

УДК 81'1

DOI: 10.26140/bgз3-2020-0901-0049

СООТНОШЕНИЕ МЕЖДУ КАТЕГОРИЕЙ ВИДА И КАТЕГОРИЕЙ ВРЕМЕНИ

© 2020

Гусейнова Рена Гусейнага кызы, кандидат филологических наук, доцент

Азербайджанский медицинский университет

(AZ1022, Azerbaijan, Baku, ul. A.Gasimzade 14, e-mail: mila_andreeva_80@mail.ru)

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается соотношение категории вида к категории времени. Несмотря на многочисленные исследования на данную тему этот вопрос является весьма *актуальной темой* для современной лингвистики, поскольку в фоне когнитивистики выявляются все новые особенности данных категорий. В статье изучаются особенности категории вида и времени, анализируются перфективность и имперфективность, взаимосвязь глагольных видов со временем, что и является основной *целью исследования*. Здесь в широком плане рассматривается вопрос аспектологии, связанные с категориями вида и времени, базируясь на *сравнительно-описательном методе*. Научной новизной статья является то, что в данной работе соотношение категории вида и категории времени рассматриваются в широком спектре современных исследований. В ходе исследования глагольный вид трактуется как языковая категория, присущая славянским языкам. Обобщая изложенные материалы и делая *выводы*, автор указывает, что глагольные виды в основном относятся к синтаксису. Классифицируя глаголы с семантической точки зрения, где способы действия являются лексически детерминированными. Данное свойства характеризуются в некоторых языках глагольными префиксами. Вопросы, исследуемые в данной статье имеют *практическую значимость* для грамматики и исследований в данной направлении.

Ключевые слова: когнитивистика, перфективность, имперфективность, категория вида, аспектология, глагол.

THE CORRELATION BETWEEN ASPECT AND TENSE CATEGORY

© 2020

Huseynova Rana Huseynaga, Ph.D in Philology, Associate Professor

Azerbaijan Medicine University

(AZ1022, Azerbaijan, Baku, A.Gasimzade str. 14, e-mail: mila_andreeva_80@mail.ru)

Abstract. The article discusses the ratio of the category of the aspect to the category of tense. Despite numerous studies on this topic, this issue is a very relevant topic for modern linguistics, since in the background of cognitive science, more and more new features of these categories are revealed. The article studies the features of the category of species and time, analyzes the effectiveness and imperfection, the relationship of lagoon species with time, which is the main goal of the study. Here, broadly, the issue is examined by aspectologists associated with the categories of species and time based on a comparatively descriptive method. The scientific novelty of the article is that in this work the correlation of the category of the species and the category of time is considered in a wide range of modern studies. During the study, the verb form is interpreted as a linguistic category inherent in the Slavic languages. Summarizing the materials presented and drawing conclusions, the author indicates that verb forms are mainly related to syntax. When classifying verbs from a semantic point of view, the modes of action are lexically determined. This property is characterized in some languages by verb prefixes. The questions studied in this article are of practical importance for grammar and researches in this direction.

Keywords: cognitive science, perfectiveness, imperfectiveness, category of species, aspectology, verb.

Introduction

In linguistic literature, the theory of aspects and the questions concerning this topic still remain one of the most difficult and unexplored sections of Slavic grammars [1, 477]. Although the morphological scheme of this category in each of the Slavic languages is considered already well-studied, Slavists are still arguing regarding its content. For example, B. N. Kovalenko claims in one of his studies that this issue is one of the most difficult topics in the process of teaching the Russian language and indicates a number of reasons for this statement [2, 158].

The main controversial aspects of the theory of Slavic aspects are such problems as the relation of the category of the aspect to the category of tense; the possibility of the coexistence of mutually exclusive values of the beginning and end of the action within the framework of one (perfect) type; the nature of the category of the aspects (lexical, grammatical or conceptual); the role of verb prefixation in the processes of intra-verb formation and word formation. On all of these issues in grammar studies, there are still different points of view and opinions of researchers.

Some scientists (A. Dostal, A. Mason, and others) considered that the categories of aspect and tense were not connected between themselves. Despite the fact that in the Russian language there are five aspect-tense forms, but aspect forms are realized only in the future and past tense. On the contrary others (T. A. van Wijk, A. Mirovich) considered that the nature of the aspect is reduced precisely to the function of expressing temporary relationships, and determine the main characteristics of the category of the aspect, based on some consequences inherent in this category. Thus, many aspects of this theory remain debatable.

In his studies F. Mikloschich considers that in content verbs of different types can not be the same, they are mainly different verbs [3]; studying this issue, K. S. Aksakov concluded that different aspect variants of the same base are forms of the same verb [4, 33]; V. V. Vinogradov considers correlative, i.e. forms of the same word, are non-prefixal verbs and verbs formed from them using the so-called empty prefixes (писать/написать, делать/сделать, желтеть/пожелтеть) [1, 498]; Yu. S. Maslov refers perfective verbs to the forms of the same word. He also includes the imperfected verbs of these verbs. For example: записать / записывать [5].

As it is already mentioned, G. Paul compared the perfective and imperfect ways of acting in the German language and Slavic aspects, and considered actions only in the temporary category. He considered the verb prefixation to be the main means of the formation of imperfective forms from perfective verbs, although he did not deny that it could be a word-formation function (G. Paul didn't exclude word-formation from grammar) [6, 67].

It is of greatest interest to us that G. Paul tried to conclude the contradictory meanings of the beginning and end of the action (state) to the perfective way of action. In this regard, the definition of G. Paul is very interesting in this coverage: "How imperfect means a verb if it refers to a process in its flowing, how effective it means if it refers to the beginning or end of a process, cf. : ждать – ожидать, мерзнуть – замерзать...(wait - wait, freeze – freeze) ... (1). A verb is imperfect if it denotes a process in its duration, in its flowing, perfect - if it refers to some moment or to the end of the process, or to the onset of some state ... (2). There are two classes of verbs: imperfective and perfective (so named by definition from Slavic grammar). Imperfective

verbs denote the duration of a state or the flowing of a process, perfect verbs indicate the beginning or end of a state or process (3)” [6].

Action verbs and state verbs are distinguished from the point of view of the traditional grammar, the first of these definitions is not accurate enough, since it leaves open the question of what to do with those verbs whose lexical content does not correspond with the traditional idea of an action or process. In the second and third definitions, the action, event and state are already mentioned as the most general verbal characteristics.

In his grammars G. Paul especially did not specify the content of these verb characteristics. But it is not difficult to give a semantic installation of content in terms of G. Paul. He considered the category of action and state (although they are the lexical properties of the verb), as the syntactic category. G. Paul argued that some verbs denoting a single action are converted to verbs with a long state without a special additional definition as a result of a change in the subject [6, 31].

Thus, according to G. Paul so called the lexical-semantic content of a verb in ordinary grammar is considered syntactic conditions, depending on which the same verb has the ability to express both action and state. This logic is explained by the fact that the authors of many grammars, commenting on the traditional division of verbs into action verbs and state verbs, emphasize that processes can also be perceived as states. At the same time, the peculiarity of the verb is represented as an action occurring in time

Perfectivity and imperfectivity verbs

Since it was not possible to expand the categories of action and state for the simple reason that many linguists empirically had to go to extremes and declare that verbs do not express states at all, but indicate only actions [7]. Due to the fact that the content of the action is isolated and unassigned within itself, the concept of action as an abstraction simply lacks external links. Although such an abstraction reflects the actual state of things, it is quite correct, but this reflection is one-sided. If we consider this approach to be correct, then we will have to recognize the definitions of the category “mode of action” by G. Paul as completely legitimate. Such a refinement by G. Paul, serves as evidence that he was aware of the one-sidedness of such an abstraction.

In the following two definitions, the researcher uses such category of action and the category of state. But well-known Slavists who studied the meanings of the category of aspect in Slavic languages, as a rule, do not use these indicated categories: “In the Slavic perfect form, this phenomenon is considered on the relation to a limited time (long or short) in its development, while in imperfect form the same phenomenon itself is considered without relation to any definition of time in its development” [8, 17]. In other words, micro- and macro-situations should be taken into account in this case.

Verbs of a perfect form denote the qualitative state of an object through action. But in the studies of F. Mikloshich, the most vulnerable place in the concept of Slavic aspect is that it lacks perfect-form verbs with initial meaning. For example, his concept does not touch upon such verbs as: «заговорить» — “speak”, «запеть» — “sing”, «побежать» — “run” and etc.

Defining imperfect and perfective verbs in his own way G. Paul tries to state this situation. Within this framework, he argues that perfective verbs relate to some moment: either to the moment the action is completed, or to the moment the onset of any state. He believes that the end of one action is the beginning of the next one.

The relationship of verb aspects with tense

In modern Russian and Slavic aspectology, quite often the question arose about the expression of action in statics or dynamics, as a special feature of aspect. These denotations are perceived in a peculiar way. Many believe that dynamism is characteristic of a perfect aspect, and static is imperfect. But we must take into consideration that some verbs of

imperfect form express action in development. If we consider that development is inevitably connected with dynamics, then a certain contradiction arises in the interpretation of the correspondence of action /state and perfect/ imperfect form. In this case, it will be more correct to rely on the concept of a semantic invariant of the form. The semantic invariant of the form is associated with the denotation of the verbs of the perfect form of actions that are fixed by the consciousness of the speaker relative to objective time, i.e. in connection with the situational background; the imperfective verbs denote an action without fixing it on the vector of objective time, i.e. abstracted from a situational background. “A person perceives an objective time in different ways: firstly, “moving” with him from the past to the future; secondly, letting it pass by itself, i.e. moving back, as it were, from the future to the past. The first aspect is associated with an imperfect aspect, the second with a perfect one” [9, 30].

The actions of a state expressed by verbs begin and end only in time. Such state actions can be divided into time-limited either from the side of their beginning, or from the side of their end. V. V. Vinogradov defines perfect and imperfect aspects in the Russian language as follows: “... The main function of the perfect form is to limit or eliminate the idea of the duration of the action, focusing on one of the moments of the process as its limit. The denotation of an action in its flowing, not constrained by the thought of the limit of the process as a whole, is the basic general meaning of an imperfect aspect” [1, 98].

E. Koshmider adheres more to the idea of foreign grammarians about time as a line, and the notion of “aspect” depends entirely on the condition whether the subject thinks of itself moving on the time line from the past to the future (in this case, the action will be directed from the past to the future and the aspect will be imperfect), or he will realize the time passing by himself (in this case, the action will be directed from the future to the past and the aspect will be perfect).

E. Koshmider considers that the Slavic terms “perfect aspect” and “imperfect aspect” are relative; they should not be understood literally [10]. Considering the fact that it is very difficult for a German speaker to perceive the difference between perfect and imperfect forms in the Slavic languages, it’s even more difficult to understand the motives that guide those who speak these languages when choosing this or that aspect.

Exploring the aspect category in Slavic languages, especially verbs in the Polish language, E. Kosmider does not deny the aspect differences between verbs in the Polish language. In his studies, as a contradiction to this thesis, he notes that these verbs are not aspect forms of the same word. He argues that the aspect differences between the verbs are manifested in the direction of the perfection meaning when adding the non-prefix verb with the prefix. Therefore, it turns out that these same differences exist between non-prefixed and prefixed Slavic verbs with the beginning semantics. Despite the fact that E. Kosmider managed to prove that the aspect category in Slavic languages does not reduced to the relationship between the completeness and incompleteness of a verb action in the sense of achieving or not achieving its result, he was able to convincingly explain what the content of the aspect category in Slavic languages.

But at the same time, the conclusions of E. Koshmider, which were based on the material of the Polish language, were soon corrected by W. Streitberg (on the meanings of completeness and incompleteness of the verb action) and acted as evidence of the informal feature of the “Germanic aspect”.

It is known that S. Agrell and E. Koshmider studied the category of the verb form on the basis of Slavic material and for Slavic languages [10; 11]. But before summarizing his conclusions from these studies, according to H. Rennike, E. Koshmider hurried a bit with his conclusions, which were made prematurely: “Koshmider adheres statements from the point of view of the Slavist, but in linguistics a theoretical idea

of the aspect, which is based on into related categories like “aspect” and “tense”. Koshmider classifies and generalizes linguistic relations in Slavic languages instead of using the aspect theory, satisfying, if possible, for all languages” [12, 102].

Although E. Koshmider pointed out the fundamental differences in the type and methods of action and considered them to be completely different phenomena, nevertheless, he did not notice significant differences between the methods of action themselves. Since, among the numerous options for action, there are those that have no relation to the aspect difference of Slavic verbs, and can very well be considered as quantitative or qualitative shades of the verb action, communicated to the verbs by the lexical meanings of full prefixes, i.e. as a function of meaning, accompanying the invariable “perfective” function of these prefixes.

To denominate separate intra-aspect, inter-aspect semantic shades, Slavists, after introducing the term “methods of action”, make mistakes, abandoning the term “sub-aspect” and the notion behind it, which A. A. Shakhmatov suggested classes of verbs that were opposed to each other within the same aspect [13], since some of these sub-aspects really lie in the same tier as the aspects. In order to try to find directions for the use of these notions in verbal systems of languages that are not Slavic, it is necessary to clearly distinguish between the notions of “aspect”, “sub-aspect” and “modes of action”.

Given all of the above, we can safely say that the verb aspect is a language category that is characteristic of Slavic languages. The notion of “verb aspect” can be decomposed into elements whose equivalents can be easily found in non-Slavic languages. The aspect category still continuing to be defined in Slavic grammars, is the general theoretical concept that H. Renike tried to construct. This definition equally includes verbs of a perfect and imperfect form in Slavic grammars, perfect and imperfective verbs by V. Streitberg, perfect and imperfect tenses by A. Diskol, perfect and imperfect tenses by T. Varron, perfect and long tenses in German grammars. Moreover, the general theoretical category of the aspect is easily found even in non-Indo-European languages, such as Bashkir or Chinese.

Conclusion

Analyzing all the above facts and theories, we come to the following conclusions:

The verb aspect is inherent only in Slavic languages, but the equivalents of its elements are easily found in other languages.

Certain types of actions hide certain aspect of temporal characteristics of verbs, and if some linguists disagree with this, then the concept “mode of action”, which combines the temporal characteristics of action with the timeless, has become commonplace.

If we compare aspects with methods of action, then by their nature they relate mainly to the sphere of syntax, and methods of action are more determined lexically, as this concept classifies verbs from a semantic point of view.

REFERENCES:

1. Виноградов В. В. Русский язык (Грамматическое учение о слове), «Высшая школа», Москва, 1986, 639 с.
2. Коваленко Б. Н. «О спорных вопросах теории вида русского глагола» // Международный научный журнал «Инновационная наука», № 6/2015, с. 158-162.
3. Miklosich F. Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen. Bd. 4: Syntax. Wien, 1883.
4. Аксаков, К. С. О русских глаголах Текст. / К. С. Аксаков. М.: Типография Л. Степановой, 1855, 47 с.
5. Маслов, Ю. С. Очерки по аспектологии Текст. / Ю. С. Маслов. -Л.: Из-во ЛГУ, 1984. 263 с.
6. Paul H. Deutsche Grammatik. Bd. IV: Syntax (Zweite Hälfte). 2. Aufl. Halle (Saale), 1955.
7. Шерба Л. В. Избранные работы по русскому языку. Москва: Аспект Пресс, 2007, 256 с.
8. Фортунатов Ф. Ф. Отчет о деятельности Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук за 1910 г. СПб. 1910, 304 с.
9. Карпухин С. А. Русский глагольный вид в языковом сознании // Языковая система текст - дискурс: категории и аспекты исследования: материалы Всероссийской научной конференции. - Самара: Изд-во «Самарский университет», 2003, с. 27-39.

10. Koschmieder E. Beitrage zur allgemeinen Syntax. Heidelberg, Winter, 1965, - 224 p.

11. Agrell S. Aspektanderung und Aktionsartbildung beim polnischen zeitwort. Lund, 1908.

12. Renicke H. Die Theorie der Aspekte und Aktionsarten. In: Bei-trage zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur. Halle (Saale), 1950, H.1/2, Bd.72, s.151-170.

13. Шахматов А. А. Синтаксис русского языка Текст. М.: URSS, 2007, 624 с.

Статья поступила в редакцию 22.10.2019

Статья принята к публикации 27.02.2020