



ASPECT AND IT'S FUNCTIONAL CATEGORY

Karimova M.Ya.

Teacher, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Imamov N.P.

Scientific researcher, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Article history:	Abstract:
<p>Received: 12th February 2022 Accepted: 12th March 2022 Published: 30th April 2022</p>	<p>The aspect has a three-dimensional dimension, which has a morphological, semantic and syntactic appearance. We have tried to show and analyze them in detail and give the corresponding characteristics of the aspectual system. Aspect in a broad sense is an additional term that characterizes a number of separate categories of language, characterized by partial semantic similarity and defined in terms of grammaticalization and lexicalization of certain features.</p>
<p>Keywords: acquisition process, syntactic appearance, grammaticalisation, lexicalisation.</p>	

The purpose of this paper is to present what is an aspect and the theory of aspect acquisition under current theoretical assumptions. To achieve this, we need an analysis that is a clear goal of the child acquisition process. Therefore, in this article, the concept of aspect is introduced and analyzed in depth.

The aspect has a three-dimensional dimension, which has a morphological, semantic, and syntactic appearance. We try to present and analyze them in detail and give the relevant features of the aspectual system.

Distinguishing between aspect and tense. Quite broadly, aspect is a descriptive cover term for a number of language particular categories that are characterized by partial semantic overlap and defined in terms of the grammaticalization and lexicalization of certain features. In defining aspect and formulating its characteristics, it is important to differentiate the meaning of the familiar term 'tense' from the meaning of the less familiar term 'aspect', particularly in view of the terminological and conceptual confusion of the two terms. Tense, to begin with, is a grammatical category, indicated in the verb, that presents 'a grammaticalized expression of location in time' (Comrie 1985: 9). It is 'a grammatical category, a set of verbal inflections or other verbal forms, that express a temporal location to an orientation point' (Smith 1991: 136). The most common tenses we find in languages are present, past, and future- though not all languages distinguish these three tenses, or indeed distinguish any tenses at all.

Aspect (or verbal aspect) is quite different. Following Comrie (1976: 3), aspects are defined as being 'different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation'. The following minimal pair illustrates a typical aspectual distinction: [1.a.]

When (h)-received the email your, (to)-you (I)-was writing (a)-letter.

When he got you're the email, he was writing to you.

When (he)-received the email your, (to)-you (he)-wrote (a)-letter.

When he got your email, he wrote a letter to you.

The difference between "he was writing in Uzbek" and "wrote" is not time, because the past tense is used in both cases. It is in this sense that the aspect differs from time, and therefore the contradictions between perfect and imperfect are considered aspectual. While the imperfect aspect of "He was writing" indicates that the writing process continues when the letter arrives, without indicating that it is complete, the perfect aspect of "He wrote" describes the writing as a completed event.

This characterization of aspect cannot be taken in isolation from time: both examples concern two events or processes, the arrival of the card and the writing of the letter, but the temporal relations between them are quite different. Aspect, therefore, is related to time, but how is it different from tense? According to Dahl (1985), tenses are deictic categories, in the sense that they relate points to the moment of speech.

Aspects, though, are non-deictic categories.

Comrie suggests the following way of making the distinction:

Aspect is not concerned with relating the time of the situation to any other time-point, but rather with the internal temporal constituency of the one situation. One could state the difference as one between situation- internal time (aspect) and situation-external time (tense).

Aspect as a functional category.

We consider the aspect as a functional category and more precisely as a functional head.

Given our view of syntax, the aspect does not only include morphological operation. Our theory



adopts Cinque, which requires aspect to be a functional head if Kayne's Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA) is to hold.

This approach has also been followed by Alexiadou (1994). In her theoretical account, aspect in Uzbek language is taken to head its own functional projection in the Syntax. Aspect must in fact be a functional head if in Cinque's (1999) (and her) theory of adverbs the adverbial licensing criterion is to hold: "adverbs are licensed as specifiers of functional projections by the relevant feature associated with the head" (1994: 46). Additionally, each adverb class is licensed by one and only head.

This claim implies that the annexes contain features that must be agreed with the licensor, and that the distribution of the annexes on which the basis is formed cannot be arbitrary. So, if we look at aspectual suffixes, they are formed in the defining position of Aspect in Uzbek and are licensed according to feature adaptation.

This is the theoretical basis of the thesis and is built to take into account the close relationship between aspectual affixes and verbal aspects in the aspectual interpretation of a sentence. If the aspect had not initiated its functional projection, then we would not have taken into account the licensing of aspectual additions and their interaction with the verbal aspect.

However, even if aspectual adverbials were treated as adjuncts, even if we were not to follow the line of Cinque and Alexiadou, and follow an adjunct approach instead, aspect would still need to head its own maximal projection. Chomsky in his *Barriers* monograph concludes that the only type of adjunction operations which can result from movement are adjunction of one head to another or of one maximal projection to another. Radford says (1997: 423) that the same would be true of the merger operations which attach adverbial adjuncts to the expressions they modify: and this in turn would rule out the possibility of merging an adverb with an intermediate projection, but would allow for structures where an adverbial (which is itself a maximal projection) is an adjunct to the maximal projection itself. So, in this sense, aspect needs to be a maximal projection itself, in order to merge with aspectual adverbials.

Furthermore there have been other proposals in the literature that pursue and present evidence in our direction. Xydopoulos (1996) presents an argument for aspect as a functional category. Although verb forms in early child language come marked for aspect, this does not mean that aspect cannot be a functional head. He agrees that "it (the fact that verb

forms come marked for aspect in early child language) does suggest that the morphological formation of these forms involves a lexical operation and cannot be assigned solely to syntax. The minimalist programme assumes indeed that the lexicon is responsible for morphological operations and that morphology is distinct from syntax. However, the role of syntax is to construct interpretable strings of lexical items. So, syntax needs to evaluate the grammatical specification of each lexical item inserted in a derivation, this being the purpose of feature checking. In the same spirit, I feel that we need to postulate an aspect phrase in order to be able to evaluate the aspectual specification of verbs."

We agree on the difference between the morphological component of the aspect of Xydopoulos and the syntactic-semantic component. Indeed, part of my research is based on this dichotomy, and its results show that, in my opinion, verbal forms that appear very early in children's language do not have to be marked for aspect. children have mastered the aspect and this is already a mastered part of their grammar. That is why my research distinguishes the morphological and semantic and syntactic components of the aspect and examines which component the children have mastered.

In general, in this article, we have presented and discussed its three dimensions: morphological, semantic, and syntactic. We also provide a description of the aspectual system in English and Uzbek.

REFERENCES:

1. Comrie, B., 1976, *Aspect*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press., 1985, *Tense*, Cambridge.
2. e: Cambridge University Press.
3. Smith, C.S., (1991). *The Parameter of Aspect* [Studies in Linguistics, Volume 43].
4. Dahl, O., (1985). *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.
5. Alexiadou, A., (1994). *Issues in the Syntax of Adverbs*. PhD dissertation, University of Potsdam.
6. Cinque, G., (1999). *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*.
7. Radford, A. (1997). *Syntactic theory and the structure of English. A minimalist approach*. Cambridge University Press.
8. *Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax*. Oxford University Press.
9. Bach, E., 1986, "The algebra of events", *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 9(1): 5-16.



World Bulletin of Social Sciences (WBSS)

Available Online at: <https://www.scholarexpress.net>

Vol. 9, April, 2022

ISSN: 2749-361X

10. Bonomi, A., 1997, "The progressive and the structure of events", *Journal of Semantics*, 14(2): 173–205.
11. Copley, B., and Harley, H., 2015, "A force-theoretic framework for event structure", *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 38(2): 103–158.