



Correlation of Verb Categories with Aspectuality and Temporality Categories in Russian Language

Zilola Mustafaeвна Ruzieva

Senior lecturer, Navoi State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v9i8.4014>

Abstract

The following article deals with the categorial features of the verb and the correlation of the category “Вид” (in Russian language) features with the functional-semantic categories of aspectuality and temporality. The mechanisms of functioning of the system of temporal forms of the verb in the Russian and Uzbek languages are investigated. The author’s position on this issue has been stated. The category “Вид” is being a classification, inflectional category, occupying an adjacent position between inflection and word formation represents the basis of aspectuality and interacts with the category of temporality.

Keywords: *Verb; Temporality; Aspectuality; Imperfect Form; Perfect Form; Ultimate; The Category “Буѡ” Temporal Forms; Species Opposition; Modes of Action; Action Limit; Binarity, Universality*

Introduction

The morphological categories of the Russian verbs represent a complex system that is the subject of endless disputes among researchers. The verb form is associated with other signs of the verb, but a closer connection is observed with the tense category, which manifests itself in the impossibility of forming some tenses within one of the types, in the specific use of certain species-tense forms.

Let us consider about tenses relations, and we will determine what categorial features are possessed separately.

The category “Вид” is the core of the aspectuality category, which is an integral part of the verb system of any language and is closely related to the semantics of the verb. Aspectuality is a special functional-semantic field, and the system of interaction of various linguistic means that express the nature of the process. It is inconceivable without distinguishing between the type and method of action.

According to Y.S. Maslov opinion, the category “Вид” expresses the qualitative characteristics of the action, and the methods of action reflect the quantitative characteristics. The verb form is the morphological aspect, and the modes of action are the lexical (partly derivational, partly lexical-semantic) aspects.

According to M.A. Shelyakin, the semantic (limit / non-limit) and grammatical (type) indicator of aspectuality are reduced to the indicator of limitedness / limitlessness, thereby forming a common semantic basis [1]. In terms of a semantic category that aspect – orientation / dared actions to achieve the limit, and from the point of view of the category “Вид” is represented as the integrity action in a specific point in time.

According to A.V. Bondarko, the dominant role is played by the semantics of the action limit, which is the basis of the grammatical category of the form [2]. It distinguishes the internal limit of action, due to the nature of the action, and the external limit, due to external factors in relation to the action [2].

Also, A.V. Bondarko and L.L. Bulanin have noted the verb form as a morphological category that expresses definitions in the nature of the course of the action that is reflected in the system of opposed grammatical forms of the perfect and imperfect types or in the opposition of different words, and indicated their distinction. Researchers believe that the mode of action is a semantic grouping of verbs, and they are distinguished on the basis of the common type of action flow [3]. There are similarities in these two categories in terms of content, but their difference in terms of expression is more important for us.

In addition, aspectuality includes verb form and modes of action, as well as non-verbal lexical and syntactic indicators of the nature of action [3: 30-31]. Non-verbal lexical elements can be represented by words and combinations of words that show the nature of the course and the action (for a long time, systematically, occasionally, etc.) These means help to characterize the action, they can not be used, they are revealed only in the context, therefore they are considered as secondary, and without a verb it is impossible to express action.

Thus, the content of aspectuality is the nature of the course of action, and word-formation and lexical means with the participation of some syntactic elements of the sentence are their expressions.

Research Methods

The general approach is functional and semantic, and descriptive, component, systemic and comparative methods were used.

Main Part

The verb form is a lexical-grammatical, partially grammatical category. A.V. Bondarko, pointing to a number of the following criteria, considers the species as a grammatical category: a) this feature applies to the entire verbal system, covers all verb forms; b) it is two-term, has abstract semantics; c) the content of each type is not a generalization of the meanings of any lexical groups, methods of action; d) the category “Вид” opposition can take place within one lexeme and within one lexical meaning. The distinction between limitation / non-limitation occurs within one lexeme: a verb can be limiting in one meaning and indefinite in another; e) most forms of the verb are relative in kind; f) this feature is based on the techniques of imperfection and perfection [2: 134].

It should be noted that the category “Вид” interacts with a complex of inflectional features: with signs of predicative, attributive, personality, impersonality, voice, time, mood, person, number, gender. Its distinguishing feature is the expression of even the smallest shades of verbal meanings.

The category “Вид” mechanism is complex and heterogeneous. It is important that there are rules for the formal expression of species differences, which are expressed by morphological rather than lexical means: suffixes, prefixes. Although they are carriers of lexical meaning, this aspect is not taken into

account in the formation of forms of the perfect form. The widespread species inconsistency does not change the grammatical essence of the category.

A category “Вид” (in Russian language) is a grammatical category of a mixed type: partly inflectional (*изучать – изучить, получать – получить*) (study – learn, receive – get – has a specific opposition), partly classification “*отрицать*” (to deny - an imperfect type, there is a defectiveness of the species paradigm – partly depends on the vocabulary). The expression of category “Вид” differences by the structure of the stems, the belonging of words and their grammatical forms to one form or another make it possible to consider the verb form as a morphological category.

The features of performing an action, denoted by a semantic (partially derivational) grouping of verbs, are called modes of action. From the point of view of A.A. Potebni, the view represents two different categories: the first is perfection and imperfection, the second is the degree of duration. The meanings of originality and finality go beyond the limits of perfection (I will speak (*заговорю*) and I speak (*заговариваю*) the beginning in them is the same, they can also be with an equal value of finality. In view of this, the beginning and the finality differ in the verbal units of both types [4: 23].

The type and mode of action differ in terms of expression. As Y. Maslov noted, the verbal form, covering all verbal units, forms clear paradigmatic oppositions of wide coverage, and the modes of action can be grammatical categories, in contrast to the types, they do not form paradigmatic oppositions, remain within the framework of lexical differences between verbs [5: 71].

Thus, the type and mode of action differ in terms of expression: the type based on the system of grammatical forms, on the system of grammatical means of expressing specific meanings, forms paradigmatic oppositions, however, the modes of action, in contrast to the types, do not form them, but retain only lexical differences between verbs.

These categories are similar in terms of semantic content, according to their close relations to each other; reflect some differences in the course of the verb action or the presentation of this flow by the speaker.

In the studies of A.Kh. Vostokova, G.P. Pavsky, N.P. Nekrasov, A.A. Potebni, G.K. Ulyanov, F.F. Fortunatova, A.A. Shakhmatova, V.V. Vinogradova, Y.S. Maslova, M.A. Shelyakina, A.V. Bondarko and other linguists analyzed in detail the varieties of the course of action, the connection and interaction of the type and modes of action.

A.V. Isachenko in his work “The grammatical structure of the Russian language in comparison with Slovak” describing the ways of verbal action, notes the “perfection” and “nature of the verbal action” [6]. A feature of perfection, in his opinion, is the absence of correlative verbs of a different kind and the expression of certain lexical meanings by prefixes and suffixes. The property of the nature of the action is the same meanings of the verbs that are not indicated by formal means.

Modes of action, possessing certain features, are divided into three types: the first type – characterized modes of action – have an external feature and form word-formation series (*знакомить – перезнакомить*) (to acquaint – to re-acquaint); the second type – uncharacterized modes of action – do not have an external sign (*спать – нельзя сказать переспать*) (sleep – you cannot say sleep); the third type (intermediate) – inconsistently characterized modes of action – partly have derivational features, partly on a semantic basis (blink and grab).

Modes of action can be represented by both types and only one of them; relative and non-correlative verbs can belong to the same mode of action.

Correlation and non-correlation by type is determined by the influence of the way the verb acts on the type. A correlative verb, if the meaning of the mode of action of the verb is combined with the meanings of both types, it can form a pair with the verb of the opposite kind; an irrelevant verb, if the meaning of the mode of action is compatible with the meaning of only one of the types has the form of only one kind.

Discontinuous multiplicity also contradicts the meaning of the perfect form – the indivisible integrity of the process (to ache). Especially effective methods of action are combined exclusively with a perfect look (*наплакаться*) (cry), as they express the real achievement of the result. Unsaturated verb words appear only in an imperfect form, since the action expressed by the verb is not directed to the limit is not closed in an indivisible integrity. A perfect form can be formed only by changing the lexical meaning of the verb unit, which will limit the course of the process with a temporary (*полежать*) (lie down) and an internal limit (*отлежать*) (tolie). Terminal verbs can have both forms (*изучать – изучить*) (study – have study), form a species pair (*писать – написать*) (write – have written), but this is not always possible. Within one and the same mode of action, some verbs have both forms, while others only have the perfect form.

Results and Discussions

So, taking into account the semantic features of individual verbal stems within the same mode of action, the stylistic and emotional coloring of verbs, it is possible to find out the reason for such phenomena.

The category “Вид” (in Russian language) has the following categorical features:

- 1) duality
- 2) versatility
- 3) temporal correlation.

Let's analyze the first sign – duality or binarity. The Russian verb form is two-term, this characteristic feature is manifested in two aspects: imperfect form (answers the question what to do?) – perfect form (answers the question what to do?). This means verb units have the ability to form species pairs (*изучить – изучать, читать – прочитать*) (study – have studied, read – have read). This ability is not possessed by single verbs that have only one – perfect or imperfect form, do not form a species pair (*хотеть, бежать, знать*) (to want, to run, to know).

The second sign is versatility. This feature is characteristic of the entire verb system, that is, all verbal units in any verb form have a form, and therefore it is considered a permanent feature. According to A.I. Tikhonov, the species system is organically intertwined with all other categories of the verb, forming within them a clear, consistent, regular system of species oppositions. The exception is two verbs, which, depending on the context, have a perfect or imperfect form *обещать, велеть, ранить, атаковать, исследовать*) (*promise, command, hurt, attack, explore*).

The third feature is temporal correlation of verb forms that has always been the object of study of the theory of the grammatical structure of the Russian language. It covers two verb categories – a category “Вид” (in Russian language) and tense.

They are independent, different, but interrelated and have interdependent grammatical components. They differ in systems of forms, meanings, means of expression and others.

A category “Вид” (in Russian language) characteristics are closely related to the tense characteristics of the verb, influencing the presence of the grammatical form of the tense in the text. Any

tense form can have specific content, but not all verbs can have a tense meaning, for example, perfective verbs do not have a present tense form. The interaction of two categories is explained in existing concepts: specific and chronological.

In some languages, the absence of a category “Вид” (in Russian language) component is filled with a temporary system. Representatives of the theory noted that the language had a complex structure of past tenses, which arose as a result of the underdevelopment of species relationships. However, this category gradually began to take shape, which led to the disintegration of the system, consisting of four temporary forms. In the 15th century, the species component began to form, which led to a single form of time and the establishment of the currently existing three times [7].

The adherents of the chronological concept (A.A. Potebnya, A.A. Shakhmatov) denied the similarity of simple temporal and species relations [4: 125]. They noted the functional dissimilarity of these categories and considered them to be different categories, developing independently of each other and not being among themselves in causal relationships.

Changing the idea of the relationship of action in relation to time led to the transformation of morphological temporal in the aspect of content and expression. All verb words were affected.

According to the Russian linguistics, there are three types of connection between verb tenses and the specific meaning of the verb are known: 1) the absolute independence of the temporal form from the specific meaning of the verb stem (past tense); 2) absolute dependence (analytical form of the future tense); 3) partial independence (a form of a simple present / future tense) [8].

Let's consider the concept of the verb tense and its features. Considerable attention is paid to the verb tense in grammar, as evidenced by a large number of studies. Problems of this category were considered in the works of V.V. Vinogradova, A.V. Isachenko, A.V. Bondarko, L.L. Bulanina, Y.S. Maslova and other scientists.

Verb tense is a system of grammatical forms that are used to indicate the relationship of an action to the moment of speech or to the time of another action. It serves to localize the event or condition referred to in the sentence. Localization is an indication, with the help of opposed to each other temporal forms, of simultaneity, precedence or adherence of an event to the moment of speech or some other point of reference. The moment of speech is a grammatical starting point, the component underlying the opposition of the members of the system of the tenses of the Russian verb.

Time is expressed in language and outside the grammatical forms of the verb. Such a concept as “temporality” (from Latin “tempus” – time) is used – a functional–semantic category based on morphological, syntactic, lexical means of linguistic expression of time, which covers the verb tense. In addition to the verb tense, the forms of the imperative and conditional moods are used to express temporality (for example, Open the door – temporality, limited by the plan of the future; If you will read a book. - attribution to the future), the infinitive in conjunction with other parts of the context, adverbs reflecting temporary adverbial relationships (long ago, before, now, in summer), the syntactic structure of the sentence (She is sick. Brother is a doctor. They are here. End of autumn – the meaning of the present) and others.

The structure of verb tenses consists of 4 subsystems: personal forms of the indicative verb, tenses of full participles, tenses of complex participle–passive forms, tenses of participles.

The indicative tenses system consists of three tenses: past and future tense, which are represented by forms of imperfect and perfect types (I tell, told, I will tell), and the present appears only in an imperfect form (I tell). Forms of a perfect kind cannot express the meaning of a particular present tense of a speech moment.

In the system of the Russian verb, the forms of the present and future tense are opposed to the forms of the past tense. In the morphological design, the past tense is reflected only by the suffix “-л-”, the forms of the present and future tense by personal endings. The past tense form does not have personal endings; grammatically, a person is expressed using personal pronouns. By gender, the verb also changes in the past tense. The listed properties of the past tense testify to its opposition to the forms of the present and future tense.

The meaning of limited or unlimited action in time refers not only to the species, but also to time. This is related to the differences between the meanings of the past imperfect forms and the past perfect forms (told – have told – between them there are not only species, but also temporary differences).

The traditional system of three tenses includes five temporal forms, namely: the past tense consists of two temporal forms: told – means precedence in relation to the grammatical moment of speech, the localization of the action in time is not expressed, but it is not excluded; told – means precedence in relation to the grammatical moment of speech, the localization of the action in time is clearly expressed.

The present tense is represented by one temporal form: I tell it – it expresses simultaneity, the localization of action in time is not expressed, but it is not excluded either. The future tense, as well as the past tense, is represented by two temporal forms: I will tell you that the simultaneity, succession and localization of action in time is not expressed, but it is not excluded either; I will tell you – the sign of the following action is expressed, the localization of the action in time is not expressed, but it is not excluded either. The possibility of expressing the sign of following makes the form similar – I will tell you with the future imperfect, and the possibility of expressing the sign of simultaneity of action brings it closer to the present imperfect.

Temporal forms are characterized not only by differences, but also by similarities. The forms of the word are very similar in their features: I told, I tell, I will tell – they are all imperfect forms. Each of them has one of three features: precedence in relation to the grammatical moment of speech, simultaneity, following; all of them do not express, however, do not exclude the sign of the localization of the action.

It should be noted that the tense of the verb is a morphological category of the inflectional type. Each verb word has temporary forms: past, present, future tense. There are no rows of verbs that represent only the past, only the present, or only the future. Only verbs that have forms of both types (to tell) have five tense forms. Verbs that exist in only one specific form have an incomplete temporal paradigm.

The theory of three times asserts that all three temporary forms are formed from the basis of the imperfect type, and only two from the basis of the perfect type. Insufficiency of the temporal paradigm does not depend on the peculiarities of the category of time and its correlation with vocabulary, but on the correlation with the species paradigm. Consequently, if some lexical units have five temporal forms, then others have three or two forms. If the verb unit exists only in one form, then it is already devoid of part of the tense forms. Based on this, it can be argued that the tense of a verb is an inflectional category, the paradigm of which depends on the species. Through the category “Вид” (in Russian language), the category of Time is indirectly related to vocabulary.

As mentioned earlier, the type of the verb word form determines the completeness or defectiveness of the temporal paradigm. In turn, the functioning of the category “Вид” (in Russian language) depends on the temporal position, which largely determines the patterns of the use of the species. The position of the present actual form allows only an imperfect form, and the abstract present, past and future tense of repeated actions allows the use of an imperfect form; in these positions the use of the perfect form is limited by certain conditions.

The sign of localization or non-localization of an action in time contains the properties of temporality and aspectuality. This feature belongs to the semantics of time: it reflects the attachment of an action to a certain period of time or the uncertainty of its position in time. Most of the meanings of particular temporary forms are determined by it. Consider the past imperfect and the future imperfect – signs: a single action, repetitive and ordinary action, a generalized fact. The sign of temporary localization is possessed by the past perfect in direct use, as well as the present actual, in contrast to the abstract present.

The sign of the localization of an action in time, having relation to the form, determines the nature of the course of the action: concrete or abstract (repetitive, possible). As you know, concreteness or abstractness is an important element of particular meanings. It follows that many particular meanings of temporal forms are associated with particular meanings. But not all particular meanings of temporal word forms are associated with the area of aspectuality: figurative meanings of time, the present stage time, the present tense of presentation, the differences between absolute and relative orientations refer only to the time domain.

The opposition of limited or unlimited process in time is reflected in the structures of the type and time. One of the main private meanings of an imperfect type is an unlimited, repetitive action, and the main private meaning of a perfect kind is a specific, actual value. The use of the category “Вид” (in Russian language) can also be influenced by the chronological moment. The present actual cannot allow the use of the perfect form, since the meaning of the action taking place at the moment of speech does not allow the integrity of the action. In this case, the use of this category is influenced by a purely temporal moment with the concreteness of action.

Conclusion

Having analyzed the development of the category “Вид” (in Russian language) temporal forms of the Russian verb, we can draw the following conclusion: the grammatical meanings inherent in the forms of tense are the meanings of simultaneity (the meaning of the present tense), precedence (past) and succession (future) in relation to the moment of speech. As a result of the interaction of categorical temporal meanings with the context, with the realizations of the meanings of this category of the verb, they are enriched, concretized and changed.

So, the specific and temporal categories are peculiar to the Russian verb. View and time are interconnected. The category “Вид” (in Russian language) influences the formation of temporary forms; in each temporal form there is a meaning of the species. In “Russian grammar” they are defined as “a system of opposed to each other two rows of verb forms” [8].

The presence of a category “Вид” (in Russian language) is associated with the lexical meaning of words. Verbs containing in the meaning the component of “action limit” represent the form of the perfect form (read, tell). Verbs denoting an unfinished, lasting action (read, tell) are imperfective verbs.

Thus, when analyzing the category of the species, it was revealed that in modern Russian it significantly affects the composition, meaning and form of other verb categories, and the species meaning in general, and interacts with the categories of aspectuality and temporality.

The category “Вид” (in Russian language) is a classification, inflectional category, occupying an adjacent position between inflection and word formation, represents the basis of aspectuality [9].

Aspectuality is associated with the category of temporality, since in both cases we are talking about the time of action: in the case of temporal values, about the “external” time of action, which is

determined in relation to the moment of speech or another point of reference in the case of aspectual values, about the “internal” time of action, representing the internal temporal structure of the situation.

References

1. Shelyakin M.A. The main problems of Russian aspectology // Questions of Russian aspectology: Sat. Art. T. 146. Izvestiya Voronezh GPI; Ed. M.A. Shelyakin. – Voronezh, 1975. –p. 288.
2. Bondarko A.V. Principles of functional grammar and aspects of aspectology. 2nd ed. Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2001. –p. 239.
3. Bondarko A.V., Bulanin L.L. Russian verb. 1997. –p.190.
4. Potebnya A.A. From notes on Russian grammar. M., 2010. –p. 250.
5. Maslov Y.S. Selected Works. Aspectology. General linguistics – M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2004. –p. 260.
6. Isachenko A.V. The grammatical structure of the Russian language in comparison with the Slovak language. Morphology: I–II 2nd ed. – M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2003 (State Unitary Enterprise Smolensk named after V.I.Smirnov). –p. 570.
7. Shakhmatov A.A. Essay on the modern Russian literary language. – M., 1941. –p. 378.
8. Russian grammar: in 1 volume // Editorial board: N. Y. Shvedova (chief editor) and others – Moscow: Nauka, 1980. –p. 579.
9. Bulygina G.V. The category “Вид” correlation and its reflection in dictionaries. Proceedings of the aspectological seminar of the philological faculty of Moscow State University. M.: MSU publishing house, 1997. –p. 180.
10. Rasuljanovna, I. N. (2019). The phenomenon of lacunarity as the linguacultural issue. *Prospects of world science-2019*, 226.
11. Maslov Y.S. Russian verb form in foreign linguistics in recent years. – M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2004. –p. 264.
12. Tikhonov A.I. The category “Вид” correlations in modern Russian linguistics. // Typology of the species: problems, searches, solutions. M.: Languages of Russian culture, 1998. –p. 490.

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/>).