

Copyright © 2018 by Academic Publishing House *Researcher*

Published in the Russian Federation  
European Researcher. Series A  
Has been issued since 2010.  
ISSN 2219-8229  
E-ISSN 2224-0136  
2018, 9(2): 121-125

DOI: 10.13187/er.2018.2.121  
[www.erjournal.ru](http://www.erjournal.ru)



## A Single Continuum of Expression and the Aspect Category in the Kazakh Language

Fazira A. Kakzhanova <sup>a, \*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Buketov Karaganda State University, Kazakhstan

### Abstract

This article investigates the reason of ‘absence’ of the aspect category in the Kazakh language. The Kazakh language is considered to be temporal, but not aspectual, in spite of the fact that this language has a set of developed aspectual planes of contents and a plan of single continuum of expression. There are so many subjective reasons of denying of the aspect category in the Kazakh language. One of the reasons is that several categories of a verb function in *a single continuum of expression* and it makes ‘an splice effect’, which complicates to identify each category separately, including the aspect category.

**Keywords:** aspect, set theory, plane of contents, plane of expression, a single continuum of expression, tense category.

### 1. Introduction

The Kazakh language is considered to be temporal, that is why there is no the aspect category in verb contents in its morphology. Having all objective prerequisites necessary for creating the aspect category such as verb seme, which generates all verb category meanings: voice, tense, mood, person, number and including the aspect category, the plane of aspect content, the plane of aspect expression (a single continuum of expression), the Kazakh language still has no this category. It is not a secondary category, if the verb expresses action or process, the aspect category of the verb expresses the inner stages of the action development and it is so closely connected with the main meaning of the verb, it is not a category of tense that only localizes and fixes actions.

There is a set theory, which denotes a collection of elements possessing some common property, in our case the verb is a set and its categories: tense, voice, mood, person, and number, including the aspect category, revealing the verb from different sides are subsets.

One of the reasons of denying of the aspect category in the Kazakh language is that these verb subsets with their discrete meanings function in a single continuum of expression and such continuum has its advantage and disadvantage. The advantage is in saving of the language elements, that there is no need to create a separate expression plan for each verb category. The ‘disadvantage’ is that an integrated function of all verb categories simultaneously in a single continuum creates a ‘splice effect’ and complicates to define each category separately. It was one of the reasons of denying the verb aspect category in the Kazakh language.

\* Corresponding author  
E-mail addresses: [fazira11@mail.ru](mailto:fazira11@mail.ru) (F.A. Kakzhanova)

## 2. Materials and methods

The main sources of the article are the works of linguists who investigate the theme: Bondarko, Verkuyl H., Dahl O., Hopper P.J. Peshkovsky A.M. Nasilov D.M., Kononov A.N., Uldashev A.A., Sauranbaev N.T., Baskakov N.A. and others. The semantic, distributive, transformational, syntactic and constituting component methods were used.

## 3. Discussion

Having all objective prerequisites necessary for creating the aspect category such as verb seme, which generates all verb category meanings: voice, tense, mood, person, number and including the aspect category, the plane of aspect content, the plane of aspect expression (a single continuum of expression), the Kazakh language has no still this category. It is not a secondary category, if the verb expresses an action or a process, the aspect category of the verb expresses the inner stage of the action development and it is so closely connected with the main meaning of the verb, it is not a category of tense that only localizes and fixes actions.

There is a set theory, which denotes a collection of elements possessing some common property, in our case the verb is a set and its categories: tense, voice, mood, person, and number, including the aspect category, revealing the verb from different sides are called subsets.

One of the reasons of denying of the aspect category in the Kazakh language is that these verb subsets with their discrete meanings function in a *single continuum of expression* and such continuum has its advantage and disadvantage. The advantage is in saving of the language elements, that there is no need to create a separate expression plan for each verb category. The 'disadvantage' is that an integrated function of all verb categories simultaneously in a single continuum creates a 'splice effect' and complicates to define each category separately. It was one of the reasons of denying the verb aspect category in the Kazakh language.

The Kazakh language has no the aspect category in its grammar. The question is why the Kazakh language has no this category, possessing all prerequisites, mentioned before for having this category. There are so many subjective reasons for denying this category. We analyze one of these reasons. It is 'a splice effect', it is difficult to identify each category separately, when several categories with discrete meanings function in a single continuum of expression.

The set theory is 'a collection of elements of an arbitrary nature, possessing a common property' that was created in the second half of the 19th century by George Kantor. Elements of a set are called subsets. The main idea is that subsets of a set possess different properties or discrete meaning in spite of they exist in one continuum and peacefully exist together while maintaining their identity. There are so many examples of this theory in life. For example, an example of a set may be any phenomenon. For example, the nature may be the set and a forest, a lake, mountains and others may be subsets in the continuum of nature and each subset of this set has its own physical and chemical parameters in spite of that they function in a single nature set continuum. Each human is also a subset of the *life set continuum*, in spite of it people are different from each other on their psych types, behaviors, preferences. A distinctive feature of sets and subsets is that one can see clearly a set ( a forest), but do not always see a separate a subset ( each tree in it) in this forest, since all the trees function in a single forest continuum.

Language as an objective phenomenon, too, is a set, for example subsets are parts of speech: a noun, a verb, an adjective and others. A verb is a complex part of speech that generates several verb category discrete meanings: aspect, tense, voice, mood, person, number and others. The verb as the part of speech is as *a set* consisting of subsets, which 'is combined by some common signs' (Kakzhanova, 2015), in this case the *subsets* of the verb are: aspect, tense, voice, mood, person and number, which reveal the verb from different sides.

These subsets: aspect, tense, voice, person, mood, and number in spite of having discrete meanings, they have no their own separate plans of expressions and all of them have function in a single continuum of expression. They manifest their discrete category meanings in a single continuum of expression or in the set:

- aspect expresses modification of an action or inner stages of action development.
- tense expresses location of an action in the time line.
- voice expresses the agent of the action: subject or object.
- mood expresses the relation of the action to reality.
- number expresses the number of subjects by whom the action is realized.

- person expresses the indexical relationship between the agent of the action and the speaker (Kakzhanova, 2010).

As already noted above, a subset of the verb has to function in a single continuum of the expression, since each of these subsets does not have its own expression plane. They have some elements in this single continuum, but insufficient for the independent expression of a particular category of the verb, but these meager elements of each category can give opportunity to identify separately them in this single continuum of expression (have been written-where have is the indicator of the perfect, been is the indicator of the passive voice).

Despite a single continuum plan of expression, all categories of the verb keep and demonstrate simultaneously their independent discrete meaning in syntax semantics. The syntax can only explicitly express these implicit categorical meanings of the verb in morphology. Since the verb serves as a predicate in the syntax, we analyze examples from three languages with different types of structures depending on their synergetic and internal determinant of these languages: 'істеп болды' (agglutinative Kazakh), 'сделал' (inflectional Russian), 'had done' (analytical English):

- 1) aspect: *perfect*
- 2) tense: *past*
- 3) voice: *passive*
- 4) mood: *indicative*
- 5) number: *plural*
- 6) person: III (singular)

Regardless of different structural types, the predicates of these languages express discrete categorical meanings of the verb simultaneously, in spite of the fact that the Kazakh language is considered to be temporal but not aspectual, from this example one can see, that the Kazakh language also expresses the category of the aspect ('істеп болды' – the perfect aspect). It remains only to be surprised at the ability of the human brain, which can decipher this integrated information in a matter of seconds. Is it possible to say that some languages are aspectual, while others are temporal, when all verb category meanings what are generated by verb seme, including the aspect category, manifest themselves simultaneously? Such division never happens objectively, it is possible subjectively, if there is a thesis that some languages are aspectual and others are temporal (Turkic languages). It is impossible to separate these categories objectively from each other from this single continuum of expression, because they are priority planned in the matrix in a single continuum of expression (Kakzhanova, 2015).

A single continuum of verb subset expression has both an advantage and a 'disadvantage'. The advantage is in saving of language means, there is no need to have the plane of expression for each verb category and this form of expression is embedded in the verb itself, therefore, they are objectively inseparable from the point of view of their functioning, but not in terms of meaning.

Having so many category meanings, the verb is the most valence and syntactically active member of the sentence. Being the core of a sentence proposition, the verb agrees each of its discrete categorical meaning with the meanings of other peripheral members of the sentence: actants and complements, determining the general pragmatics of the whole sentence.

The 'disadvantage or drawback' of such a set is that it is difficult subjectively to separate these verb categories with discrete meanings from each other in the unified continuum of the expression, it means that it complicates to identify the meaning of each category separately and it creates the illusion of the existence of a merged categories. Such 'a splice effect' does not exist objectively, since the fusion denies the discreteness of verb category meanings, that is the violation of the discrete information of the verb categories about actions. Any language having a verb is the owner of these verb categories, since the generating property is inherent to all language verb semes.

In the Kazakh verb morphology contents, the category of the aspect is not presented because of the 'absence' of this category in this language, in spite of the fact that this category has an extensive network of content planes in the World View of the Kazakh speakers. The task of the language is to find means of expressions to decode the existing planes of contents in the surface level, because the language is an interpreting and decoding part of the content plans.

The plane of the aspect content expresses the inner stage of the development of action, since the content plan refers to the conceptual part, but it is difficult to demonstrate in the form of pictures it is impossible to express the verb in the form of pictures, because it is not a noun.

Therefore, they are presented by language: action-result, action-process, action protracted, action-act, momentary action, iterative action, inchoative action and many others.

Man is first and foremost an action and every action of a person occurs in a certain aspect, depending on situations, they may use result, process, fact and other actions. The plan of aspect content exists in the life of each person, regardless of what they speak in different languages, so the content plan is present in the picture of the World View of all people, including people who speak Kazakh. To have the category of aspect, as it was mentioned before you need to have three points: the verb that generates the categorical meanings of the verb, the content plans and the expression plans. Kazakh language has all these prerequisites instead of the plane of aspect expression, it has as the other languages a single continuum of expression. If these conditions necessary for having the aspect category exist, can we say that the Kazakh language has no the aspect category? A 'splice effect' is and was one of many reasons of denying the aspect category of in the Kazakh language.

N. Sauranbaev wrote about the aspect category of an agglutinative Kazakh language: "The category of aspect in the Kazakh language and in other languages of the Turkic system still remains a problem. Some believe that in general there is no such category in the Turkic languages. And some, especially supporters of the formal-comparative method, are looking for aspects that exist in inflectional languages" (Sauranbaev, 1982).

Scientific works on the aspect category were conducted by linguists of the Kazakh language, firstly, there was no systematic work on this theme, secondly they looked back at the theory of aspectology, created on the plans of expressions of the Slavic languages, having adopted its conceptual-categorical apparatus completely. The Kazakh language as Russian language refer to a synthetic languages, but the Kazakh language refers to the agglutinative part of this group, the Russian language refers to the inflectional part, this difference already indicates that affixes behave completely different in syntax semantics. On the planes of the Russian aspect expressions, the Kazakh language will not be able to determine the category of the aspect, rather it will be denied. The aspect category is not only a problem of the Kazakh language, this is a problem of all Turkic languages.

On A. Shcherbak 's opinion in his work 'Essays on the Comparative Morphology of the Turkic Languages' writes: "The aspects as a grammatical category is absent in the Turkic languages. Occasionally, there are affixes expressing multiplicity actions, and the periphrastic formations serving the purposes of transmitting of shades, actionsarts and moments of actions occurring as: 'the beginning of action', 'the ending of actions', 'the action is carried out for oneself,' 'the action is for the other , the action intensifies', 'the action occurs unexpectedly' are presented (Sherbak, 1981).

On the opinion of R.A. Autilipova: "We proceed from the fact that in the Bashkir language, as in the other Turkic languages, the grammatical category of the verb aspect is absent. Therefore, when describing the functional-semantic category of aspectuality, one will focus on other verbal means of representation of aspectual meanings- syntactic, lexical, morphological, contextual, intonational and combined means , which refer to different tiers of the language hierarchy ' (Abutilipova, 2009).

Syntactic, semantic, distributive and transformational and analysis of components of single continuum, show that the aspect category exists in the Kazakh language, the above mentioned example (істеп болды) indicates the existence of the aspect category in this language. We cannot analyze the functional-semantic field (FSF) of the aspect category separately, because of absence of a separate plan of the aspect expression, so it can not separately be the core of the FSF. But analyses of FSF of the unified continuum of expression demonstrate the existence of the aspect category in the Kazakh language.

The 'absence' of the aspect category in the Kazakh language is not critical for the language itself, since it is an objective phenomenon that it will develop in its own way, rather than at the behest of the subjective postulates of our linguists, who sometimes behave not as observers but position themselves as language legislators. It is dangerous from the point of absence of any linguistic phenomenon by subjective inference, it means that there will be no information about this phenomenon and this will lead to certain consequences in the learning of this language.

There were linguists who said about the existence of the aspect category in the Kazakh language. They are Mamanov I.E., Oralbaeva N.O and others.

Still we have no the name to the aspect category in the Kazakh language. Studies on the aspect category were conducted in the Kazakh language by many scholars in different years and there is no a permanent name of this category in the Kazakh language, there are different names in

different times, for example, 'syapat'(aspect) (Mamanov, 1966; Tomanov,1988); 'kyimyldyn out sypaty' (aspect of movement) (Oralbaeva, 1971; Makhmudov, 1958); 'amaldyn otu sypaty' (aspect of action) (Iskakov, 1974), 'kurinis' (appearance) (Uiykbaev, 1958). 'Turleny'(inner modification) was offered, because the plane of aspect content is an inner development of action or inner modification of an action, the plane of aspect expression is carried out on the basis of generating property of verb seme or a seme modification.

#### 4. Results

The aspect category is an important category among categories of verb, which expresses the inner development of actions. The Kazakh language is considered to be temporal, but not aspectual. According to the subjective judgement there is no the aspect category in the Kazakh language, but the objective the Kazakh language has the aspect category in its matrix. It is generated by verb seme.

Verb categories have no their own plane of expression, that is why they function in a single continuum of expression. It is difficult subjectively to identify each discrete meaning of verb categories, including the aspect category.

The function of verb categories in a single continuum of expression is prior planned in the verb matrix, it gives savings of language units, there is need to give a plane of expression to each category, being not clutter the already stuffed our memory.

The Kazakh language has all prerequisites, which are necessary for having of the aspect category in the Kazakh language: 1) verbs with their generating semes, which create all verb categories with their discrete meanings; 2) the plane of aspect contents in World View of the speakers of the Kazakh people; 3) planes of the aspect category in the form of a single continuum of expression (istep boldy – perfect aspect).

Different names of one concept complicate the difficult position of the aspect category in the Kazakh language. A phenomenon name is the essence of the concept. Concept essence is based on character-forming concept properties. The name 'turleny' (modification or transformation) expresses the inner modification of extra –linguistic 'action' and inner seme modification of the linguistic 'aspect' from the point of language.

The Kazakh language has all the verb categories, including the aspect category.

#### References

- Kakzhanova, 2015 – *Kakzhanova F.A.* (2015). *Kategoriya vida v kazakhskom yazyke i ee podvidy* [Category of species in the Kazakh language and its subspecies]. Karaganda. P. 185.
- Kakzhanova, 2010 – *Kakzhanova F.A.* (2010). *Problema kategorii aspekta i ee tipologiya v angliiskom yazyke* [The problem of the aspect category and its typology in English]. Karaganda: KarGU, P. 7.
- Sauranbaev, 1982 – *Sauranbaev N.T.* (1982). *Қазақ тілі білімінің проблемалары*. Almaty. Izd: Nauka, pp. 125-175.
- Sherbak, 1981 – *Shcherbak A.M.* (1981). *Ocherki po sravnitel'noi morfologii tyurkskikh yazykov* [Essays on comparative morphology]. L.: Nauka, 7 p.
- Abutalipova, 2009 – *Abutalipova R.A.* (2009). *Funktsional'no-semanticheskaya kategoriya aspektual'nosti v bashkirskom yazyke* [Functional-semantic category of aspectuality in the Bashkir language]: Avtoref. dis. d-ra. filol. nauk. Ufa, 35 p.
- Mamanov, 1966 – *Mamanov I.E.* (1966). *Қазіргі қазақ тілі*. Almaty: Mektep.
- Tomanov, 1988 – *Tomanov M.* (1988). *Қазақ тілінің тарихи грамматикасы*. Almaty: Mektep, 243 p.
- Oralbaeva, 1971 – *Oralbaeva N.O.* (1971). *Analiticheskie formy glagola v sovremennom kazakhskom yazyke* [Analytical forms of the verb in the modern Kazakh language]: avtoref. dokt. filol. nauk. Alma-Ata.
- Makhmudov, 1958 – *Makhmudov K.K.* (1958). *Tezisy doklada* [Theses of the report]. *Voprosy grammatiki tyurkskikh yazykov*. Alma-Ata: AN KazSSR, pp. 66-68.
- Uiykbaev, 1958 – *Uiykbaev I.K.* (1958). *Kategoriya glagol'nogo vida v sovremennom kazakhskom yazyke* [Category of verbal form in modern kazakh language]. Kand. diss. Alma-Ata.