



УДК 811.512.122

DOI: 10.22363/2313-2299-2019-10-2-513-521

## THE KAZAKH LANGUAGE HAS THE ASPECT CATEGORY IN ITS MATRIX

F.A. Kakzhanova

Buketov Karaganda State University,  
28, st. University, Karaganda, The Republic of Kazakhstan, 100028

**Abstract.** The subject of the article is the absence of an aspect category, expressing main ideas of sentence propositions in the morphology of the Kazakh language and the conceptual confusion of the aspect category with tense category in the Kazakh language, which create certain difficulties not only in learning of the Kazakh language but also making correct translation from Kazakh into other languages or vice versa. It has no official title, fixed in academic dictionaries, in spite of having objective content plans and expression plans in the Kazakh language.

There are different opinions about the aspect category in the Kazakh language, some linguists consider, that there is the aspect category in the Kazakh language, others deny it. The result is the aspect category has not been presented in the morphology of the Kazakh verbs.

The article is devoted to analyzing the objective prerequisites creating the aspect category in languages, including the Kazakh language and reasons of appearing of subjective negations of the aspect category in this language.

**Key words:** aspect, single continuum, content plan, expression plan, set theory, discrete meaning, cognitive dissonance.

### INTRODUCTION

It is difficult to assert what is denied.

There are different opinions about aspect category in the Kazakh language, some linguists consider that the Kazakh language has the aspect category, some of them deny the existing of it in it. The result is that the Kazakh grammar text-books have no the verbal aspect category in a verb morphology content.

According to N. Sauranbayev, *‘the aspect category still remains a problem in the Kazakh language and in other languages of the Turkic system. Some scholars believe that in general such a category is missing in the Turkic languages’* [1. P. 125—145].

*‘In my opinion, to look for the verbal aspect in the Kazakh language is to waste time’* [2. P. 144].

*‘There are a lot of problematic issues in Turkology. The problem of the verbal aspect is the most acutely debatable and extremely confusing’* [3. P. 62].

In spite of these opinions, the objective Kazakh language has a set of developed planes of aspect contents and planes of aspect expressions, it will be proved by the objective prerequisites for the existence of the aspect category in the objective Kazakh language.

## 1. DISCUSSION

**The aim.** The aim is to identify the objectively existing aspect category and establish its status in the Kazakh language.

**The methods of investigation.** It was impossible to search of the aspect category of the Kazakh language by postulates of the traditional existing aspect theory, that is why non-paradigmatic and axiological methods through the identification of problems, hypotheses are used.

**Investigation results.** The objective Kazakh language has all objective prerequisites to have the verbal aspect category. Objective prerequisites creating the basis for the aspect category in the objective Kazakh language had been analyzed to identify and establish the status of the aspect category in the Kazakh language, which are not taken into account. They are the following:

- *verb seme, based on the fractal-quantum properties, generates all verb categories: aspect, tense, voice, mood, number, person;*
- *presence of the aspect content plans in the World View of native Kazakh speakers;*
- *presence of the aspect expression plans in the Kazakh language and its peculiar features* [4. P. 4].

If all these objective prerequisites exist in the Kazakh language, then, undoubtedly, it has the aspect category.

Each language has its own development synergetics, based on a language matrix and an internal determinant inherent to each language.

**The first objective prerequisite** to have the aspect category is that the Kazakh language should have a verb category, where a verb seme as a semantic unit, carrying the meaning of a word, based on fractal-quantum properties, creates all verb category meanings: tense, mood, voice, number, person, including an aspect category. Having six verb categories thanks to generating property of verb seme, the verb is the center of sentence proposition in syntax semantics.

When a verb is *not* in syntax semantics, it is just a verb, all verb categorical meanings are implicit in the form of just 'dozing', when a verb is in statics, for example, 'oku- to read', one can see only the denotative meaning of the verb, and its phonetic shell. As soon as the verb begins to function in syntax semantics (*okyp zhatyrmyn* — am reading; *okyp boldym* — have read), the verb 'transforms' its implicit categorical meanings into an explicit form.

The morphological form of the verb 'oku' — to read is transformed into different predicates in syntax: (1) *okimyn* — reads; (2) *okyp zhatkan* — was being read and all categories of the verb function in this single continuum of expression and each of them expresses its own discrete meaning:

- aspect: (1) fact; (2) process;
- tense: (1) present and future tenses (such a phenomenon exists in the Kazakh language when one infix (-i, -okimyn) expresses two grammatical forms, that is, two meanings are in one form); (2) the past;
- voice: (1) active; (2) passive;
- mood: (1), (2) indicative;
- person: (1) — I, (2) — all persons;
- number: (1) — singular; (2) plural.

Since each verb category (aspect, tense, voice, mood, person, and number) does not have its own expression plan, they all function in a single continuum of expression. In spite of they function in a single continuum of expression, each of them keeps its discrete meaning in it and expresses it in syntax semantics, describing a verb from different side, based on their discrete meanings.

Such a single continuum of expression is inherent practically to all languages and it is planned in the matrix of languages. A single continuum of verb expression is a unique phenomenon, it is a closed environ that does not miss any verb category from it and does not accept any other language unit from outside. It means that it is impossible to deny the aspect category from this closed continuum of expression, if one denies the aspect category, in that case one has to deny the other verb categories: tense, voice and others, functioning together with the aspect in this single continuum of expression. This fact makes possible to assert that all languages having a verb are aspectual, temporal and etc., despite the subjective opinions that some languages are considered to be temporal (Turkic, including Kazakh) or aspectual (Slavic languages).

But these categories in a single continuum of expression sometimes have a ‘fusion effect’ making difficult to perceive each separate category meaning of a verb: tense, aspect, voice, mood, person and number, which is one of reasons of negation.

#### **Conclusions:**

- the Kazakh language has a verb category;
- the Kazakh verb semes have a generating property;
- verb seme generates all verb categories, including the aspect category;
- the Kazakh verb categories, including the aspect category, function in a single continuum of expression;
- when functioning in a single continuum, all verb categories keep their discrete meanings;
- it is impossible to throw out any verb category from a single continuum of verb expression and it is inherent to all languages, including the Kazakh language;
- the Kazakh verb shows all verb categoral meanings, including the aspect category (okymyn — *factual*, okyp otyrmyn — *process* aspect + *the other meanings of verb categories*), it means that the objective Kazakh language has the aspect category in its matrix.

**The second objective prerequisite** that indicates the existence of the aspect category is the presence of an aspect content plan in the World View of people, speaking the Kazakh language.

There are a lot of actions in the life of people, but these four actions are the main types of actions: process, protracted, result, and fact and they have their subaspects.

The area of using of these aspect content plans are:

1. Action — process. The plan of content is process. Process is the main necessary stage of actions to transit to a new stage.
2. Protracted action. The plan of content is protracted actions. It expresses also actions started, but not completed because of interrupting by other actions and such actions have further continuation.
3. Result action. The plane of the content is a completed action. Actions in their inner development come to a logical end of development and reach a completely new stage.

4. Fact actions. The plan of content of fact actions is widely spread and quite common. Fact actions cover systematic iterative actions, actions of alternating sequence, instant actions and others.

#### **Conclusions:**

— aspect *content* plans express an internal action structuring or inner stages of action development: action-process, action-result, action-fact, prolonged action, etc;

— the main aspect content plans are present in the life of each person, including the life of speakers of the Kazakh language. Human being life is measured by actions and they can not live without actions, which are the aspect content plans.

Thus, the Kazakh language has the second prerequisite, indicating the existence of the aspect category in the World View of the Kazakh people.

**The third objective prerequisite** for the aspect existence is the presence of aspect expression plan in the Kazakh language. An expression plan is a linguistic phenomenon that fixes the content plans of World View with language means. In order to have the aspect category in languages they should have the aspect expression plans. The Kazakh language is an agglutinative language. The agglutinative language uses different agglutinations.

When analyzing any linguistic phenomenon in the Kazakh language, we often consider it in terms of an agglutinative language, for example, if it is the aspect expression plan, it would be logical to assume that the aspect expression plans should be based on the laws of the agglutinative language. If we do not find an agglutinative nature of language phenomenon in this language, probably this phenomenon will be denied, as it happened with the aspect category in the Kazakh language.

Pure analytic, agglutinative or inflectional languages do not exist, each language has a synthesized form of these enumerated forms, the only difference is that one of these structures dominates in some languages, for example, agglutination in the Kazakh language.

Despite the ‘absence’ of the aspect category in the Kazakh language, we see a single continuum of expression with the aspect category. A single continuum of verb expression in the Kazakh language has: a synthetic form, with elements of agglutination (*okidy*) and an analytical form (*okyp zhatyrmyn*) also with elements of agglutination. These examples of the Kazakh language indicate that the objective Kazakh language has language means for the manifestation of the aspect category.

The formula of the synthetic single continuum of verb category expression of the Kazakh language consists of any semantic Kazakh verb + agglutinations: *aitamyn* — **say**, *koremin* — **see** and express the fact aspect, in spite of the opinions that only the verbs: *zhaty* — *to lie*, *otyry* — *to sit*, *ury* — *to stand*, and *zhury* — *to go* can express synthetic predicates.

The formula of the analytical form of the single continuum of verb category expression consists of *gerund* + *auxiliary verb* + *agglutinations*: *okyp bolamyn*, *okyp tastady*, where *okyp* is the gerund; -a — the indicator of the Future Tense; *bol-*, *tasta-* are auxiliary verbs; and -myn, -dym, are agglutinations.

Plans of the aspect expressions are the single continuum of expressions, which are different in languages, that is why it is impossible to search for the Kazakh aspect

expression plans on the basis of the aspect expression plans of the Russian, in spite of they belong to one the same synthetic languages, because they have an inner divergence.

**Conclusions:**

— there are two types of plans of aspect expressions in the Kazakh language: synthetic with agglutinations (*okimyn*) and analytical + agglutinations: (*okyp zhatyrmyn*), they state that the Kazakh language has the plans of aspect expressions in its matrix in the form of single continuum of expression;

— a single continuum of expression expresses all verb category meanings: aspect, tense, voice, mood, person and number.

The Kazakh language has all three prerequisites for having the aspect category mentioned at the beginning of the article:

- 1) verb category with its seme generative property;
- 2) presence of the aspect content plan in the Kazakh speakers' World View;
- 3) presence of the Kazakh aspect expression plans.

They testify to the existence of the aspect category in the Kazakh language. If linguists could not discern this category in a single continuum of expression because of 'fusion effect', is it the reason to state that the aspect category is absent in the Kazakh language?

Having all prerequisites for the existence of the aspect category and it actually functions in this language, what are reasons of appearing of opinions, conclusions denying the existence of the aspect category in Kazakh language?

There are so many reasons of negation of the existence of the aspect category in the Kazakh language. One of the main reasons of negating besides 'fusion effect' is contradictory conclusions and judgments about the aspect category on the basis of 'cognitive dissonance'. 'The cognitive dissonance theory' was proposed by L. Festinger [6]. Cognitive dissonance occurs when there are conflicting judgments about the same concept, phenomenon, in this case it is the aspect category.

Some linguists believe that the aspect category exists; others, on the contrary, deny its existence in the Kazakh language. Different contradictory conclusions about the same concept do not pass without leaving a trace, creating in 'the *minds conflicting series of representations, opinions and ideas*' [6]. Such situation causes doubt and uncertainty about the correctness of judgments. At the end, there comes a moment of acceptance of one of the dominating ideas or conclusions on the topic being investigated, like 'irrefutable argumen' of the proof.

In 1956, a coordination meeting on the most complex topics on the verbal aspect and others in Turkic languages was held in Almaty, convened by the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Language and Literature of the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences, where prominent Türkologists and Kazakh scholars were. They were B.A. Serebrennikov, N.A. Baskakov, L.N. Kharitonov, N.T. Sauranbayev, M.B. Balakayev, I.E. Mamanov, A.I. Kharisov, N.T. Sauranbayev, N.Z. Gadzhiyeva, M.Sh. Shiraliev, S.A. Amanzholov, G.G. Musabaev, A.A. Yuldashev, E.N. Shipova, I.P. Pavlov, V.G. Karpov, Yu.D. Desheriyev, G.D. Sanzheev, I. Uykbaev and others.

This meeting was an important event of that time, it meant that the aspect category was an important category in linguistics and that the problems existing in the aspect category in Turkic languages would be solved.

Some scholars believed that the aspect category in the Turkic languages existed; others considered this category is problematic one in these languages. Proponents of the first direction argued the existence of this category in the Turkic languages without pointing the peculiar features of the aspect category in the Turkic languages. Proponents of the second direction believed that the verbal aspect category in the form that was inherent to Slavic languages did not exist in the Turkic languages and there was lack of explanatories from their side.

In the final speech, B.A. Serebrennikov said, ‘summarizing all our considerations regarding the grammatical aspect category in the Turkic languages, we can draw the following conclusions:

1) the aspect theory in the Turkic languages, proposed by V.A. Bogorodsky and N.K. Dmitriev, was based on a logical understanding of the grammatical category, therefore it can not be accepted;

2) there is no the aspect in the Turkic languages. The combination of gerunds with auxiliary verbs, although they have an aspect meaning, but it does not form a grammar aspect category, since the completeness and duration of action in them are always complicated by an additional shade. Verbs that are combined with various auxiliary verbs could be called aspect classes, but not aspects, they have the aspect meaning, but do not form the aspect category;

3) some past tenses in the Turkic languages also have the aspect meanings. Their aspect meanings are more abstract and they are not associated with an additional shade. However, these tenses do not pass through the entire conjugation system and therefore they do not form the grammatical aspect category [7. P. 29—30].

The essence of the first B.A. Serebrennikov’s remark was, ‘according to N.K. Dmitrieva’s opinion about the idea of the aspect category in the Kumyk language, ‘the aspect category is expressed by gerundial constructions, and besides it is expressed by the past tense in the indicative mood. The ‘idea about the aspect’ in this case is nothing else than a logical aspect category existing first in our consciousness. This logical aspect category in a language can sometimes have its own expressions, but sometimes it has no it. However, the grammatical aspect category, according to the logisticians, does not cease to exist because it is, above all, an idea’ [7].

**Counterargument to the first conclusion.** Thinking and its main tool — logic are always in relationship with the language for the adequate transferring of deep structures to the surface. If thinking is an instrument of judgment, opinion, reflection which represents the ‘deep structure’ (N. Chomsky, 1957), or its a content plan, then the language is its expression plan, which transforms it to ‘surface structure’. Both of these tools belong to a man. By the definition of O. Shor, *‘there is no a single word in a language, not a single syntactic or morphological phenomenon, which in its origin and development would not be due to the needs of thinking’* [8; 9]. If language does not express thoughts, why do we need language?

A person will not utter a meaningless sentence, since logic always strictly checks the meaning of what is said from the point of view of language, for this reason such a sentence as ‘trees eat apples’ which is perfect from the point of grammar (syntax), but not from the point of meaning. Such a sentence is not permissible (this sentence can be pronounced, but a person who says this will not be accepted to a healthy society). Language conveys only that which is the result of thought processes and it in its turn, must be an objective reflection of reality. Language does not create a deep structure, i.e. the semantic part; it only encodes the results of thought processes and transmits orally or in written form with the help of linguistic units according to the laws of logic to surface. The grammar as a component of the language cannot ignore mind, since grammar usage is determined by contextual syntax semantics, i.e. sentence proposition based on logics.

R. Langacker in his work ‘Cognitive Grammar’ (1987) assigns semantics a central place in grammar, considering it the main in a language.

*‘The meaningfulness of grammar becomes apparent only with an appropriate view of linguistic meaning. In cognitive semantics, meaning is identified as the conceptualization associated with linguistic expressions [9. P. 4].*

R. Jackendoff (2002) considers that ‘language is instantiated in the minds and therefore the brains of language users, so that linguistics is to be regarded as a branch of psychology’ [10. P. XIV].

*Concept meaning (Cm) and language meaning (Lm) represent two pieces of a single human cognitive process: decision-making (Cm) in conceptual structure and its interpretation (Lm) in surface structure. Such duplication of the meanings of the concept ☼ and the word ‘sun’ is a prerequisite for the synchronization of deep and surface structures and the appropriate transformations from the former to the latter. The distinction between the concept ☼ and the word ‘sun’ in their form. They have the same functions (concept and lexis functions), because functions depend on Cm and Lm, they are the same [11. P. 20 —21].*

Language can not exist without logics, i.e. without plans of contents.

**Counterargument to the second conclusion.** If the combination of *gerund with an auxiliary verb(s)* has the aspect meaning and it means that it is the plan of the aspect expression and this single continuum of expression expresses all other meanings of verb categories. A plan of expression (the gerund: *okyp* + the auxiliary verb: *otyrmyñ*) exists if there is a plan of content (process aspect), if both plans (content and expression) are available, then there the aspect category exists.

**Counterargument to the third conclusion.** Verb tense and verb aspect are two independent, autonomous discrete categories, such autonomous meanings of these categories are planned a priori in the language matrix, and they never participate in creating of meaning of each other. For example, both predicates (1) *istedi — did*, (2) *istep boldy — have done* express the past tense, but, regardless of this, they express different aspects: (1) factual (2) result, besides it expresses other verb categorical meanings.

The past tense is not the indicator of the result aspect; it is only the indicator of the past tense and no more. The aspect expresses an internal action development stages, tense simply localizes the action on the time line.

## 2. THE MAIN CONCLUSIONS

The results of analyses show, that the Kazakh language has a set of developed aspect category. It has the plans of contents and its own plans of expressions. It is impossible not to have the aspect category in languages, including the Kazakh language, the aspect category is one of the dominant verb categories, expressing different types of actions inherent to human being, which reveals the essence of each sentence proposition.

© Какжанова Ф.А., 2019

Дата поступления: 12.03.2019

Дата приема в печать: 15.04.2019

## REFERENCES

1. Sauranbaev, N.T. (1982). Problems of Kazakh linguistic. Almata: Science Press. pp. 12—17. [In Russ.].
2. Amanzholov, S.A. (1958). Problems of the verbal aspect in the Turkic languages. In *Questions of the grammar of the Turkic languages*. Alma-Ata, Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR. pp. 41—44. [In Russ.].
3. Balakaev, M.M. (1958). Problems of the verbal aspect in the Turkic languages. In *Questions of the grammar of the Turkic languages*. Alma-Ata, Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR. pp. 62. [In Russ.].
4. Kakzhanova, F.A. (2015). The Aspect category and its subspects in the Kazakh language. Karaganda. [In Russ.].
5. Kantor, G. (1985). Works on Set Theory. Moscow: Nauka. [In Russ.].
6. Festinger, L. (1999). Theory of cognitive dissonance, Trans. from English A. Anistratenko, I. Znaesheva. SPb.: Yuventa. [In Russ.].
7. Serebrennikov, B.A. (1958). Problems of the verbal aspect in the Turkic languages. In *Questions of the grammar of the Turkic languages*. Alma-Ata, Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR. pp. 29—30. [In Russ.].
8. Shor, R.O. & Chemodanov, N.S. (1945). Introduction to linguistics. Moscow: State Teaching and Pedagogical Publishing House of the People's Commissariat of Education of the RSFSR. [In Russ.].
9. Langacker, R.W. (2008). Cognitive Grammar. Basic Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Jackendoff, R. (2002). Foundation of Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
11. Kakzhanova, F.A. (2013). Views on Grammar. USA. Fast Pencil. 2013. pp. 21—22.

УДК 811.512.122

DOI: 10.22363/2313-2299-2019-10-2-513-521

## О КАТЕГОРИИ АСПЕКТА В КАЗАХСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

**Ф.А. Какжанова**

Карагандинский государственный университет им. Е.А. Букетова  
Ул. Университетская, 28, Караганда, Казахстан, 100028

В статье исследуется проблема категории аспекта, выражающей на морфологическом уровне главную идею предложения на казахском языке. Автор исследует концептуальное смешение категорий аспекта и времени в казахском языке, что приводит к определенным трудностям не только в про-



цессе обучения языку, но и в ходе перевода с казахского языка на другой, и наоборот. Категория аспекта не имеет зафиксированного академическими словарями значения, несмотря на то, что у нее есть объективный план содержания и выражения в казахском языке.

Существуют разные мнения о категории аспекта в казахском языке: некоторые лингвисты признают ее существование, другие отрицают. Однако категория аспекта не представлена в морфологии казахских глаголов.

Статья посвящена анализу объективных предпосылок создания аспектной категории в языках, в том числе казахском, и причинам появления субъективных отрицаний аспектной категории в названном языке.

**Ключевые слова:** аспект, единый континуум, план содержания, план выражения, теория множеств, дискретное значение, когнитивный диссонанс.

### БИБЛИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ СПИСОК

1. Сауранбаев Н.Т. Проблемы казахского языкознания. Алмата: Наука Пресс, 1982. С. 12—17.
2. Аманжолов С.А. Проблемы словесного аспекта в тюркских языках // Вопросы грамматики тюркских языков. Алма-Ата: Изд-во Академии наук Казахской ССР, 1958. С. 41—44.
3. Балакаев М.М. Проблемы словесного аспекта в тюркских языках // Вопросы грамматики тюркских языков. Алма-Ата: Изд-во Академии наук Казахской ССР, 1958.
4. Какжанова Ф.А. Категория Аспект и ее субаспекты на казахском языке. Караганда, 2015.
5. Кантор Г. Работает над теорией множеств. М.: Наука, 1985.
6. Фестингер Л. Теория когнитивного диссонанса / пер. с англ. А. Анистратенко, И. Знаешева. СПб.: Ювента, 1999.
7. Серебренников Б.А. Проблемы словесного аспекта в тюркских языках // Вопросы грамматики тюркских языков. Алма-Ата: Изд-во Академии наук Казахской ССР, 1958. С. 29—30.
8. Шор Р.О., Чемоданов Н.С. Введение в языкознание. М.: Государственное учебно-педагогическое изд-во Народного комиссариата просвещения РСФСР, 1945.
9. Langacker R.W. *Cognitive Grammar. Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
10. Jackendoff R. *Foundation of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
11. Kakzhanova F.A. *Views on Grammar*. USA. Fast Pencil, 2013. P. 21—22.

#### Для цитирования:

Какжанова Ф.А. О категории аспекта в казахском языке // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика. Т. 10. № 2. С. 513—521. doi: 10.22363/2313-2299-2019-10-2-513-521.

#### For citation:

Kakzhanova, F.A. (2019). The Kazakh language has the aspect category in its matrix. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 10 (2), 513—521. doi: 10.22363/2313-2299-2019-10-2-513-521.

#### Сведения об авторе:

Какжанова Фазира Айдархановна, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Карагандинский государственный университет им. Е.А. Букетова; *научные интересы:* проблемы семантики, семантика синтаксиса, функциональная грамматика, и отдельные аспекты морфологии (категория аспекта, категория падежа, модальность, нефиниты и др.); *e-mail:* fazira11@mail.ru

#### Information about the author:

Fazira A. Kakzhanova, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Karaganda State University. E.A. Buketova; *research interests:* problems of semantics, semantics of syntax, functional grammar, and certain aspects of morphology (category of aspect, category of case, modality, nonfinite, etc.) *e-mail:* fazira11@mail.ru