

THE NOTION OF ASPECT AND ITS SYSTEMATIC REPRESENTATION IN LINGUISTICS

Jurabayeva Dilnoza Zafarbek qizi

Trainee teacher at National University of

Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek,

English Linguistics Department

djurabayeva1011@gmail.com

+998941505199

Abstract: The article investigates the linguistic category of aspect and its systematic representation in English and Uzbek. Aspect is treated as a grammatical and semantic category that expresses the internal temporal structure of an event, including its duration, completion, repetition, and relation to the moment of speech or another reference point. The study is based on a comparative analysis of theoretical works on aspectology and descriptive grammars of English and Uzbek. The results show that English has a relatively fixed grammatical opposition between simple, progressive, perfect, and perfect progressive forms, whereas Uzbek represents aspect through a more complex interaction of tense markers, participial forms, auxiliary verbs, lexical semantics, and contextual interpretation. The comparison demonstrates that English aspect is primarily expressed through analytic verb forms, while Uzbek aspectual meanings are often realized by agglutinative morphology and auxiliary verb constructions. The article concludes that aspect should be analyzed as a system combining grammatical, lexical, and discourse-level meanings rather than as a purely morphological category.

Keywords: aspect, aspectuality, tense, English, Uzbek, progressive, perfect, auxiliary verbs, comparative linguistics.

Introduction. The category of aspect is one of the central issues in modern linguistics because it connects grammar, semantics, and discourse. Unlike tense, which locates an event in relation to the moment of speech, aspect describes the internal temporal organization of an event: whether it is viewed as completed or ongoing, repeated or single, bounded or unbounded, resultative or processual. Therefore, aspect is not merely a formal grammatical category; it is also a conceptual mechanism through which speakers interpret events.

In general linguistics, aspect is usually divided into two major domains: grammatical aspect and lexical aspect. Grammatical aspect refers to forms encoded by the verbal system, such as the English progressive *is writing* or perfect *has written*. Lexical aspect, also called Aktionsart, concerns the inherent temporal properties of

verbs and verb phrases, for example, the difference between *know*, *run*, *build a house*, and *recognize*. These distinctions were developed in the works of B. Comrie, Z. Vendler, C. Smith, Ö. Dahl, and other scholars who argued that aspectual meaning is created by the interaction between verb morphology, lexical semantics, and sentence context.

The study of aspect is especially important in contrastive linguistics because languages differ considerably in the way they encode aspectual meanings. English has a well-developed analytic system based on auxiliary verbs and participles. Uzbek, as a Turkic and agglutinative language, expresses aspect through tense-aspect forms, participles, converbs, auxiliary verbs, and lexical means. This contrast makes English and Uzbek a productive pair for comparison.

Materials and Methods. The research is based on descriptive, comparative, and analytical methods. The material includes theoretical studies on aspectology, English grammar, and Uzbek grammar. The article relies on the conceptual distinction between tense and aspect, the opposition between perfective and imperfective meanings, and the classification of lexical aspect into states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements.

The contrastive method is used to compare English and Uzbek aspectual forms according to their function rather than their surface structure. For example, English *is reading* is not compared only with one Uzbek form, but with several possible Uzbek equivalents such as *o'qiyapti*, *o'qimoqda*, *o'qib turibdi*, depending on context. This functional approach is necessary because English and Uzbek do not have identical grammatical categories.

Results. Aspect expresses how an event is viewed from the inside. If tense answers the question "When did the event happen?", aspect answers "How is the event temporally structured?" For example, in English, *He wrote a letter* presents the event as complete, while *He was writing a letter* presents it as ongoing at a certain moment. The event may be the same, but the speaker's viewpoint is different.

Most theories distinguish between perfective and imperfective aspect. Perfective aspect presents the event as a whole, with its beginning and end viewed externally. Imperfective aspect focuses on the internal development of the event, such as duration, repetition, or habituality. However, not all languages express this opposition in the same way. In Slavic languages, perfective and imperfective are often lexical-morphological categories. In English, the opposition is represented mainly by progressive and non-progressive forms. In Uzbek, aspectual meanings are distributed across tense forms, auxiliary verbs, and lexical constructions.

English aspect is usually represented by four main verb forms: simple, progressive, perfect, and perfect progressive. The simple aspect presents an event without focusing on its internal structure. It may express facts, habits, repeated actions, or completed

events: *She reads every day; He arrived yesterday*. The progressive aspect is formed with be + present participle: *is reading, was working*. It shows an action as ongoing, temporary, or incomplete: *She is writing an article*. It may also express temporary habits, gradual change, or planned future events. The perfect aspect is formed with have + past participle: *has written, had finished*. It connects a previous event with a later reference point and may express result, experience, continuation, or recent past: *He has just arrived*. The perfect progressive aspect combines perfect and progressive meanings: *has been working*. It emphasizes duration and continuity before a reference point: *She has been learning Uzbek for two years*.

English also has lexical aspect. Stative verbs such as *know* and *believe* differ from dynamic verbs such as *run* and *write*. Accomplishments imply a process with a result, while achievements such as *arrive* are punctual.

Uzbek expresses aspectual meanings through verb morphology, participial and converb forms, auxiliary verbs, lexical meaning, and context. Therefore, Uzbek aspect is best viewed as a functional-semantic system rather than a fixed grammatical paradigm. Progressive or continuous meaning is often expressed by *-yapti, -moqda, -ayotir*: *U kitob o'qiyapti* – “He/she is reading a book”, *Talabalar maqola yozmoqda* – “The students are writing an article”. Assistant verbs such as *tur, yot, o'tir, yur* also indicate duration, process, or manner: *U yozib turibdi* – “He/she is writing”, *Bola uxlab yotibdi* – “The child is sleeping”. Completion and resultative meanings are expressed by constructions such as *-ib bo'l-, -ib qo'y-, -ib chiq-*: *U ishni qilib bo'ldi* – “He/she has finished the work”, *Men xatni yozib qo'ydim* – “I have written the letter”, *U maqolani o'qib chiqdi* – “He/she read the article through”. Habitual and repeated actions are usually expressed by *-adi/-ydi* and adverbs: *U har kuni ishlaydi* – “He/she works every day”, *Biz tez-tez uchrashamiz* – “We often meet”. Past habitual meaning may be shown by *-ar edi*: *U yoshligida ko'p kitob o'qir edi* – “He/she used to read many books in his/her childhood”. The participial form *-gan* can express anteriority, result, or completed action: *U kelgan* – “He/she has come / came”, *Men ko'rganman* – “I have seen”, With *edi*, it may express a pluperfect-like meaning: *U kelgan edi* – “He/she had come”.

Thus, Uzbek has several means corresponding to English aspectual meanings, but they are distributed across morphology, auxiliaries, and context rather than organized in one fixed paradigm.

The main difference between English and Uzbek lies in the formal organization of aspect. English aspect is highly grammaticalized in the auxiliary system. The opposition between *writes, is writing, has written, and has been writing* is systematic and obligatory in finite verb phrases. Uzbek, by contrast, uses a wider range of morphological and periphrastic means, and aspectual interpretation is often more context-dependent.

Discussion. The comparison confirms that aspect cannot be reduced to a simple list of verb forms. It is a multidimensional category involving viewpoint, lexical meaning, grammatical marking, and discourse function. English and Uzbek both express duration, completion, repetition, and result, but they distribute these meanings differently across their grammatical systems.

English belongs to the type of languages where aspect is strongly associated with auxiliary constructions. The progressive and perfect are central to the tense-aspect system and are taught as part of the finite verb paradigm. This gives English aspect a relatively transparent formal structure, although semantic interpretation can still be complex.

Uzbek, however, shows a more distributed system of aspectuality. Some aspectual meanings are expressed by special tense-aspect markers such as *-yapti* and *-moqda*. Others are encoded by auxiliary verbs, especially in converbial constructions. Still others depend on lexical meaning or adverbials. This makes Uzbek aspect rich and flexible, but less easily reducible to a small paradigm.

For translation and language teaching, these differences are significant. Learners of English whose first language is Uzbek may overuse the simple form instead of the progressive or perfect because Uzbek does not always require the same grammatical distinctions. Conversely, English-speaking learners of Uzbek may try to find direct equivalents for every English aspectual form, although Uzbek often chooses constructions according to discourse context rather than a fixed paradigm.

The findings also support the functional-semantic approach to aspect. In both languages, aspectual meaning emerges from the interaction of grammar and semantics. For example, the English sentence *He was writing a letter* contains progressive morphology, but the telic noun phrase *a letter* also influences interpretation. In Uzbek, *U xat yozib qo'ydi* contains the auxiliary *qo'ymoq*, but the resultative meaning is strengthened by the context and the object.

Conclusion. Aspect is a fundamental linguistic category that represents the internal temporal structure of events. While tense locates an event in time, aspect describes how the event is viewed: as ongoing, completed, repeated, habitual, or resultative.

English expresses aspect mainly through an analytic grammatical system consisting of simple, progressive, perfect, and perfect progressive forms. These forms are relatively systematic and play an obligatory role in finite verb phrases. Uzbek, in contrast, expresses aspect through a broader functional-semantic system that includes tense-aspect suffixes, participles, converbs, auxiliary verbs, lexical semantics, and context.

The contrast shows that English and Uzbek share universal aspectual meanings but differ in their formal representation. English relies more on auxiliary verb

paradigms, whereas Uzbek relies more on agglutinative morphology and auxiliary verb constructions. Therefore, in comparative linguistics, translation, and language teaching, aspect should be analyzed not only as a grammatical category but also as a semantic and discourse-based system.

Future research may focus on corpus-based analysis of English-Uzbek translations to determine how particular aspectual meanings are rendered in real texts. Such research would provide more precise data on the frequency and distribution of progressive, perfect, resultative, and habitual meanings in both languages.

References:

1. Brinton L. The development of English aspectual systems. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
2. Comrie B. Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
3. Talmy L. Lexical Typologies. In Timothy Shopen, ed. Language typology and syntactic description, 2nd ed., vol. III: Grammatical categories and the lexicon. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
4. Vandewalle J. On Uzbek Converb Constructions Expressing Motion Events // Bilig, Journal of Social Sciences of the Turkic World. – 2016, №78.
5. Hojiyev A. O‘zbek tilida ko‘makchi fe’llar. – T.: Fan, 1966.
6. Mengliyeva M. Harakat tarzi ma’nolarining o‘zbek va ingliz tillarida berilishi va badiiy matnda tarjimasi: filol. fan. nomz. diss. – Andijon, 2021.
7. Yusupov U. Contrastive linguistics of the English and Uzbek languages. – T.: Akademnashr, 2013.