

Influence Of Action Verbs On Iterative Expression

Djurayev Botur Ilkhomovich

Independent researcher at the department of theoretical aspects of English language, Faculty of English language, Samarkand State Institute of foreign languages, Bustonsaroy 93, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article is devoted to the issue of the influence of action verbs on iterative expression. It is known that the analysis of iterative semantics focuses on the expression of all contextual units that affect the predicate. The author concluded that the units that form iterative semantics represent the basic semantic properties of a particular word group and activate the additional semantic properties that are specific to that word group. In the Uzbek language, the mode of action of a verb is a linguistic phenomenon of aspectual significance. It is self-evident after the above considerations that the action forms of the verb cannot belong to the pure aspect. However, from a functional-semantic point of view, the mode of action, which has an analytic form, is included in the scope of the aspect, and the action.

Keywords: action verbs, iterative expression, contextual-pragmatic criteria, limited / unlimited verbs.

1. INTRODUCTION

Action verbs and units that affect the meaning of the predicate are evaluated as the main means of forming the functional-semantic field. Therefore, special attention deserves the question of determining the possibility of adaptation of verbs denoting iterative semantics with other units. In this case, the suffixes of the tense form allows the formation of iterative meanings by analyzing the semantic possibilities of adverbial units.

2. METHODS

Several methods of investigation were chosen in this article. Descriptive, distributive, transformational, and applicative methods were used in the analysis of language material.

3. FINDING AND DISCUSSIONS

The units that form iterative semantics represent the basic semantic properties of a particular word group and activate the additional semantic properties that are specific to that word group (2011). Criteria for selecting the main lexical units that create iterativeness is divided into the following types: 1) units with lexical index; 2) the meaning that arises as a result of the possibility of joining the verb to the word combinations (lexical adaptive units); 3) words denoting quantitative and repetitive phenomena; 4) quantitative possibility of the verb; 5) units with semantic frequency; 6) the effect of adverbial units (2011). The criterion of quantity used in the definition of lexical units that define iterativeness has an

objective place. However, it is also important to consider lexical-pragmatic criteria. It is based on lexical-semantic, lexical-syntactic, lexical-morphological, contextual, contextual-pragmatic criteria.

As noted in the previous section, the analysis of iterative semantics focuses on the expression of all contextual units that affect the predicate. E.V. Paducheva argues that for semantic interpretation to be complete, it must be possible to explain the specific features of the linguistic phenomenon of a word (2009).

The multiplicative and self-factive meanings of action verbs in Uzbek are partially different from other groups. In verbs belonging to this group, the analysis of verbs denoting the mode of action, as well as the group of verbs denoting one-way direction and denoting directional action in different directions, may be important in determining the iterative meanings. Consequently, Russian scientists A. Zaliznyak and A. Shmelev who are active in the study of action verbs compared the verbs denoting one-way direction *идти* (go), *ехать* (drive) with contrasting them group of verbs denoting different direction *ходить* (walk), *ездить* (ride, drive, travel) (2000). The authors emphasize that there is an iterative meaning in the verbs *ходить* (walk), *ездить* (ride, drive, travel).

One of the most widely used terms in the field of iteration is habitual, which refers to events that have become habitually repetitive and an unlimited number of repetitive actions. The

term iterative is used in relation to the generalized expression of the stated meanings.

It is well known that lexical multiplicity is also based on grammatical expression in the description of short sequential action situations. In particular, Who is knocking at the door? the sentence represents the repetition of an action in a given situation in a series, in a sequence. Let's look at another example: John is eating apples. This example also represents a sequence of similar or identical situations. The occurrence of iterative meanings is not unique to the semelfactive properties of the verb. Iterative meaning (as we have seen in the above examples) is also expressed by the use of tense forms of the verb, units representing multiplicity, repetition, singular action, as well as quantitative forms. Compare:

- a) John drives to work (regularly);
- b) John drives a car (easily).

In Example (a), John's driving has a certain direction and can be assessed as recurring events. In the next example (b), the uncertainty of direction does not create an iterative meaning in the action or event.

Because of the variety of lexical and syntactic devices that represent repetitive actions, as well as the iterative meanings are determined by different time periods, linguists suggest studying them in terms of "internal repetition (multiplicity) of events" and "multiplicity of predicates" (1989, 2000, 2002).

The repetition of events, situations over a period of time takes place within the context. As a single phenomenon following meaning arises as a result of pragmatic influence. Therefore, the repetition of events over time is studied in terms of internal repetition and external repetition. If the lexical meaning of an internal repetition is determined by the plural form of the noun that comes as a possessive or complementary function, etc., the external repetition is determined by the repetition of certain events in the same tense. External repetition is defined in certain ways, morphological additions, within the category of time. Consider the following example: Saturday nights I just move the furniture with sharp corners out of the way, so I won't cut my head when he gets his work in. He's got a left swing that jars you! Sometimes I take the count in the first round; but when I feel like having a good time during the week, or want some new rags, I come up again for more punishment (O'Henry, 156).

Repetition of the usual behavior of the subject is expressed through the structures I just move the furniture .., I take the count ..., I come

up again . In this repetition, the Saturday nights in the context are sometimes formed by the present tense and the plural form of the noun, as well as by the tense form of the verb (Present Simple). It should be noted that the iterative situations in this scene have not meant the multiplicity of events, but the repetition of individual events that have a common feature. In determining the meaning of the multiplicity or repetition of events, it is important to identify the functions of the grammatical indicators or pragmatic means involved in the text. In this case, it is necessary to pay attention to the lexical-grammatical, semantic, pragmatic means in the text, which determine the time, interval, process aspects of events. Apparently, iterative meaning is not a separate phenomenon of independent significance, but a series of meanings formed by lexical-grammatical, contextual, pragmatic means. In this case, attention is paid to the specific meaning associated with the action of the subject. In particular, the subject's behavior is understood as a time-related event. For example: Do you remember when we were very young we used to take you out to have a look at the man in the moon before you went to bed (M. Binchy, 167). In this example, the subject denotes the usual repetitive actions over a period of time. The iterative semantics is represented by the compound used to take . The familiar information conveyed to the listener in this example is pragmatic. It should be noted that there are conflicting opinions and comments about the meanings used in English compounds. English linguists J. Bybee and Ö. Dahl claim that the meanings expressed by this compound have habitual semantics (1989). Linguists such as K. Smith, B. Levin, on the other hand, note that this compound has an iterative meaning (1991, 2000). Russian linguist G. Tatevosov (2005) and Uzbek aspectologist G. Mirsanov (2018) agree with the views of scholars who recognize the compound "used to" with an iterative meaning. They argue that the used to combination is a repetition of an event or action of the same type that occurred in the past, depending on the situation. The situation is understood as individual information covering general information and can be assessed as an individual characteristic. Consider the following example: What have old ivy wine to do with your getting well? And you used to love that vine so, you naughty girl (O'Henry, 193).

The compound "used to love" in the given example has always meant an individual phenomenon. In this example, it can be said that the singularity of the event also depends on the semantics of action verb "to love", which

isinvolved in the compound . It is known that the verb “to love”belongs to a group of verbs with unlimited properties and has a static meaning. Apparently, the perception of the multiplicity or repetition of actions in a time interval as a phenomenon depends not only on the defining units in the sentence, but also on the actional feature of the verb, sometimes on the grammatical index. In particular, when “used to”is combined with the gerund form of the verb, the action represents the process of events. Compare: She had even grown used to noticingAnna joggle the reluctant Jimmy with her elbow as a signal forhim to invite her chum to walk over his feet through a two-step.(O’Henry, 39); They used to own that house... well? The house that was over there (M. Binchy, 315).

In the first given example, the repetition of events of the same type is expressed as a process. In the next, the phenomenon of possession is described in a static manner. These examples combine in a way with the understanding of habitual meaning. In these examples, the subject-specific behaviors represented bytime-limited intervals. E. Franconi and others describe habitual meanings as subject-specific events in an indefinite period of time.The semantics that represent the action connected with a personality traits. Certain behaviors, events that are specific to the subject, are realities that characterize the person. A context in which the Continuous form, which means repetition in a time-limited interval, means that the event is repeated individually, while a context that does not have a limited time interval, means that the event is processive. Compare: a) When she feels bored, she is always playing computer games; b) She is always working to broaden the usage of the site .

Adverbs play an important role in the expression of habitual meaningsin English. However, the plural semantics of the predicate should also not be overlooked. Interpreters also make up the majority in relation to the Continuous (progressive) forms of the meaning of aspectuality in English. The lexical meaning of the verb semantics, which denotes these progressive forms, occurs in connection with the singular or plural forms of the argument (possessive, complementary). Consider the following examples: a) Someone was shaking her shoulder hard (G. Lynne, 14); b) The men, hanging on for dear life a top their slow, clumsy horse, realized the women were getting away (J. Deveraux, 41); Across a path from the kitchen was the produce garden, where a man and three

children were weeding the vegetables (J. Deveraux, 25).

In these examples, we can observe the occurrence of different meanings through the same progressive form. In particular, the iterative semantics in example (a) is related to the semelfactive verb, in which case a kind of action quantum is formed. In the next (b) example, the plural form of the argument (possessing) allows us to interpret actions as a separate (individual) situation. In the next example (s), the plural form of the argument also plays an important role in the formation of iterative semantics. It should be noted that the iterative meaning that arises in the course of each event is related to the situation. Therefore, the choice of linguistic means is important in the expression of iterativeness.

In the analysis of the expression of iterative meanings, it is important to identify events, actions, habituality of the situation, repetition, infrequent occurrence, frequent occurrence, repetition over a certain period of time. These semantic differences have their own lexical and grammatical features in each language.

In Western linguistics, the frequent or infrequent occurrence of events is studied in a specific context (1994). The semantics of the rare occurrence of a known event is referred to by the term rarity (2005). This semantic group is represented by special linguistic means. In English semantics of frequency is usually expressed by the adverbs often, very often, from time to time, rhythmic, all the time and so on. For example: may run along down to your club now. I'm glad it ain't your liver. But don't forget to burn a few punk sticks in the joss-house to the great god Mazuma from time to time (O’Henry, 59); "I was expecting something like this all the time," says Andy. (O'Henry, 220). Rare meanings is usually formedby the adverbs rarely, sometimes, occasionally, at times, every now, seldom, sporadically and so on. For example: There was something foreign about the affair, for the Park is rarely used in the morning except by unimportant people who love to be healthy, poor and wise(O’Henry, 150); I suppose I've written some interesting stuff at times '(O'Henry, 248).Highlighted adverbs are used to express not only above-mentioned meanings but also can express habitual semantics. Habitual semantics is also represented by the following adverbs: mostly, every time, daily, weekly, often, usually, constantly and so on. For example: Myfingers go on a strike every time I try it. (O'Henry, 266). It should be noted that the semantics of habituality occurs not only in these forms, but also in the

harmonization of the indefinite tense form of the verb. For example: The dropping out of a prince consort rarely disorganizes a monarchy (O'Henry, 103).

In the Uzbek language there is a special form of the verb —иб тур, which means that an event happens rarely. According to D. Nasilov —иб тур auxiliary verb structure means the usual repetition of limited actions (1989). For example: Куйганёрга бу тарафлардан тинмай от-арава, машиналар ўтиб турарди (С. Аҳмад, 147); (Horse-drawn carts and cars passed by Kuyganyor from these directions).

The semantics of iterativeness in this example is formed by the limited feature of the verb “ўтмоқ” (to pass) and by the time indicator —ар. In particular, the auxiliary verb in the form -иб тур evaluates the repetition of an event in terms of time. Additional spatial indicators within the framework of iterative behavioral verbs are also formed by the formation of complex verb conjugations (2009). In these cases, the auxiliary verb in the form -иб тур is an iterative expression. For example: Аммо Азизхон анча пайтгача ўзига келаолмай ҳовлибетида у ёқдан-бу ёққа бориб-келиб турди (С. Аҳмад, 63). (But Azizkhan could not come to his senses for a long time and went back and forth in the courtyard). In this example, the lexical meaning of the compound verb conjugation from time to time in the case of place-time case function means the action in the opposite direction, while the iterative semantics is related to the auxiliary verb semantics.

Apparently, the iterative meaning of the verbs belonging to the gait movement group is formed directly by the limited feature of the verb and the combination of the auxiliary verb— тур. In the Uzbek language, the lexical meaning and context of the leading verb also have an impact on the differentiation of the iterative semantics formed by the auxiliary verb —иб тур. Let us consider the following examples: а) Лутфинсонинг юраги гуппилаб урар, кўкраклари қувончдан қалқиб турарди (Lutfinson's heart was pounding and his breasts were trembling with joy) (С. Аҳмад, 146); б) Бекорга пашша қуриб ўтирма, манаву байрокни қимирлатиб тур (Do not dry the mosquitoes in vain, wave this flag) (С. Аҳмад, 147); в) Тонг саҳар тушган шабнам то офтоб ялаб олгунча майса қиёқларида титраб турарди (The dew in the morning trembled on the grass until the sun set) (С. Аҳмад, 227). The verbs қалқимоқ, қимирлатмоқ, титрамоқ (to rise, shake, and vibrate) in the given examples have semelfactive properties and mean the

repetition of short quantum movements. The structure formed by the addition of the auxiliary verb —иб to these verbs creates an iterative repetition of the action in a certain period of time. The semantics that defines the time interval is related to the semantics of the auxiliary verb тур.

Another compound that forms the tense features of a verb are aspectual-temporal expressions, which serve as syntactic indicators of the actional properties of verbs (2012).

One of the peculiarities of the Z. Vendler classification is that for a verb to be perfect, the action must have an internal (execution process), or an external boundary (the result to be achieved) (1957). V.D. Nefedov, who has conducted research on the effects of limited and unbounded feature of verbs on aspectual semantics that determine the external and internal features of a situation, argues that iterative meaning has a separate description and analysis. The author divides the semantics of repetition into several semantic groups: repetitive actions over a period of time; clear sequence of situations; uncertain quantitative situations; indefinite series of actions; repetitive situations that have become habitual (1968). The semantics of iteration, as well as the occurrence of repeated events in an infinite number of plural cases, has been studied by O.D. Gaken (1979).

In these cases, the context is important. Moreover, the lexical meaning of a particular verb must fit into this context. For example, the English verb “to knock” means “to knock the door”. The use of this verb in any context means that the actions take place sequentially.

Repetition is common for situations where a situation has a narrow scope. In this case, the multiplicative lexical feature of the verb is important and occurs independently of the special means of expression. The lexical content of the case function, which represents the meaning of repetition, is considered more stable than that of the verbs. This is because these indicators do not mean additional contradictory meanings when combined with verbs (2001). V.V. Bogdanov argues that these cases may apply to aspectual operators who are tasked with changing the meaning of a sentence (2007). According to B.M. Balin, in cases of repetitive meaning, units denoting condition reinforce an iterative meaning (1969). L.B. Garifulin classifies this type of statement into an incomplete aspectual group and argues that action is an event that has not reached its limits (1969). B.M. Balin considers iteration to be a type of unlimited action: “... a distinctive feature of the meaning of a limiting action is that

the action (state) reaches its limit or moves to a certain new state (1969). Repetitive movements can be divided into homogeneous parts. Because each of them has separate phases.

Z. Vendler distinguishes the semantic group of verbs as follows: 1) activities denoting continuous action, related to an activity or homogeneous process — an indefinite period of time, e.g., running; 2) accomplishments are, for example, running a mile; 3) instantaneous actions and results related to a certain time interval: (achievements-reaching the top); 4) continuous states, processes associated with an indefinite period of time (1974).

F.A. Ganiev was the first in Turkology who distinguishes verbs in compound (complexverbal) verb constructions in the Tatar language as a category of action flow or action style (1963). The author also makes extensive use of the concepts of limitation / infinity in his monograph. He considers these events as lexical-semantic phenomena in the example of the Tatar language. Analyzing the analytical forms, F. Ganiev states: The limitation / infinity of a compound verb depends on the auxiliary verb, if the auxiliary verb is limited, its content is limited, if the auxiliary verb is not limited, the compound verb is not limited (1963).

In recent times it has become widespread to compare the meanings of the prepositional and auxiliary verb conjunctions with the aspect. In this regard, we believe that A. A. Kholodovich's opinion that the division of verbs into limited / unbounded groups should be universal, interlingual (1979). It is acknowledged that the Turkic languages do not have a fully synthetic-grammatically formed verb aspect category, and its special lexical-semantic and grammatical meanings are promising to pay special attention to the expression of analytical verb forms.

In the Uzbek language, the mode of action of a verb is a linguistic phenomenon of aspectual significance. It is self-evident after the above considerations that the action forms of the verb cannot belong to the pure aspect. However, from a functional-semantic point of view, the mode of action, which has an analytic form, is included in the scope of the aspect, and the action (Aktionsart) differs from the purely specific aspect. V. G. Guzev, in his monograph "Verb", considers it expedient to divide aspectual meanings first into *vid* (private aspect) and then into action meanings. Aspect is an expression of the speaker's subjective verbal attitude to action, has a high level (Aktionsart) clear semantics, that is, reflects the beginning, continuation, end

stages, which are objectively specific to the process of action (1990).

Thus, two aspects of broad aspectual meanings should be distinguished: 1) how the aspect appears in the speaker's imagination and serves to express in different ways, and 2) which reflects the qualitative or quantitative specific features that are objectively specific to the process of action serves to express grammatical meanings. According to V. Guzev, the aspect and action-specific meanings are combined into the meaning of the general aspect. He concludes in his research that in the study of the category of perspective in the forms of compound verbs in the Turkic languages, the study of the meanings of subjectivity / objectivity and action in the sense of action (action) is promising (1988). D.M. Nasilov introduces the analytic form formed in the presence of the auxiliary verb *oʻyɹ* into the type of expression of the mode of action (Aktionsart), because this form does not give a description of the transition to a new action and state, and therefore does not have a specific semantics of aspect. At the same time, his monograph "Problems of Aspectology of Turkic Languages" contains a lot of linguistic evidence that proves that aspect and action are internal special phenomena that fall into the category of a single grammatical aspect (1989). G. Mirsanov, who studies behavioral verbs in the Uzbek language, also understands the concept of limitation / infinity as a lexical-semantic, and the mode of action as a lexical-grammatical phenomenon (2009). In his view, limitation / non-limitation in compound verbs depends on the auxiliary verb, and if the auxiliary verb is limited, that auxiliary verb conjugation represents the completed aspectual meaning. If it has an unlimited character, means continuity or iterativeness, depending on the lexical meaning of the leading verb.

A. Shluinsky emphasizes that in Turkic languages the auxiliary verb *-typ* serves as the main aspectual derivative (2005). The author relies on the analysis of the multiplicity of predicates in the Karachevo-Bulgarian and Tatar languages. When it comes to iterativeness, it usually refers to the multiplicity represented by a predicate (2005). However, if we look at the verb predicates of Turkic languages, including Uzbek, it is clear that auxiliary verbs also have the ability to express iterative meaning, some of which play an important role in the expression of iterative meaning. In particular, G. Mirsanov concludes that limited behavioral verbs, when combined with auxiliary verbs *-typ*, *-top*, represent an iterative aspectual situation (2009). However,

there are also opinions that the auxiliary verb – *typ* has a habitual meaning in Turkic languages (2005). Apparently, in Turkic languages, a great deal of attention is paid to the analytical compounds formed by the use of prepositional and auxiliary verbs in the form of rhymes. In turn, aspectual meaning analysis is performed by dividing verbs into limited / unlimited groups. In the Uzbek language, it is important to determine the properties of verbs limited and unlimited within the analytical form, as well as the contextual expression of their completion or non-completion and aspectual features of tense forms (1989). In Turkic languages, it seems that the limiting feature of the verb can also play an important role in determining iterative semantics.

CONCLUSION

Very little work has been done in Turkic studies on the meanings of limited / unlimited verbs. For example, F.A. Ganiev, referring to the aspect properties of Tatar verbs, considers the concept of limitation / unrestrictedness of the verb as a lexical-semantic phenomenon, adding the aspect meanings of complex verbs to the category of the mode of action verbs. The properties of the verb are related to the formation of various aspectual situations that arise in the process of action. In particular, in the formation of iterative meanings, the influence of the limiting, unrestricted properties of the verbs is great. In particular, Yu. S. Maslov connects iterative verbs as a quantitative aspectual meaning, with the limiting property of the verb (1984). Quantitative aspectual situations include, in addition to the iterative meanings of verb lexemes, various repetitive actions that are generated within the context. In the Uzbek language, there are different ways of expressing aspectuality within the functional semantic field: verb aspectuality and verbless aspectuality. Verb aspectuality refers to repetitive aspectual signs given by the semantic content of analytic forms, along with cases of the multiple aspect represented by individual verb lexemes or words. Quantitative aspectual cases without verbs are determined using the morphological and syntactic means of the verb.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Samarkand State Institute of foreign languages, in Uzbekistan for supporting and granting me while I was off to conduct this research reported here. I also would like to thank people who work in our library here and met me all the time with open hearts and minds

REFERENCES

1. Balin B.M. Nemetskiy aspektologicheskiy kontekst v sopostavlenii s angliyskim: spetskurs dlya stud. i aspirantov fak. inostr. write. Kalinin: KGPI im. M.I. Kalinina, 1969. –S 131 .
2. Binchy M. Firefly Summer, Cornerstone Digital, 2010. – 924 p.
3. Bogdanov V.V. Predlozhenie i tekst v sodержatelnom aspekte. SPb .: Philol. fak. SPbGU, 2007. –S 128
4. Bybee J., Dahl Ö. The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. // Studies in language, vol. 13, 1, 1989. P. 51-103.
5. FranconiE., Giorgi A., Pianesi F. A Mereological Characterization of Temporal and Aspectual Phenomena. // Martin-Vide, C. (ed.). Current Issues in Mathematical Linguistics. Elsevier: North-Holland Linguistic Series, 1994. P. 269-278.
6. Gaken O.D. Systema sredstv reproduksii iterativnosti glagolnogo deystviya v sovremennom nemetskom yazyke: avtoref. dis. ... cand. filol. nauk. Kalinin, 1979. P. 16.
7. Ganiev F. A. Aspect characteristic of verbs of the Tatar language. Kazan, 1963 P. 116-117.
8. Ganiev F. A. Vidovayaxarakteristikaglagolovtatarskogoy azyka // Problemaglagolnogovidavtatarskomyazyke. –Kazan, 1963. S. 377-382.
9. Garifulin L.B. Structure of categories of aspects // Questions of Romano-Germanic writing. Vyp. 3. Chelyabinsk: Izd-vo Chelyab. gos. ped. in-ta, 1969. p. 143–147. References 137 p.
10. Grekova O.K. Dvuchlenna li oppozitsiya aspektualnyx znacheniy odnokratnosti / povtoryaemosti v predlozhenii? // Tr. aspektologicheskogo seminar filol. fak. MGU im. M.V. Lomonosova. T. 1. 2-e izd. M.: Izd-vo MGU, 2001. S. 50–62.
11. Guzev V. G. Essays on the theory of Turkish lexicography. Glagol. L., 1990. 132 p.

12. Guzev V. G. In the aspect category. *Sov. Turkology*. 1988. № 1. S 9.
13. Kratzer A. On the Plurality of Verbs. // Dölling J., Heyde-Zybatow T. (eds.). *Event Structures in Linguistic Form and Interpretation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2005, P.140-156.
14. Levin B. Aspect, lexical semantic representation, and argument expression. *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 2000. – P.413–429.
15. Maslov Yu. S. *Essays on aspectology*. L., 1984.S. 180.
16. Mirsanov G. Q. Expression of aspectual and temporal content in discourse. // *Monograph*. –Tashkent: “Navruz”, 2018. – 156 p.
17. Mirsanov G'.Q. Action and aspectual features of behavioral verbs in English and Uzbek. *Filol.fan.n diss. avtoref. –T.:*, 2009. – P. 21.
18. Mirsanov G'.Q. Action and aspectual features of behavioral verbs in English and Uzbek. *Filol.fan.n diss. avtoref. –T.:*, 2009. – P. 21
19. Nasilov D.M. *Problems of Turkish aspectology: Action*. - L.: Nauka, 1989. –S. 173 p.
20. Nefedov V.D. *Vliyanie obsoyatelstv vneshney i vnutrenney karakteristiki deystviya na aspektologicheskuyu tendentsiyu predelnyx i nepredelnyx glagolov v sovremennom nemetskom yazyke: avtoref. dis. ... cand. filol. nauk*. Kalinin, 1968. P. 30.
21. Nemogay Yu.V. *Bazovaya osnova lexicheskogo minimuma russkogo yazyka // Uchen.zap. Tavr.nats. un-ta im. V.I. Vernadskogo. Ser.: Philology. Sotsialnye kommunikatsii*. 2011. T. 24 (63), № 2, ch. 2. S. 53–56.
22. O' Henry. *Selected stories*. –Great Britain. Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1995. – 750 p.
23. Paducheva E.V. *Lexical aspect and classification of predicates by Maslov - Vendleru // Questions of writing*. 2009. № 6. S. 3–20.
24. Philip H. *The quantization puzzle // Events as Grammatical Objects*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 2000, P.3–60.
25. Said Ahmad. *Ufq*. Toshkent: “O'zbekistan”, 2014. – 340 b.
26. Shluinskiy A.B. *Typology predikatnoy mnojestvennosti: kolichestvennye aspektualnye znacheniya: dis. ... Kand. filol. nauk*. M., 2005. –S. 201.
27. Shustova S.V. *Potential causative verbs in dynamic-functional aspect: dis. ... D-ra filol. nauk*. – Perm, 2011, S. 141-143 .
28. Smith C. *The Parameter of Aspect*. – Dordrecht: Kluwer. 1991, P. 156-159.
29. Tatevosov S. *The Parameter of Actionality. // Linguistic Typology*, vol. 6, 3. 2002;
30. Tatevosov S.G. *Action: typology and theory // Вопросыязыкознания*. 2005. № 1. S. 108–141.
31. Vendler L. *Verbs and times // Der englischeAspekt/Ed. By A.Schopf. - Darmstadt, 1974. - P. 217-234*
32. Vendler Z. *Verbs and Times. // The Philosophical Review* 66, 1957, P. 57-64.
33. Vostrikova, N. V. *Typology sredstv vyrajeniya eksperientsialnogo znacheniya. Diploma work*. M.: MGU, 2005. –S. 59-72.
34. Xolodovich A. A. *Problems of grammatical theory*. L., 1979. 138 p.
35. Xrakovskiy V.S. *Vzaimodeystvie grammaticheskix kategoriy: vid, vremya, naklonenie // Ot znacheniya k forme, ot formy k znacheniyu: sb. statey k 80-letiyu chlena-korrespondenta RAN A.V. Bondarko*. M.: Yazykislavyan culture, 2012. S. 539–561.
36. Zaliznyak Anna A., Shmelev, A. D. *Introduction to Russian aspectology.–M., 2000. –S. 87-89.*