example given, the *adverbial* conjunction glancing meant a momentary action and a figurative expression, while the analytic form of the main predicate, *opened*, expressed the result of a change of state. As a result, a resultative meaning has arisen. In the next example , the predicates *withered*, *sunk into his eyes* mean that the state of the subject has changed and can be an example of resultativeness.

Auxiliary verbs in the Uzbek language are semantically rich in expressing events. For example, the verb *to stay* has a locative and static character. But this verb in the function of an auxiliary verb also expresses the resultativeness associated with the change of state. Also, the verb *to throw* performs such a task (A. Hojiev, 1975). For example: *Ash the wrestler got into an interesting situation. Since Boyat, his eyes, which were shining with the intoxication of victory, became desolate* (Said Ahmad, 193). *Mahmud came under the plane tree, pulled out his knife and cut the ropes tied by Qumri on condition* (Said Ahmad, 95).

In the first example, *he fell into an interesting situation, his eyes became unsatisfied* . In these examples, change of state can be evaluated as a key indicator of performance. Analytical forms formed with the auxiliary verb *kalmok komakchi* in Uzbek in most cases have a resultative meaning. This expressed result is not only a semantic feature of the auxiliary verb, but also depends on the tone-tense indicator .

The past tense form of the verb in the cited examples also played an important role in the occurrence of resultativeness.

The Uzbek language also has its own verb forms that can be an example of resultativeness. In this case, verbs with limited characteristics participating in the predicate are combined. For example:

- *Well, brother, you still don't know about many things. What happened happened, what died died, what remained remained* (Said Ahmad, 218).

In this example, verb combinations in the form of "*dead died*" and "*remained*" mean the result of an event and formed unique resultative structures. In the given example, the verb of the same form is reduplicative.

Resultativeness in the Uzbek language is morphologically formed and occurs in analytical forms, with the help of incomplete verbs, and also in adjective forms. Unlike the English language, resultativeness in the Uzbek language can also be evaluated as a characteristic of the past tense. For example: *Mahmud came under the plane tree, pulled out his knife and cut the ropes tied to Qumri conditionally* (Said Ahmad, 95).

Resultativeness in Uzbek language is expressed in analytical forms in most cases. In these cases, productivity occurs as part of the taxi event. In this case, resultativeness represents an event that happened before the main information within the text. Let's focus on the following examples:

In the eyes of Ummatali, his son has become more mature and thoughtful (Said Ahmad, 107);

Only the nuts in the yard remained bare (O'tkir Hoshimov, 23).

In the Uzbek language, the moment of speech is considered as a base point in the realization of the tense of actions expressed by verbs. This is because the actions taken before the moment of speech are measured in relation to the time interval. In particular, an event that happened in a short period of time compared to the moment of speech has the form of the recent past tense, or an event that happened long before the time of speech has the form of the long past tense. For example: The wolf *died* with his yellow eyes wide open (Said Ahmad, 320). Here, the past tense also means

the result of an event. But resultativeness goes back to the lexical meaning of the leading verb. The analysis of the previous examples shows that the auxiliary verb "stay" appears as one of the most important elements that make up resultative structures. The incomplete verb "e di" in the structure gave an additional informative meaning to the result. Although various studies on the Uzbek language verb system have been carried out, the distinguishing signs of completeness, perfectionism, and productivity related to aspectual semantics have not been identified. According to the results of the analysis of the examples in the previous chapters, resultativeness in Uzbek is expressed by adjectives or adjectives, secondary resultative predicates, passive participles with limited action verbs, adverbial verbs (usually verbs to do and be) and adjectival compounds, some analytical forms of the verb, and resultativeness. constitute some verb lexemes with semantics. Including secondary resultative predicates, passive participles involving limited action verbs, passive verbs (usually to do and to be) verbs and adjectival compound, analytical forms of the verb are recognized as resultative structures. Most of the highlighted analytic forms refer to completed actions in the past tense. A completed event that delivers results is determined by the relevance of action information. For example: *Qambar's father once again painfully felt the inaccuracy of his sons, looked at the ground and became silent* . (Pirimkul Kadyrov, 62); *Hulkar covered the bread, sprinkled a little water on it and put the pot on the burning coals*. (Pirimkul Kadirov, 85).

These structures are expressed in predicates such as subjective and objective effectiveness, causative-objective effectiveness.

It is worth noting that in the Uzbek language, the adjective of the form -gan has the possibility to mean resultative meanings even when it has its own syntactic function. But even in these cases, the adjective is a part of the predicative compound. For example: *Ten - ten a one-year-old boy was standing on the branch of an old pear tree, breaking off dry branches, and an old woman with wrinkles covering her face was picking them* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 123). *After all, Akbarali is stalking your way with her fallen son-in-law* (Said Ahmad, 108).

In the grammar of the Uzbek language, it is noted that the adjective in the *-gan* form mainly indicates a static state (*Grammar of the Uzbek language; 1975, 510-512*). In the above examples, the adjectival form in the compounds *covered with wrinkles, covered with dust* means the resultative meaning in the state of static.

There are also synonymous groups that form result structures . They are expressed using certain analytical forms. The role of auxiliary verbs is important in the formation of a synonymous group of these structures . For example: *happened, went, read, wrote, etc.*

In the Uzbek language, the perfect form of the past tense and the auxiliary verb "to be" form a resultative that is related to the present tense. Productivity occurs in Uzbek mainly in some auxiliary verb combinations. In particular, auxiliary verbs such as "to be", "to come out", "to finish" in the Uzbek language mean the completion of the action expressed by the leading verb and its result. For example: *Avaz placed the arrow and put Hulkar's pillow next to him* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 59).

In direct analytic forms, the leading verb in the accusative form means action, and the meaning of resultativeness comes from the meaning of the auxiliary verb. This case is a characteristic of transitive verbs. For example: *I looked at his open eyes. In the darkness of the night, I couldn't tell what kind of expression froze in his eyes* (Said Ahmad, 49).

The grammatical form of the English perfect is taken as the prototype of the meaning of perfect. But the issues related to this category have not been sufficiently researched. Views on the meaning of English perfective forms differ both theoretically and also in practical grammars (R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Swartwick, 1982). For example B. According to Comrie, it refers to "an event that occurred before the perfect speech situation" (Comrie; 1985, 52). American English colloquial speech researchers (Lindstedt, 2000), (J. Terry, 2001) say that the mixed form of the past tense (Past Indefinite) and the perfect form or the auxiliary verb have of the perfect has fallen out of circulation .

In the Uzbek language, resultativeness is also expressed in the form of an adjective. Resultant event h is calculated as a result of a change of state.

3.2. Analysis of resultative structures expressed in the form of a passive ratio

Linguists dealing with the issue of distinguishing result structures focused their attention on the lexical meaning and syntactic structure of the argument. (Langacker; 1991, 283). There are many views on the representation and definition of result structures, and result in general. V.P. Nedyalkov and S.I. Yakhontov gives the definition that the result is a new state resulting from a previous action (V.P. Nedyalkov, S.I. Yakhontov; 1983, 7). According to the authors, the effectivity is a phenomenon related to the passive ratio. V.S. Hrakovskiy connects resultativeness with the action feature of the verb. He evaluates the adjectival two forms of finite characteristic verbs as the main indicator of resultivity (V.S. Hrakovskiy; 1991, 151). It should not be forgotten that this feature is not characteristic of all languages. In addition, the adjectival form of finite characteristic verbs can express different meanings within the context. Let's focus on the following example: *For a while he'd been dazzled too. Then completely blinded.* (Liz Fielding, 67). The two forms of the adjective *dazzled* in the above example do not mean resultative. Perhaps it represented the process of change of state. The conjunction *Then completely blinded* in the next sentence has a resultative feature as a result of a change of state. The term "resultativeness" is applied to the transition of the subject to a new state as a result of the completion of the previous action (V.P. Nedyalkov, S.I. Yakhontov; 1983, 7). A similar opinion J. We can also observe in the works of Bybee: "Consequentiality is a state that has arisen as a result of a certain action committed in the past" (J. Bybee; 1994, 53).

Resultative meanings are formed only in the structure of finite characteristic verbs. From the aspectual point of view, resultative and perfect meanings are close to each other. Both structures differ from each other through semantic and pragmatic relations. If the perfect tense is determined by a pragmatic basis in relation to the speech situation, the resultativeness has an informative nature in relation to the speech situation, and also the actional properties of the verbs are of certain importance. For example, perfect expression occurs within both finite and non-finite characteristic verbs, while resultativeness occurs only in finite characteristic verbs.

In English, passive constructions are studied within the framework of tenses. Although the passive participle form has clear indications, there are a number of other constructions with passive meaning. In some cases, the passive meaning is also expressed in certain lexical units. In addition, we can find expressions close to resultative in terms of the meaning of passive relative forms.

In English, in some cases, similar structures are found in the construction of the resultative and passive participles, but the resultative meanings formed in the passive form depend on the transitivity and limitation of the verb involved in the predicate. It is these aspects that are considered to be the interrelated aspects of effectiveness and passivity. Thus, the question remains open whether the resultative and the passive should be evaluated as two different structures or whether they should be interpreted as two different semantic expressions of the same structure.

The passive is a dynamic process, which means that the action is performed or performed by someone (who is not involved in the possessor's task). The passive relation is a two-level grammatical category, which consists of action and subject relations at the lower level, and is expressed in the morphological and semantic relations of the verb. At the highest level, there is a relation of the singular in the passive participle and the possessive function, which belongs to the syntactic level. The passive meaning is also expressed in the lexical-semantic feature of the verb. That is why there are also those who give a semantic description to the passive participle. Passive and resultative structures can be evaluated as close structures due to their syntactic form (typical of the English language), their relation to the transitive and intransitive properties of the verb, their lexical-semantic expression, and in some cases, they complement each other in terms of meaning.

The famous Russian linguist A.V. Bondarko interprets the passive in the Russian language as a functional-semantic category and includes it in the framework of semantic analysis as a subject- and object-oriented action relation (A.V. Bondarko, 1984). In the Uzbek language, the passive voice is included in the verb grading category and it is emphasized that it is formed within the framework of object verbs (Grammar of the Uzbek language; 1975, 452).

It seems that indifference has a morphological, syntactic and lexical-semantic basis. There is also the possibility of determining the relationship of inertia and productivity through transformation. For example: *The task done, students are enjoying with the break / The task has been done and students are enjoying with the break.* If *the task done* in the first example given is an example of resultativeness, the form of *The task has been done in the second example* is considered passive. That is why we believe that it is important to take into account the expressions characteristic of productivity in the analysis of the unknown ratio. In passive analysis, subject and object relations are taken into account in addition to verb forms and verb meanings. In resultative analysis, attention is mainly focused on the analysis related to object relation or subject state change. In both cases, syntactic combination, lexical-semantic meaning, morphological forms, and in some cases the participation of other elements of the sentence are considered important.

It is worth noting that syntactic combinations act as a dynamic unit in form and content. It is in the development of the language that the formation of syntactic compounds is of great importance. That is why we can see that more attention is paid to the syntactic combination and the semantic-syntactic formation of syntactic combinations in the analysis of the structures of the passive ratio (N.J. Suleymanova, 2018). Among them, the syntactic formation of resultative structures and passive structures has attracted the attention of researchers and linguists (J.Carrier, JH Randall; 1992, 173-234. A.Goldberg ; 2006, 280. W.Croft ; 2001, 416). .

It seems that the meanings formed within the framework of certain structures arise within the framework of syntactic and semantic relations. Therefore, the semantic expression of the passive ratio category is formed in the possessive and complementary relationships of the verb and under the influence of other elements of the sentence. As a result, the existence of resultative meanings in passive expressions cannot be denied. This requires not to ignore specific related aspects in the analysis of each of them.

P.V. Petrukhin, D.V. Sichinava ; 2006, 193-214) is widely used for languages where result structures are not fully formed like in English . In this case, productivity

is not the only indicator, but other categories, in most cases, are represented by an unknown ratio. In such cases, the resultativeness is expressed by adding the lexical feature of the verb and passive relative forms. For example: *The glasses were washed, the windows opened to air the place, two clean dishcloths laid out to dry on the counter.* (Maeve Binchy,71); *The days of a community depending on one family seat for livelihood and living quarters were long gone* (Maeve Binchy,43).

In these examples, the lexical basis of resultativeness has been shown in connection with the expression of change of state. It is difficult to distinguish between state change and productivity, and therefore we believe that it is appropriate to analyze their derivatives together.

The compositional term used by R.Larson (R.Larson; 1988, 335-391.) in relation to this combination, which forms intransitive resultative structures, is that the internal argument of the verb (combination of verb and noun) is combined with a linguistic unit that has a resultative meaning. This concept is also applied to passive relative forms that have a resultative meaning. Let's focus on the following examples:

a. *The seedlings were watered flat.*

b. *Those cookies were broken into pieces ;*

c. *The socks have finally been scrubbed, clean.* (DJ Napoli, 1992).

When the resultative is used in the passive tense, the noun in the function of complement acts as the owner of the sentence. But it is included in the intransitive resultative structure because the meaning of resultativeness is preserved. In this case, the linguistic expression of the relation of action is assigned to the possessive noun, and some elements forming the construction are involved in a hidden state.

Resultant structures also have a descriptive expression, and the descriptive expression is considered as a semantic update. Figurative expression is interpreted as an additional meaning that occurs within the whole sentence. It should be noted that in these cases the word it is important not to confuse the meaning of the whole with the meaning expressed by the predicate. Because the meaning of the predicate refers to the basic meaning that is formed within the framework of compositionality, and it

forms a resultative structure. And the meaning of figurative expression is a complete sentence product.

3.3. Lexical-grammatical means of expressing result

Grammatical research in any language focuses on the representation of events as linguistic units and the codification of the interrelationships of units involved in a sentence. This type of grammatical analysis is known in the history of linguistics by many terms: grammatical relations, syntactic functions, subcategorization of frames, argumentative structures, argument dependence, etc. One of the main concerns of each branch of grammar is the selection of the correct relationship of similarities and differences within that language and across other languages. Possessives, participles, complements are usually included in formal categories as purely grammatical relations. But in the process of representing events through interaction of these categories, a huge semantic difference occurs. In addition, if the cross-section of languages is compared, not only the syntactic tasks in them, but also the scope of meaning expressed by formal indicators, differ. In particular, in English, participles and complex complements form specific structures. These structures are used to express resultative and causative meanings from a semantic point of view. These meanings are also interpreted as separate categories in English. In particular, both causation and effectivity are complex, comprehensive categories that have many ways of expression. They also reflect the relationship to the objects of the external world. Within the category of causation, there is also the concept of direct causality, and it is necessary to distinguish between the relations that they perform.

Lexical means play an important role in the formation of result structures . Therefore, the resultative structures represented by the agentive complement perform communicative-pragmatic tasks. In this regard, we quote the opinion of the famous linguist Sh. Safarov: "When it comes to the factors that create the relationship between semantics and pragmatics in the content of speech structures, usually the function of lexical units (for example, performative units, illocutionary verbs) is discussed, and grammatical tools are left out of consideration. As a matter of fact, the

functional distribution of grammatical tools in the areas of semantics and pragmatics has its own appearance (Sh. Safarov; 2008, 94). Predicate means the result of previous actions. An event that takes place before the resulting meaning can perform performative or referential functions. For example: *Too angry, he also hit his other hand with a ruler. Seeing this from the desk on the other side, Avaz came running, took the ruler from his brother's hand and broke it* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 15).

In linguistics, the main focus is on the verb as the center of the sentence, because its semantic essence or semilogical core is manifested together with tense and time. In addition, the verb is considered as a dynamic sign (V.L. Egorov ; 1989 , 86). The rest of the clauses in the sentence are integrally connected with possessive, complement, and case verbs, and each clause plays an important role in the expression of the verb, its semantic differentiation, and the enrichment of the verb's meanings. Depending on the lexical-grammatical meaning of the verb, the possessive substance can be the doer of the action, the manager of the action, the recipient of the action. Also, the action of the verb can express the state, character, method and other signs of the owner. For example : *Then he closed the door, leaving her standing there* (Ch. Frazier, 256);

True to Inman's signal, the door soon reopened (Ch. Frazier, 257);

Inman's mouth tightened like a cord had been pulled in him (Ch. Frazier, 257).

The complement gives a transformational meaning to the action of the verb, it means that the action of the verb is completed, it is full. The relationship between the object and the verb occurs only with the transitive nature of the verb. For example : *Tom sent the letter. They get their clothes in Paris .*

Substantives and adverbs in the case function are the structural completion of the verb action, purpose, space and time movement in measurement, quantity , method , style like meanings means _ For example : *The slaves had the same fare, but ate out under the pear tree* (Ch. Frazier, 135); *Ada and Ruby went to work cooking* (Ch. Frazier, 135).

The complement gives a transformational meaning to the action of the verb, the fulfillment of the action of the verb, the meaning of the complete execution of the

action of the verb. The relationship between the object and the verb occurs only with the transitive nature of the verb. In such cases, the resulting meaning occurs depending on the lexical feature of the verb. M asalan : *As far as we could see were red hills all washed down with gullies and scattered over with patches of piney woods. (O'Henry, 244) ; and all the sheep had died and Yeah, and what did you get you see, you get mutations going on in plants so that you get at the moment when the plants themselves are altered, it doesn't necessary, necessary mean that they're killed off, it doesn't necessary mean that they are killed off, it means that the actual genes alter, that they go on breathing so you get ginormous sort of cabbages, you know, cabbages that'll normally be about that size, suddenly become that size that they're the biggest (source: F7L)*

Substantives and adverbs in the function of fillers are the structural completion of the verb action, purpose, space and time movement in measure, quantity , method , style like meanings has a certain influence in the work . For example : *He put down the newspaper automatically as the door opened wide (Maeve Binchy,107).*

verbs plays an important role in the formation of the resultative meaning . As we have seen , each verb, apart from its lexical meaning , it forms a resultative meaning as a result of combining with other word groups . These complexes, while differentiating the lexical-semantic meanings of verbs, can create their various combinations.

At the moment, though, the red hen came bursting through the leaves, her wings partially opened and trailing in the dust (Ch. Frazier, 32).

In English, the resultative structure of connecting verbs indicates the result of a new quality, stateful past, the emergence of a new state. For example :

It had gone dark ;

Her hair had gone gray ;

He has got lame.

Now we will focus separately on the meanings of such combinations and connecting verbs combined with other components. The linking verb *to falls* is usually combined with adjectives and some nouns. These compounds mean a change

of state or the beginning of a process, state, regardless of the subject's will. We pay attention to the following examples:

Her husband had fallen a victim to his zeal for the public safety; The artist fell out of favor It fell dark (It fell dark).

The resultative semantics associated with the change of case in these examples is not the semantics of the linking verb, but rather the meaning of the second component expressed as *victim, favor, dark*.

The leading verb in the accusative form means action, and the meaning of resultativeness comes from the lexical meaning of the auxiliary verb. This case is a characteristic of transitive verbs. For example: *Hulkar finished kneading the dough, and turned the pot over the coals in the stove and started heating it. The dog stood up and barked loudly* (Pirimkul Kadirov, 84). *The moon, which appeared crimson at first, gradually began to fade and lose its color. It turned yellow, then blue-blue* (Said Ahmad, 210).

divides resultative phenomena into strong resultatives and weak resultatives in the process of typological analysis (R. Washio; 1997, 1999). The author states that in the strong resultative, the meaning of the verb and the meaning of the adjective are independent of each other, and object-oriented causation means ergative resultativeness. As evidence, the author gives the following examples: a) *The horses **dragged** the logs **smooth*** (R. Jackendoff; 1990, 226. R. Washio; 1997, 39. R. Washio; 1999, 689).

b) *The jockeys **raced** the horses **sweaty***. (Washio R., 1999:689).

In weak resultativeness, he connects the change of the state of the object under the influence of possible causation with the feature of the verb and gives the following examples: a) *He **wiped** the table **clean***. v) *He **sharpened** the pencil **pointy***. (Washio; 1997, 227. 1999, 689).

In our opinion, the classification of resultativeness into a strong or weak type is directly related to the actional semantics of the verb. The verbs *drag, race* used by Washio have a feature that is not limited from the action point of view, precisely under the influence of this semantic feature, these structures have expressed a

resultative meaning. The verbs *wipe*, *sharpen*, which express weak resultativeness, are actionally limited in nature, and the meaning they express is the resultativeness that occurs as a result of a change in the state of the object. In this case, Washio connects the change of meaning with the feature of the verb, but does not pay attention to the fact that it is an action feature of the verb.

Resultative structures in the English language have a special place at the syntactic-semantic level. They are of the form NP1 VP (NP2), where the action denoted by NP1 produces a certain consequentiality by causing NP2. In this case, the third component or secondary predicate creates a resultative structure. For example: *Herman hammered the metal flat*.

Resultant constructions of the form NP1 VP NP2 are typical constructions found in the English grammar system. Since these structures are built depending on the semantics of the verb and represent a new event, we believe that they should be studied within the framework of aspectual modifiers.

It seems that the analysis of resultative structures covers the syntactic level as well as idiomatic expressions. If the syntactic level deals with the definition of language units that form direct, resultative structures and the resultative meanings that arise as a result of the verb forming combinations, idiomatic expressions are focused on the definition of the meanings that are formed by the combination of the verb and the unit that adapts to it. Also, the semantic distinction between the resulting meaning and the figurative expression is made directly within the syntactic level. The main difference between the use of an adjunct (complement) and an argument (any noun modified by a verb) involved in result structures is that the unit in the function of an adjunct can be repeated, that is, one or more language units can be involved in order to fill the meaning semantically. Arguments alone form resultative structures by combining with verbs. But there are also opinions about the fact that there are several ways of expressing productiveness in each language. "Resultativeness in any language depends on a) type of diathesis; b) to the meaning indicator of productivity; v) there are ways of expression depending on the exact lexical resultative meaning of a certain verb (V. P. Nedyalkov, S. E. Yakhontov; 1983, 15)". Of course, all methods

belong to the additional expressive properties of resultativeness, and are related to resultative semantics, such as a change of state, a transition to a new state as a result of a certain action.

The distinction between resultivity and staticity (transitional state) is a bit complicated. That is why there are opinions that these types of expression should be analyzed together, considered as a synonymous phenomenon (V. P. Nedyalkov; 1981, 164). J. Bybee; 1994, 53). The lexical basis of resultativeness is mainly related to change of state. This situation can occur when the Uzbek verb "to be" is combined with an auxiliary verb with a static meaning. For example:

Lutfiniso's wedding clothes were already torn to shreds by the thorns (Said Ahmad, 32). The wolf's tongue became silent (Uncle Murad, 25).

In some cases, the meaning of resultativeness can be expressed in the adjective form of a static verb or in the passive participle. For example: *Tengdik and Beyshenadi, who were sleeping next to him, had already had a fight* (Said Ahmad, 109).

Grammatical indicators in the expression of resultativeness (resultative meaning formed in the form of an adjective form or a passive participle) occur depending on the lexical feature of the verb. This case is considered a phenomenon related to verbs that have a limited character from the point of view of transitivity and action. For example: *The door banged behind her and John Ryan saw, through the bedroom window, his wife ran across the small footbridge opposite the pub. (Maeve Binchy, 4).*

Resultative structures can also be formed in the intransitive nature of the verb when the action is directed to the owner. For example:

The floor was made of beaten earth, the walls were washed white with lime to keep off the flies. A crude stone hearth, a few sticks of furniture, chests and coffers and a shelf full of kitchen implements were all the friar's apparent possessions. (source: H9C); That night Sergeant Sheehan found somebody lying in a very awkward position, legs splayed, head lolling, and stretched right across the footbridge at the end of the town (Maeve Binchy,79) .

It seems that the resultative structures are not only a combination of a complement and a secondary predicate used after the verb, but also a phenomenon characteristic of all arguments that enter into a relationship with the main verb (A. Goldber; 2004, 181-182).

of result structures , the feature of actional limitation characteristic of activity verbs also plays an important role. However, resultativeness is not considered the main feature of limited feature action verbs. In these cases, resultativeness is considered a semantic phenomenon resulting from the interaction of an argument with a verb with a limited feature. An example of this is the above sentence *The river froze solid* . Compare: *He waved at Michael silly* (Maevé Binchy,46).

Resultant meanings can be assigned to attribute and predicate at the same time. In this case, the function of the attribute is related to the expression of the state, while the language units in the function of the predicate mean that the result has been achieved. Such effectiveness can be observed in the combination of different similar events. For example:

The young woman stepped into the cab; the doors shut with a bang; Jerry's whip cracked in the air; the crowd in the gutter scattered, and the fine hansom dashed away 'cross-town (O'Henry, 69) .

We are used to taking the adjective form in the given example synonymously. However, despite the fact that their syntactic-semantic functions are different, they formed a number of result structures. These structures have come to represent the outcome of events that are relevant to the present. The resultative meaning of these structures "is inextricably linked with the action feature of the verb, i.e. limited and terminative type" (E.V. Petrukhina; 2000, 24). Because this meaning is caused by the action feature of the verb involved. The action feature of the verb is important in the meanings it conveys as a result of the combination of leading and auxiliary verbs (G'. Mirsanov; 2015, 37-42).

Resultativeness is formed in both languages using certain grammatical categories. As an example of this, we can cite the resultativeness expressed in the adjective form and the passive participle combinations. A situation expressed by an

adjective means a resultative meaning that has arisen anew. For example: *Turning, she found her view blocked by a broad chest, broad shoulders encased in a white linen shirt* (Liz. Fielding, 9).

that in the Uzbek language, the combination of the verbs "to be" and "to get" with leading verbs with limited features in the function of auxiliary verbs also form resultative structures . For example: *Three more people were thrown into the empty cage next to us. Now we have enough space* (Said Ahmad, 32).

E. Dal and E. Heden introduce the concept of "current relevance" in relation to the expression of productive situations related to the present time. The authors evaluate this phenomenon from a pragmatic point of view. They explain the concept of "current relevance" by the fact that in the example of " *A bank has been robbed " , the place directly related to the event is not meant, but what consequences were brought to the participants of the dialogue, how the event was carried out, and its result becomes more interesting. (O. Dahl, E. Hedín; 2000, 391 - 392). Of course, in this case, the speaker not only conveys information about the event, but also focuses on the extent to which the information conveyed (banking) affects the listener, or checks the listener's awareness of the event, and similar relationships. E. Dal and E. Heden's example is more perfect in form than in performance. Until this time, clear guidelines have not been developed that differentiate between performance and perfection. For this reason, in most cases, the resultative and the perfect are evaluated as one phenomenon. It goes to V. A. Plungyan expresses the following attitude: "Thus, the perfect can be characterized as a weakened resultative if the description of a specific lexicographically determined state resulting from the completion of the action, any information corresponding to the current situation, the echo of the situation described by the speaker is related to the current reality" (Plungyan ; 2000, 299) .*

Determining and grouping the lexical-semantic field of a unit in the lexical system reveals the general semantics of synonymous and antonymic indicators in them, as well as minor features. In particular, when defining and comparing the lexical-semantic field of verbs belonging to different lexical-semantic groups, the differences in

their meaning elements (method of action, dependence, direction, difference in direction, initiation of action, acceptance of action by the subject, reaction to action, evaluation of action, means of action) , feature of subjects, object relation, etc.) helps to reveal. This situation is expressed in the verbs that form the event of direct result.

Resultative structures related to causation are closely related to the dynamic nature of the verb. Due to the dynamic nature of the verb, the causative patient is doomed to a change of state.

Each of the analyzed resultative, descriptive, causative structures has independent semantic limitations. Although they differ in categorical, lexical-semantic aspects, they are interconnected.

The resultative meaning formed with the participation of intransitive verbs can be purposeful or leading . In this case, the change of state is related to the subject.

Resultativeness, like other aspectual categories, has the characteristic of temporal variation and is contrasted with progressiveness (Plungyan, 2006). Contrasting progressiveness (relating to the present tense) with resultativeness can only be effective in semantic relations.

Based on the examples collected in English and Uzbek languages, it was possible to determine the amount of linguistic means of expression that create result structures. In the development of this statistical analysis, fiction literature in the languages under comparison and examples collected from the British corpora internet corpus were used as a basis.

In English - 2335 in Uzbek - 1894

Table No. 1

t/r	Linguistic expression	Number of eye lexemes	Indicator percentage	t/r	phrases	Number of eye lexemes	Cursor percentage
1	Lexical-based performance	633	28.5%	1	Lexical-based performance	284	13.5%

2	Productivity expressed in the secondary predicate	814	35.5%	2	Productivity in analytical forms	957	51.6%
3	Resituativeness expressed in the form of a passive ratio	375	16.4%	3	Resultativeness expressed by the static form of the verb	76	8.5%
4	Productiveness expressed with an adjective	515	19.6%	4	Productiveness expressed with an adjective	577	26.4%
	total	2335	100%		total	288	100%

The above statistical analysis was carried out on the basis of collected examples. Based on this, in English, a large percentage of resultativeness belongs to special structures involving separate secondary predicates, while in Uzbek, it is determined in the analytical forms of leading and auxiliary verbs.

The statistical analysis of the structural models of productivity in English took the following form:

Table No. 2

Models	Examples of examples	Amount of application of R/t
Vtrans N+Adj	wiped the table clean	441
<i>X have , get ,make, cause YV to -inf /PII</i>	get him retired / to have it delivered	568
NP1 VP Adj	The lake frozen solid	117

NP1 VP transN/Pr+Adj	He shot her dead	219
NP1 VP intransN/Pr+Adj	The cab doors flew open	263
VPconj PII	got drunk	255
NP1 VP trans Passive	He is fallen / is gone	228
adj.reflexiveVprp	The door banged behind	244
total		2335

In the examples collected in English, the resulting structures represented by the models Vtrans N+Adj, X *have*, *get*, *make*, *cause* YV *to* -inf /PII made up about fifty percent of the total amount. This statistical indicator also shows that productivity in English has a unique structure .

The statistical analysis of structural models of productivity in the Uzbek language took the following form:

Table No. 3

Models	Examples of examples	Amount of use of R/Ts
(Adj) Xnoun NP2 intransV -gan	traces of embarrassment are gone	128
(Adj) Xnoun NP2 trans V -gan	washed clean	98
NP1 V to V aux kol	became a favorite;	147
Vreduplicated	he slept	46
NP1 V result Vaux left	bent over	276
Adj Vaux -gan	made between	239
Adj V be Vaux kol	his eyes became dull	198
NP1 V Vaux left	became glassy	117
V reduplicated	what's dead is dead, what's left is what's left	88
NP1 VV aux ket	bent his back	268

NP1 VV aux kol/edi	was dead	289
total		1894

According to the analysis of the collected examples, a large percentage of resultative meanings in Uzbek are NP1 V result Vaux kol, Adj Vaux –gan, NP1 VV aux ket and NP1 applies to VV aux kol/edi models . These models are mainly formed by analytical forms in the Uzbek language.

Chapter summary

The effectiveness of the resultative is visible in the syntactic relation of the subject. In this case, the qualitative change of the subject is related to the change of state caused by the effectivity. This phenomenon can be seen in the use of intransitive verbs in the function of predicate, in passive combinations. At the same time, resultativeness, on the one hand, acts as a sign of relevance for subsequent events and has a pragmatic expression, and also forms a semantic structure in terms of the relevance of the meaning to the speech situation.

resultative structures in Uzbek depends on the meaning of the auxiliary verb. In these cases, the auxiliary verb loses its meaning to a certain extent and undergoes desemantization. Language units that make up the structure are evaluated as a single phrase through syntactic connection.

Resultant structures are formed differently depending on the lexical-semantic expression of the verb, depending on whether it subordinates an additional argument. For example, in English, some transitive verbs form structures depending on the meaning of the adjective in the function of a secondary predicate, which subordinates a complex object or changes the state of an object.

, we focused on the verb forms and structures that mean result , and the comparative analysis of their means of expression in English and Uzbek languages. Attention was paid to the resultative meanings expressed by analytical compounds as verb forms, as well as lexical and grammatical resultative structures .

Attention was paid to the differentiation of past tense meaning, perfect, causative, descriptive, completed meaning, as well as resultative meanings, which are evaluated as synonyms for resultativeness, and lexical-semantic signs distinguishing these phenomena were identified.

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were reached based on our research aimed at cross-analysis of the functional-semantic and linguistic-cultural and cognitive aspects of the resulting structures in English and Uzbek languages.

1. Resultant semantics in the compared languages is expressed in models and methods of expression based on the structural, morphological, syntactic, lexical, and linguistic features of each language;

2. Language units of all levels with a certain form and content can form a structure. Sentences have a special meaning as one of the important research objects of syntax and semantics. Meanwhile, all languages contain a number of structures such as causative, passive, descriptive, resultative, instrumental, intensive. Among them, the method of expression, the forms of creation, the resultative structures with syntactic-semantic connection, which are suitable for typological analysis, are of great importance;

3. In the Uzbek language, resultative structures are similar in form to descriptive structures. The adjective in the form of *-gan*, which forms the resultative and descriptive secondary predicates, performs the following syntactic functions: 1) the adjective is evaluated as an element dependent on the predicate; 2) the adjective acts as a case in relation to the main predicate;

3) the adjective is the main element reflecting the meanings of result and descriptiveness in these structures; 4) in the adjective-resultative structures, it comes into contact with the verbs *to do* and *to be*, which take the *-ib* form;

The main indicator of the resultative structures characteristic of the English language is the morphological sign of the second component, which acts as a complex complement, and this situation is: 1) the use of the adjective that indicates the change of the state of the object; 2) the infinitive form of the limited characteristic verb; 3) the second component of the complex complement used after causative verbs provides the adjective form II. In these cases, the secondary predicate means the result of the change of the state of the object.

5. Expression of causativeness differs according to the morphological and syntactic formation of languages. In some languages, this phenomenon has morphological properties, while in others it has lexical properties. The lexical feature is also a feature of morphologically formed languages. Because the causative is a lexical and semantic feature of the direct verb, and morphologically it forms unique structures.

6. Resultative structures in English and Uzbek do not have clear and similar forms. In English, resultativeness is expressed using the adjective, infinitive and adjective forms as a secondary predicate, the passive participle form of some (usually limited characteristic) verbs, linking verbs and adjectives in compound structures, the lexical meaning of verbs with resultative meaning.

7. In the Uzbek language, resultativeness has a *-gan form* in the analytical compounds formed with the adjective and the auxiliary verbs to be , *stay, go*, incomplete verb compounds with the adjective and *edi* , *the lexical-semantics of the verb has a result-oriented meaning*. For example: verbs such as *break, die, fall* , figurative expression is considered a characteristic phenomenon of structures that mean a certain result.

8. Perfect and resultative semantics differ by speech situation. In English, from the point of view of the past tense, in a narrative text, the perfect is evaluated as a sequence of actions, taxi events, and in the present tense as an event related to the speech situation, while the resultative contains information related to the change of state. In addition, these phenomena are also distinguished on the basis of dynamic and static characteristics.

9. Lexical means play an important role in expressing productivity. In particular, the lexical meanings of linguistic units such as verbs, nouns, and adjectives participating in resultative structures play an important role in expressing the resultative meaning.

the structures of the passive ratio, the resultativeness is manifested as the result of the action directed towards the agentive complement or as a means of ensuring the change of the subject's state.

11. The adjective form (adjective II form in English) reflects the weakened meaning of the verb and means the resultativeness associated with the change of state as a result of the action.

12. In comparative languages, the resultative structure has certain grammatical indicators. In particular, in English, the transitive nature of the verb takes the lead, and the participation of the agent or patient in the framework of the structure has an important place. In the Uzbek language, the analytical forms of the verb and the adjective form form the basis of resultative structures . Structures involving transitive verbs and intransitive verbs differ in terms of transitivity. Transitive verbs take an indirect object and the object undergoes qualitative change.

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

LIST OF REFERENCES USED

I. Regulatory documents and publications of methodological importance

Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On the strategy of actions for the further development of the Republic of Uzbekistan" // "Khalq sozi" newspaper 02.08.2017. 28(6722)- no.

II. Scientific literature

1. Abduazizov A.A. An Introduction to Linguistic Theory. - T.: Sharq, 2010. - 144 p.
2. Avilova N.S. Vid glagol i semantika glagolnogo slova. - M., 1976. - 328 p.
3. Akimova T. G. Semanticheskie priznaki v sphere kachestvennoy aspektualnosti i funkcionirovaniya vidovremennyx form angliyskogo glagol // Teoriya grammaticheskogo znacheniya i aspektologicheskie issledovaniya: Sb. state. / Otv. Ed. A. V. Bondarco. - L., 1984. - S. 71-91.
4. Arutyunova N.D. Typical language meaning: Otsenka. Sobytie. Fact. - M.: Nauka, 1988. -341 p.
5. Beloshapkova T.V. Kognitivno-diskursivnoe opisanie kategorii aspektualnosti v sovremennom russkom yazyke : Autoref. diss.... d -ra . Take an elephant . science – M .: 2008. -40 p.
6. Bondarko A.V. Functional grammar. L.: Nauka, 1984. -133 p.
7. Bondarko A. V. Principles of functional grammar and question aspectology. - L., 1983. -208 p.
8. Bulygina T.V. K postroeniyu tipologii predicatov v russkom zyke // Semanticheskie tipy predicatov. - M., 1982. - S. 7-85
9. Buranov Dj. Sravnitel'naya typology of English and Turkish languages. - M., 1983. - 266 p.
10. B o' ronov J. Comparative grammar of English and Uzbek languages . - Tashkent, 1973. -284 p.
11. Ganiev F.A. Vidovaya characteristicsika glagolov tatarskogo zyyka: Problema glagolnogo vida v tatarskogo zyyke. - Kazan. 1963. -S. 377-382.

12. Guzev V.G. Ocherki po teorii turksskogo slovoizmenenia: Verb. - L., 1990. - 165 p.
13. Ivanova I. P. The modern English language. - L., 1961. - 200 p.
14. Egorov V.L. Glagoly funktsionirovanie v opisanii principa deystviya / Voprosy lingvistiki. - M., 1989. -S .86.
15. Espersen O. Grammar of philosophy. - M., 1958 . -404 p.
16. Zikirillaev G'. Morphology of the Uzbek language. - Bukhara, 1994.
17. Zikirillaev G'. Spirit and language. -T.: Science, 2018. -464 p.
18. Lander. Yu. A. Perfekt i obstoyatelstva konkretnogo vremeni // *Yazyki mira. Typology. Uralistics. Pamyati T. Zhdanovoy* . Sost. V. A. Plungyan, A. Yu. Urmanchieva. M.: Indrik, 2002. - S. 300–312.
19. Maslov Yu. S. Essay on aspectology. - L., Izd-vo LGU, 1984. - 263 p.
20. Maslov Yu.S. Resultative, perfekt i glagolnyy vid // *Typology of rezultative constructions: Resultative, stative, passive, perfect.* - L., 1983. - S. 41-54.
21. Maslov Yu. S. K osvaniyam sopostavitelnoy aspektologii / *Voprosy sopostavitelnoy aspektologii.*– L. , Izd-vo LGU, 1978. – S . 4-44
22. MillerDj. E. Does the English perfect form of the verb work? Proshloe, blijayshee proshloe i rezultativnost v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke // *Trudy aspektologicheskogo seminara filologich. f-ta MGU im. M.V. Lomonosova* , volume 3. M.: MGU, 1997. - S. 103–120.
23. Mirsanov G'. Q. Aspectual and temporal content expression in discourse. // *Monograph.* -Tashkent: "Navroz", 2018. -156 p.
24. Mirsanov G'. Q. Aspectual semantics represented by the auxiliary verb "qol". // *Science news*, 2015, No. 7. -B. 37-42.
- 25 . Mirsanov G'.Q. Actional and aspectual characteristics of verbs of movement in English and Uzbek languages. *Philol.fan.n...diss. autoref.* - T.;, 2009. - 21 p.
26. Muhamedova S.Kh. Predicativeness and valence of directional action verbs in Uzbek language. *Philol.fan.candidate.diss...autoref.* -T., 1999. -20 p.
27. Muhamedova S.Kh. Semantic and valence features of action verbs in Uzbek language. *Philol. science. doc.diss....authorref.* -Tashkent, 2007. -46.

28. Nasilov D.M. Aktsionalnost v Altayskikh yazykah: typology and "determinant" // Voprosy tyurkskoy filologii (Materialy Dmitrievskikh chteniy). - M., 2006. Vyp., VI . - S. 80-90.

29. Nasilov D.M. Problemy Turkskoy aspectology: Aktsionalnost. - L.: Nauka, 1989. - 208 p.

30. Nasilov D. M. Stative and perfect passive in the Uzbek language // Tipologiya rezultativnykh konstruksiy (resultative, stative, passive, perfect) / Pod red . L.: Nauka, 1983. Nedyalkov V. P. S. 118–123.

31. Nevskaya, I. A. Depictivnye vtorostepennye predicyaty v turkskikh yazykax //Synkhronnoe i diachronnoe v sravnitelno-istoricheskom yazykoznanii / Pod ed. V. A. Kocherginoy. - M.: Dobrosvet, 2011. - S. 171–175.

32. Nedyalkov V.P. Nachinatelnost i sredstva eyo vyrazheniya v zyykakh raznykh tipov // Teoriya funktsionalnoy grammatiki. Introduction Aspectuality. Vremennaya lokalizovannost. Taxi. - L., 1983. - S. 180-195.

33. Safarov Sh. Pragmalinguistics. - T.: "National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan", 2008. - 286 p.

34. Safarov Sh. Semantics. - T.: "National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan", 2013. - 341 p.

35 . Boogaard R., Janssen T. Aspects of Language- 31. Tense and Aspect // www.let.vu.nl/staf/thalm.janssen

36 . Brosig B. Depictives and results in modern khalkh Mongolian // Hokkaidō Gengo bunka kenkyū.2009. No. 7. – P. 71–101.

37 . Bybee JL, Perkins R, Pagliuca W. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world* . – Chicago: The U. of Chicago Press, 1994.

38 . Carrier J., RandallJ.H., The Argument Structure and Syntactic Structure of Resultatives // *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 1992. -R. 173-234.

39. Comrie B. Subject and Object Control: Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics. *BLS* 10, 1984. –R. 450-464.

40. Chomsky N. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT, 1965. – 251 p.

41. Bobokalonov R.R. Tibbiyot va neyropsixolingvistika. Monografiya, GlobEdite. Republic of Moldova, Europe printed, 2023. Pages 3-123. ISBN: 978-620-0-64769-6.
42. Bobokalonov R.R. Neyropsixolingvistika: lingvistik shaxs va xarizmalı inson. Monografiya, GlobEdite. Republic of Moldova, Europe printed, 2023. Pages 3-149 ISBN: 978-620-0-64878-5 (Hammualif: Sayfullayeva Ra‘no).
43. Bobokalonov R.R. Nutqiy hosila, semiotik belgi, diskurs va neyropsixolingvistik holat. Monografiya, GlobEdite. Republic of Moldova, Europe printed, 2023. Pages 3-223. ISBN: 978-620-0-64729-0.
44. Bobokalonov R.R. Нейропсихолингвистика: языковая личность и харизматический человек. Теория, практика и методика. Neyropsixolingvistika: yazykovaya lichnost' i xarizmaticheskiy chelovek. Teoriya, praktika i metodika. Monografiya, LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, Republic of Moldova, Europe printed. 2023. Pages 3-230. ISBN: 978-620-6-15214-9.

Internet sites

www.thoughtco.com/text-linguistics

phdessay.com/text-linguistics

<http://eas.uni-sofia.bg/text-linguistics>

Ru/article/n/tezaurus-aspectologicheskikh-terminov-principy-formirovaniya <http://net.knigi-x.ru/24konferenciya/169714-1-the-semantic-scope-slavic-aspect-> [http://](http://www.maldura.unipd.it/glagvid)

www.maldura.unipd.it/glagvid

<http://programma.x-pdf.ru/16jazykoznanie>

<http://eas.uni-sofia.bg/text-linguistics>

www.utsc.utoronto.ca/~binnick

www.rucont.ru/efd/

google.ru/books/about/Verbal_Aspect_in_Discourse

CELT (*Corpus of 181.Electronic Texts*), www.ucc.ie/celt). <http://gramota.net/eng/materials/>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Chapter I. Theoretical foundations 3

1.1. Study of aspectual and action-like events 3

1.2. Main theoretical approaches in the interpretation of the concept of aspectuality 11

1.3. Study of productivity within aspectual studies 21

1.4. Theoretical views on resultative and perfect relationships 28

Chapter conclusions 35

II . Linguistic realization of result structures 36

2.1. Different aspects of resultative structures according to their linguistic essence 36

2.2. 57 on the relationship between the resultative and causative meanings 42

2.3 . Semantic properties of resultative structures in english 52

2.4. Semantic features of uzbek language resultative structures 58

Chapter summary 61

Iii . Events in the resultant content linguistic and cognitive characteristics of composition 64

3.1. Regarding the types of resultative structures represented by the secondary predicate 64

3.2. Analysis of resultative structures expressed in the form of a passive ratio 83

3.3. Lexical-grammatical means of expressing result 87

Chapter summary 98

General conclusions 100

List of references used 103

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

**More
Books!**



yes
I want morebooks!

Buy your books fast and straightforward online - at one of world's fastest growing online book stores! Environmentally sound due to Print-on-Demand technologies.

Buy your books online at
www.morebooks.shop

Kaufen Sie Ihre Bücher schnell und unkompliziert online – auf einer der am schnellsten wachsenden Buchhandelsplattformen weltweit! Dank Print-On-Demand umwelt- und ressourcenschonend produziert.

Bücher schneller online kaufen
www.morebooks.shop



info@omniscryptum.com
www.omniscryptum.com

OMNIScriptum



FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY