



Aspectual Meaning of Verbs in Different System Languages

Dilbar Nurmukhamedova

Department of Russian Language and Literature, Gulistan State University, Gulistan, Uzbekistan

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v10i4.4833>

Abstract

The similarities and differences in the transfer of the meaning of aspectuality in translation in languages of different systems (on the material of Russian, English) were not the object of special scientific research, meanwhile, the linguistic description of the translation process is considered as a kind of language communication. In the formulation and solution of problems in this direction, the relevance of studying aspectuality in languages of different systems is seen. This article analyzes these questions.

Keywords: *Aspectual; Different Systems; Russian; English*

Introduction

For modern science, of particular interest is how a person perceives individual fragments of reality reflected by consciousness and represents them in language. With the universality of general cognitive laws, each language has specific means of representing linguistic content. The aspectual features of an action are not an exception, for which languages use not only different intra-categorical means of expression, but also different categories to interpret the nature of the course of the action, its temporal and limiting framework. To confirm what has been said, let us turn to the analysis of aspectual relations in Russian and English.

Being one of the most important language categories reflecting the idea of "internal" time, aspectuality covers a number of particular meanings that appear in the relationship of intersection with the content of the categories of duration, phase, perfection, multiplicity, etc. The concept of the aspectual field of the Russian verb developed within the framework of the theory of functional grammar interprets this category as having a clearly defined core and having diverse linguistic means for expressing its content. According to researchers, in Russian and other Slavic languages, the nuclear means of expressing aspectual relations is the category of aspect, which "is the most specialized and regular grammatical means" [1], while other means of expressing aspectuality are not grammatical in nature.

Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion

The study of languages of different systems at the present stage of development of domestic linguistics is one of the promising areas. This is due, firstly, to the need to study both native and non-

native languages, and secondly, the emergence of new improved methods and directions for the study of languages of different systems; thirdly, the interest of the humanities in the general and particular theory of linguistics and a number of other issues studied from the standpoint of cognitive science, which have different status in languages with different structures.

The similarities and differences in the transfer of the meaning of aspectuality in translation in languages of different systems (on the material of Russian, English) were not the object of special scientific research, meanwhile, the linguistic description of the translation process is considered as a kind of language communication. In the formulation and solution of problems in this direction, the relevance of studying aspectuality in languages of different systems is seen.

The typology of languages knows systems without a grammatical form, but with a grammatical category of time (for example, the ancient Semitic languages) [2,3,4]. It should be noted that the study of aspectuality in the Russian language is the fundamental basis for describing in our study the means of transferring aspectuality in translation, since the standard language helps to compare the structures of different languages.

Under aspectuality, according to the definition of A.V. Bondarko, one should understand “the internal characteristic of the flow and distribution of action in time” [2]. A. V. Bondarko considers temporality as “external time”, and aspectuality as “internal time” of action, the grammatical core of aspectuality is the category of aspect. Thus, the connection between the category of form and time lies in the fact that both categories express the relation of an action to its course in time. The category of time expresses the relation of the action to the moment of speech, and the category of aspect denotes the way it proceeds in time. If in a language a species has the status of a grammatical category, then the opposition of aspectual meanings acts as a species, otherwise it is considered as a semantic (conceptual) category.

The aspect category is usually defined as a lexico-grammatical category that conveys the characteristics of the course of an action or process indicated by a verb - repetition, duration, repetition, instantaneous action, or effectiveness, completeness - incompleteness, or, finally, limit, that is, the relation of an action to its internal limit [2]. There are disagreements about the relationship between the categories of species and time. Many hypotheses boil down to the fact that the systems of temporality and aspectuality initially developed independently, and in the course of the development of the language, their interaction took place.

The problem of a typological approach to the study of languages attracted the close attention of a number of well-known scientists in 1980-2000. XX century. [5,6,7], found some coverage in studies conducted on the material of various languages, and expanded the methods and principles of analysis.

The structuring of the action expressed by the verb, i.e. the relation of the action to its beginning, completion, moment of speech, another action, result or goal, in each individual language has its own specifics of expression. Basically, in the system of different languages, the categories of time and aspect are used to display this complex of differences. Appearance and tense are intertwined in different ways in different languages, receiving either a grammatical, or a lexical, or a lexico-grammatical expression - sometimes together with each other, sometimes separately.

However, despite the significant achievements of modern aspectology, the aspect category still does not have a generally accepted definition, and such key issues as the semantic-functional and formal characteristics of the aspect category continue to be controversial. This circumstance leads to a different interpretation of the relationship between the categories of species and time, which is expressed, in some cases, in their absolutization, in others, in the recognition of the subordinate nature of the category of species in relation to the category of time, as well as in the confusion of the categories under consideration. The contradictory interpretation of verb forms from the positions of interest to us is also

expressed in the unsystematic description and confusion of different-level means of conveying the nature of the course of the action.

The unit of typological analysis, which J. Buranov [8] called a typological category, is the grammatical meaning that is a grammatical category in at least one of the compared languages. In the Russian language there is a word-formation category of the 5th type, which in its meaning is associated with the methods and nature of the action, namely: perfect and imperfective. The prefix perfective verb indicates the achievement of the limit; prefix-suffix imperfective verb due to the duration contained in the semantics of the suffix *-ива-* (*-ыва-*), conveys the process of action tending to its limit, but not reaching it (for example, «переплыл» - «переплывал»).

D. Payart creates a calculus of specific meanings, based on the concept of the so-called marking of the relationship of an utterance to a situation of communication. The subject of the communication situation, speaking at the moment of speech, creates an utterance E, and the utterance is correlated with the moment T, or stretched between T1 and T2. The author emphasizes that the analysis of aspect and voice requires consideration at the level of the situation of communication.

K. Fuchs introduces another point - the speaker's point of view on the action, which does not coincide with the moment of speech.

D. Payart points to the valence of aspectual forms with the circumstances of time and direct object: perfective forms are not combined with adverbs of an indefinite period of time («Он долго одевался» - «Он оделся за две минуты», but circumstances cannot be interchanged without changing the meaning of the form). The perfective of a transitive verb requires an object that, at the same time, has the sense of definiteness («Он пил чай» - «Он выпил чай») [9].

J. Forsythe considers opposition by appearance to be privative, declaring the imperfect aspect to be unmarked (“non-aspective”). That is why the imperfect form receives a number of contextual options, which are revealed when opposing not verbs in paradigmatics, but aspectual uses of their contexts [9].

The work of T. Peterson suggests oppositions + activity (он курит = «он сейчас курит», or «он курильщик») and + time (correlation with the moment of speech) [9].

The works on the Semitic view propose a concept according to which an “aspect” expresses an attitude towards an utterance, placing a point of view on an action either “inside” the action or outside it [9]. Aspect, therefore, is a “subjective” category, showing the intersection and non-intersection of the “sphere of utterance” and the “sphere of the speaker”.

Ait Hamu Khalid's aspect system is something else. He introduces the concept of “genericity”, which means “general truth” in English, and in relation to this concept builds the opposition “continuous” - “discontinuous” [9].

The specific differences established on the Slavic material were transferred to the Indo-European by B. Delbruck and K. Brugman, who introduced the term “mode of action”, *Art der Handlung Aktionsart*, differences in the category of point, continued (italic), iterative, terminative action. It was these differences that were then applied to the grammatical material in the Gothic language [9]. The definition of “species” in Greek and Slavic languages coincided with many comparativists [9], in modern Greek “aspect is the relation of the subject to the verbal action” [9]. If there is a connection between the verbal action and the subject - the present perfect, if there is no connection - the aorist, a simple statement of the action.

In O. Jespersen, meanings are hidden under the aspect:

- 1) aorist - imperfect;

- 2) conclusive verbs {catch, end, kill), non-conclusive verbs (see, hear, love, praise, blame);
- 3) permanent (permanent) -punctual (transitory);
- 4) the meaning of completeness in combination with the preposition look out, give up. In Danish: For example - skrevpa et brev.
- 5) change - stability: fall asleep - sleep, get to know - know;
- 6) repeated - a single action;
- 7) implication of result/non-result ergreifen (inchoatives in some languages) [10]

Therefore, if the grammatical category of aspect forms a certain system, including the opposition of two categorial forms, then Aktionsarten do not form grammatical oppositions, but represent lexical differences, or the accompanying meaning of the grammatical form. So, the continued form in English can have an "intense" meaning: I'd be cheating him [11].

Conclusion

In a number of works, the terms "modes of action" (Aktionsart) and "types" (Aspect) are used as synonyms, so, among the first, V. Shtreitberg attributed the difference: perfect and imperfect, and associated with the German prefix. Then, in a new series of papers, a distinction was made between these concepts. Actually views (Aspect) are a correlative pair, in contrast to the set of ways of action (Aktionsarten) [11].

Analysis of the set of concepts regarding various means of conveying the nature of the course of an action in the Russian language from A.A.Potebnya [9], F.F.Fortunatova [9], A.A.Shakhmatova [9] up to the present time speaks of a long history in the recognition of the category of species. Only in studies conducted over the past decades on this issue, aspect-temporal relations began to be considered as two independent categories with their own specifics, on the one hand, and as inextricably dialectically interconnected, on the other. In recent years, this problem has received a more convincing explanation.

Turning to the results of the analysis of the linguistic material of languages with different structures (Russian and English), we can conclude that the word-formation potential of the verb in these languages is not the same. This explains the variety of means of conveying the nature of the course of action in the languages taken for the study.

References

1. Bakhmudova A.Sh. Some peculiarities of expressing habitual meaning in Dargwa and English languages, *Izvestia of Volgograd Teachers Training Institute. Series: «Philological Sciences»*. Volgograd, 2011. №7 (61). Pp. 52-55.
2. Bondarko A.V. *Fundamentals of functional grammar*. St.Petersburg: Publishing House of St.Petersburg University, 2001. 260 p.
3. Gak V.G. *Comparative typology of French and Russian languages*. Series: From linguistic heritage of V.G.Gak. M.: Librokom, 2013. 288 p.
4. Zhigadlo V.N., Ivanova I.P., Iofik L.L. *Modern English language*. M.: Publishing house of literature in foreign languages, 1956. 348 p.
5. Ivanova I.P., Burlakova V.V., Pocheptsov G.G. *Theoretical Grammar of modern English*. M.: Higher School, 1981. 286 p.
6. Mallaeva Z.M. *Verb of the Avar language: structure, semantics, functions*. Makhachkala, 2007. 397 p.

7. Musaev M.-S.M. Dargwa Language. Makhachkala: Academy, 2002. 184 p.
8. Mutalov KO. Verb of the Dargwa Language. Makhachkala: Publishing-printing centre of DSU, 2002. 218 p.
9. Kashpur Valeriya Viktorovna, Fil Yulia Vadimovna, Shapoval Anna Alexandrovna Aspectual characteristics of the Russian and English verbs in the language and text (on the material of M. A. Bulgakov's story "Heart of a Dog" and its translations), ACTA Tomsk State University, 2013. No. 377.
10. Bulgakov M. The Heart of a Dog, translated by Avril Pyman. Moscow: Raduga Publishers, 1990. P. 195-303.
11. Bulgakov M. The Heart of a Dog, translated by Michael Glenny. L.: The Harvill Press, 1989. 128 p.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).