Functional and semantic field of aspectuality in different-systemic languages

Ámbito funcional y semántico de la aspectualidad en las lenguas de distinto sistema

Written by:
Aliyeva Gulchohra Babali[74]
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2266-947X

Abstract

Comparative analysis of linguistic phenomena provides the development of the problem in two planes: semantic - how similar or different is the volume of concepts in the national language world pictures, and functional - the means offered by language to actualize the concept in speech. This study provides a detailed analysis of the functional and semantic field of aspectuality in the English and Ukrainian languages at all levels: from grammatical to syntactic. The article also considers the application of the functional-semantic field of aspectuality as a tool for comparative study of multisystemic as to identify their common and distinctive features. The goal of the article was to identify and compare ways of transferring Aspectuality and their main regularities in Ukrainian and English. For this purpose, the phenomenon of Aspectuality in Ukrainian and English was compared from the position of modern aspectological views.

Keywords: Aspectuality, functional-semantic field, grammatical category of kind, perfect kind, imperfect kind, perfect, imperfect, limit verbs.

Resumen

El análisis comparativo de los fenómenos lingüísticos proporciona el desarrollo del problema en dos planos: el semántico - cuán similar o diferente es el volumen de los conceptos en las imágenes del mundo de las lenguas nacionales, y el funcional - los medios que ofrece la lengua para actualizar el concepto en el discurso. Este estudio ofrece un análisis detallado del campo funcional y semántico de la aspectualidad en las lenguas inglesa y ucraniana en todos los niveles: desde el gramatical hasta el sintáctico. El artículo también considera la aplicación del campo funcional-semántico de la aspectualidad como herramienta para el estudio comparativo de los multisistémicos en cuanto a la identificación de sus rasgos comunes y distintivos. El objetivo del artículo era identificar y comparar las formas de transferencia de la aspectualidad y sus principales regularidades en ucraniano e inglés. Para ello, se comparó el fenómeno de la aspectualidad en ucraniano e inglés desde la posición de los modernos puntos de vista aspectuales.

Palabras clave: Aspectualidad, campo funcional-semántico, categoría gramatical de tipo, tipo perfecto, tipo imperfecto, perfecto, imperfecto, verbos límite.

Introduction

The system-structural approach to linguistic phenomena, developed on functional grammar, provides an opportunity to demonstrate the relationship and interdependence of multilevel functional-semantic categories, to analyze situations of the aspectuality in the process of their functioning, to connect linguistic and speech phenomena into a single whole. A significant number of modern linguistic studies are aimed at studying multilevel linguistic phenomena and means and their complex interaction, when each component of the system is considered in terms of its functional relevance.

The most common universal semantic categories in the languages of the world include the

[74] PhD in Philology Associate Professor Head of the Department of English Language Azerbaijan State Marine Academy, Baku, Azerbaijan.

functional-semantic category of aspectuality, conveyed by verbal means of different levels of language, specialized for the representation of the nature of the course and distribution of action in time. Aspectual relations and their expression belong to one of the hardest-studied phenomena in the study and comparison of languages, since the problem is to understand the relationship not only between the species categories of two languages, but also directly or indirectly related to it other grammatical categories, as well as lexical and morphological units. Now, despite numerous explorations, the functioning of linguistic units with aspectual meanings is covered in detail in the literature, the components and structure of the functional-semantic category of aspectuality, ways of aspectual derivation and means of representation, and other aspects of the problem under study are not defined.

The material of our study is English and Ukrainian languages. These languages belong to different groups, both genetically and typologically. English belongs to the Germanic languages of the branch of Indo-European languages and Ukrainian is to the East Slavic languages. From the structural-typological point of view English is an analytical language and Ukrainian is a fusional language.

Identifying and comparing ways of transferring aspectuality and their main regularities in Ukrainian and English is the **purpose of our article.**

The object of the study is the functional-semantic field of aspectuality and its structure.

The subject of the study is the specific features of Ukrainian and English verbs, which are the structural components of any functional-semantic field.

Literature Review

The study of the functional-semantic category of aspectuality since the middle of the twentieth century is rapidly developing as an independent branch of linguistics - aspectology. However, the problem of describing the functionally semantic field in Ukrainian linguistics remains open. Functional and semantic studies of the analyzed material in the typological comparison of Ukrainian and English in modern linguistics are few.

The category of aspectuality and the problems associated with it, its components and means of expression in their studies within the framework of the functional-grammatical approach were considered by such linguists as (Bączkiewicz et al., 2021; Melnyk et al., 2021), usually considered from the view of the structural-semantic. The linguistic concepts developed by them formed the theoretical basis of domestic aspectology, which develops a model of functional grammar based on the concepts of functional-semantic field and categorical situation.

In most Indo-European languages, space is expressed by means of noun paradigms and time by verb paradigms, that is, space is subject and time is associated with an event. The historical and linguistic analysis of the scientific literature on the problems of the categories of aspectuality, modes of action and verbal species shows us that in the language of any system the history of their study takes its origins from the isolation and description of the most clearly expressed specialized verbal means with one or another aspectual semantics. Next is the analysis of the categories of verbal species and species meanings (modes of verbal action). Functional-semantic representations of tenses in Ukrainian, Russian and English from the view of comparative-typological approach were analyzed.

We agree with the author's judgments, because, as the linguistic material shows, the differentiation on the grounds of speed\slowness, constancy\moment, concreteness\generalization is the most common among the linguistic material, as well as the corresponding concepts, emphasizes their importance for speakers of comparable languages.

In addition to the field of locality, the field of aspectuality interacts with the field of temporality. If aspectuality determines the nature of the course and distribution of action in time, temporality, in turn, covers temporal relations, oriented to the moment of speech or any other moment, associated with the time of broadcasting. The national specificity of the use of words with temporal semantics in Ukrainian and English is highlighted (Lykhosherstova, 2018). It is known that the functional-semantic field of aspectuality interacts with other functional-semantic fields and forms diffuse (combined) segments. For example, the functional-semantic field of Aspectuality, integrating and interpenetrating into the functional-semantic field of locality and temporality, forms segments, where aspectual-locative and aspectual-temporal values are combined. In Ukrainian, the leading center of the

functional-semantic category of aspectuality is the grammatical category of the verbal form (Derdzakyan,2021).

As noted by Pérez-Sabater (2021) "scientific interest in the aspectual problematics and its acute debatability caused the emergence of such a science as aspectology". The category of species in direct connection with the category of time is considered (Kuzmina et al., 2021). The Ukrainian aspectological opinion, apart from the study of grammatical species and species-temporal categories, studies "the aspectual classes of verbs (dynamic/static, limiting/indefinite) and their subclasses, that is, the ways of action, as well as various aspectual-relevant context components expressed by non-verbal vocabulary and syntactic means". However, despite the notable intensification of "aspectological research during the last decades", "which "became a prerequisite for scholars to unite their efforts around solving the complex problems of Aspectuality and species" (Pérez-Sabater, 2021) the question of revealing the essence of this category still remains open and requires further research both on the example of the Ukrainian language and on the examples of other languages, so we were so interested in the topic of the study of the multisystem as to identify the differences and common features in English and Ukrainian.

Research Questions or Hypotheses

Data collection and analysis method

The purpose of the article determined the choice of the main methods of research: descriptive method (description of the functional-semantic field of aspectuality and its structure; systematization of approaches to determining the features of the category of verbal species); method of semantic analysis (determination of semantic categories of verbs) method of comparative analysis (comparison of morphological and grammatical characteristics of verbs in English and Ukrainian languages).

The methodological basis of the study is the fundamental features of languages, their systematicity and hierarchy, the interconnectedness and interdependence of linguistic phenomena, the integrative interaction of lexis and grammar.

The work uses the methodology of system-structural linguistic research in order to identify the functional and semantic features of the aspectuality of the relevant Ukrainian and English verbal means, component analysis of linguistic units, comparative analysis of the phenomena of Ukrainian and English languages. The source of linguistic material is texts of classical and modern Ukrainian and English literature and periodicals. The breadth of the factual material, its diversity and versatility allowed to identify multilevel means of representation of aspectual meanings in the above-mentioned languages.

Results

Analysis of the Functional and Semantic Field of Aspectuality

The totality of the verbal means of a multilevel linguistic hierarchy, which are used to convey the same meaning, constitute a functional-semantic category. In modern aspectology of ubiquitous usage has also acquired the term functional-semantic field, the main position of which is the grouping of language means interacting on a semantic-functional basis.

The most common and universal semantic category according to many researchers is the functional-semantic field of aspectuality. The study of this category has led to considerable interest in the comparative study of languages, which aims to identify the similarities and divergences of these languages.

For a long time, the category of aspectuality has been studied primarily as a feature of Slavic languages, and aspectuality in other languages has been considered against the background of the Slavic model. Today, the situation has changed somewhat, and new works on aspectuality have appeared, based on comparative and typological approaches, describing the diversity of aspectual systems in the world's languages. Now the generally accepted point of view is the following: the Slavic type is only one of the existing aspectual systems.

The analysis of such linguistic phenomenon as aspectuality in English is a more difficult task than the description of this category in Ukrainian. This is due, firstly, to the relatively smaller number of works devoted to Aspectuality in English, and secondly, to the fact that all existing conclusions are also quite debatable. There is no consensus among linguists concerning both the semantic aspectual inventory itself (the number of "species" or aspectually significant features) and the belonging of morphological forms of the category in question. Opinions are divided: some

linguists consider aspectuality only as morphologically allocated forms, another part recognizes its presence only in the lexical meaning of verbs. Valuable observations on the presence and expression of meaningful aspectual categories are contained in works that examine aspectuality in English typologically, combining it with the broader context of a set of verb categories, including kind, time, and possibly modality, mode of action.

We agree with the statements that the category of aspectuality is a functional-semantic category and has a field structure with a predicative core. The semantic content of this category, is the nature of the course of action, and the expression - morphological, word-formation, lexical and syntactic means (Bączkiewicz et al., 2021).

In each language we can distinguish a functional-semantic field of aspectuality, as all languages present interacting linguistic means expressing the nature of the course of action in time. The main components of the structure of any functional-semantic field are the core and its periphery. Basically, the core is the grammatical (morphological) category of species. At the periphery are: 1) the classifying lexical and grammatical category of the verb's species character; 2) the classifying semantic (lexical) category of modes of action.

The species character of the verb is expressed by the opposition of limit and non-specified verbs, and the category of modes of action includes lexical-semantic groupings of verbs (they convey different modes of action).

Verb species as a grammatical category expression of aspectuality

Thus, let us elaborate on the analysis of the category of aspectuality. The grammatical category of species (the core of the functional-semantic field of aspectuality) is present only in some languages and there is still no single, satisfactory, universally accepted definition. The term is first encountered in Slavic linguists, so it would be more logical to begin our analysis by the Ukrainian language.

In the Ukrainian language, the verb form is considered as a binary category, including two opposite groups of verbs - perfect (perfective) and imperfect (imperfective) forms. The oppositional use of the species forms is important in the linguistic consciousness of a native speaker of the Ukrainian language in situations such as: "Andrew wrote, wrote, but did not finish it. The

students read, read, but didn't finish, etc. " As we can see from the example, the semantic basis of this type opposition is the opposition of reaching / not reaching the internal limiting of the verbal action. In Ukrainian, as in other Slavic languages, the perfect form expresses the "completeness of the situation", the achievement of its natural (internal) limit, and the imperfect form expresses the "incomplete" nature of the situation. Thus, in the lines of Lina Kostenko's poetry: "There is still a name, and the river is no longer there. The willows have withered away ... "and" Where have you gone, river? Come back to life! The shores have cracked lips... "The highlighted verbs of the perfect form indicate the limit landmarks of the action, on its completeness and symbolize the result".

It should be noted that the species differs only in the past and future tenses. The idea of completeness does not coincide in the Ukrainian language with the present and the forms of the present turn out to be out of aspectual opposition. Thus, in the fragment "And what about man? What about man? He lives on the ground. He does not fly. No wings. Has wings", in the verbs of the present tense lives, does not fly, has, we trace the absence of action boundaries.

Most linguists consider it necessary to terminologically distinguish between the category of species in Slavic languages and the aspectual category in other languages, since the Slavic species is as a special case of the general concept of "aspect". The development of the Slavic verb species is not limited to the field of aspectuality. From the very beginning, the interaction between the fields of aspectuality and temporality played an essential role. Thus, the development of the category of the species was carried out in such a field structure, which already had grammatical elements - aspectual-temporal.

However, not all scholars consider kind a morphological category, because kind in the Ukrainian language is not based on the opposition of inflections, that is, grammatical forms.

Verbs with different kinds differ from one another in the ungrammatical element of meaning.

View is considered in morphology as a tribute to the tradition established back when word-formation was not separated from morphology. If we take this point of view, the species core of the functional-semantic field of aspectuality in the

Ukrainian language is built only on the binary opposition of grammatical meanings of perfect and imperfect kinds, that is, there are no unified grammatical forms that build the opposition of perfect and imperfect kinds. Thus, the category of species is a more classifying category than the word-derivative.

It is worth noting that for the English language, not only the belonging of morphological forms to the aspectuality, but also the semantic aspectual inventory itself (the number of "kinds" or important aspectual meanings) continues to be debatable. It is thought necessary to distinguish between aspectuality as a grammatical category of the verb, aspectuality as a lexical and grammatical character of verbs, and aspectuality as part of the semantic structure of the sentence, that is, the result of semantic interpretation, which takes into account the meaning not only of verb categories. Just like aspectuality in Ukrainian, this category in English is conveniently represented in the form of a functional-semantic field. Aspectuality as a grammatical category will correspond to the center of the functional-semantic field, while lexical and grammatical characteristics of verbs and other means will be located towards the periphery. The functional-semantic field of aspectuality in English should probably be presented as polycentric. The number of centers depends on the number of the identified aspectual categories, in which the views of scholars differ quite strongly.

There is also a great diversity of opinion on the problem of species in English. Since in Old English the category of kind was represented by two kinds - imperfect and perfect, some scholars erroneously include only the perfect and the imperfect in the category of kind. In English the aspectual meanings are transmitted lexically, through the context in combination with some temporal forms, which are verbositive, while in Ukrainian the category of species is word-formation, independent of the category of time, although it is related to it. Therefore, there is every reason to assert that there is no verb category of species in modern English, although it was in Old English.

From a typological point of view, the meanings of Aspectuality in English can in no way be reduced to a single binary opposition of the "perfect/imperfect" type. As Kruty et al. (2022) rightly points out, scholars who support such a binary approach to the universal category of kind are usually too strongly influenced by the "Slavic model" of type.

Two species categories are distinguished in the English language system: the type of "development" (continuum/indefinitum). (continuum/indefinitum) and the species of "retrospective coordination" (perfect/imperfect). However, we should not forget that in terms of content, aspectuality and temporality are different. Temporal meanings are associated with the localization of the designated action in time, with its orientation in relation to the moment of speech. Aspectual meanings, on the contrary, have no such functions and show how the action proceeds and is distributed in time, but without relation to the moment of speech. For English, not only the belonging of morphological forms to Aspectuality, but also the semantic aspectual inventory itself (the number of "kinds" or important aspectual meanings) continues to be debatable (Kuzmina et al., 2021). However, the grammatical core of the functional-semantic field of aspectuality in English includes four grammatically expressed types: indefinite: "Work was a shining refuge when wind sank its tooth into my mind"; prolonged: "Everything we love is going away"; perfunctory "On the birthday of the world, I begin to contemplate, what I have done and left, undone"; and perfunctory extended: "I had been talking with Rosina".

Limit and non-limit verbs

The study of the lexical and grammatical category of verb species, expressed by the opposition of limiting (to shout, discover) and non-limiting verbs (lie, lie), is also essential in the study of verbal species. It represents a transitive link between the modes of action and the grammatical category of species. There are many contradictory opinions concerning the definition of the very concept of liminality.

A limit can be defined as a situation in which the process continues up to a certain point (Comrie, 1976). A direct connection between the limit and the presence or absence of an internal boundary, that is, there must be an indication of an internal constraint (Smith, 1997).

The phenomenon of real and potential limitation by place, the situation occupies on the axis of transition from one state to the opposite, has been studied in detail ("yes-no-transition") (Dietrich, 1995).

Let's consider his point of view on the example of the verbs to cook and to become cooked the author illustrates the presence of a potential limit

in the first example and the achievement of a real limit in the second.

Liminality should be analyzed as "the meaning of completeness (exhaustiveness) by a given verb's fixed manifestation of an action in time," which is often the basis of aspectological studies (Bączkiewicz et al., 2021). The definition of liminality as "the ability of any event to have a definite, definite, distinct, natural completion in time defines. That one should distinguish between special limiting states (subject to the indication or proper moment of transition of a given state to the opposite) and non-limiting states (subject to its absence), argues (Britsyn et al., 2021).

Radyuk & Kozubenko (2021) calls these concepts "situations of conditional duration" and "situations of conditional duration". Limit is what is included in the semantics of the verb and indicates the internal, the very nature of the action provided for the boundary. It is defined as a latent semantic category, it has no grammatical means of expression, but it has a lexical and grammatical meaning and is manifested, for example, in Ukrainian in the ability of verbs to form species pairs. Let us consider several examples of limiting verbs: verbal verbs of unidirectional motion - run, fly, crawl; of concrete physical action - build, cook, weed, sew, chop, cut, break; and most verbs of intellectual activity - count, teach, multiply. Here is an example from Ukrainian classical literature: *"In the morning, did what or not, by nature I ran to my friends, to gather them at five to look at the drill; As I went for water, and there my friends met me, and started laughing at me, that I am a whitewash, as you call me, mother, and I went for water, and I cannot carry buckets, I do not hold a bucket the wrong way; completely ridiculed; and here Trohimu dogs as they attack me, and I as run, as frightened ! And what, Oksana! - Peter began to say, hurrying after her, that like a swallow she flies and does not touch the ground for joy; Our Oksana did not beg, and like a fly flew from him and jumped into the house ...; Oksana stopped joking and running to her friends: she still sits at home, then sewing, then spinning".* (Kvitka-Osnov'yanenko, 1982).

The semantic limitation of these imperfect verbs, we conclude that they are able to correlate with perfect forms, but they can realize this ability only by the presence of such appropriate grammatical means as fully desemantized prefixes. Verbs of unidirectional movement do not have these means, as the prefixes give them the grammatical meaning of the perfect kind,

thus making them potential perfectives and giving them different word-formation meanings, e.g., compare the following verbs: to fly into, to fly over, to fly into, etc. Specific prefix correlations of verbal verbs of concrete physical action and intellectual activity form selectively, depending on the ability of this or that prefix to desemantize and turn into a perfect kind indicator in the structure of the verb with the corresponding lexical meaning. Among the main means of their grammatical perfectivation we find the prefix po, e.g., type pairs: build - build, count - count, multiply - multiply, sew - sew, weed–weed out. The prefix c/co-, c-, for example, the species pairs: to build - to build, to hammer - to grind, to knit - to bind, to knit - to bind, and to build - to grind, for example, the species pairs: to build - to build, to hammer - to grind, to knit - to bind.

The non-substantive verbs, respectively, are the absence of an internal limit, which would limit the course of the action at least in perspective. Unsubstantive verbs with the meaning of sound, speech and thinking, verbal verbs conveying differently directed motion, substantive verbs expressing the word meaning "to be someone, to resemble someone" and "to engage in a certain activity": *"Here Oksana was silent, kept silent and said: "You have already left the seventh and thought"; You said that you would go for me, let me send people, beat yourself already ... They gather to talk, but they say nothing, they kiss..."* (Kvitka-Osnov'yanenko, 1982).

There are some differences in the manifestation of the sign of liminality in Ukrainian and English. In English, the limitation of the verb can be expressed through the object, which marks the end point of the situation, for example: "Joe is reading" (indefinite), and "Joe is reading a book" (limiting). In English, liminality is understood as the ability of a verb to express an action that cannot continue after reaching its conclusion. For example, to arrive, to bring, to break, to catch. The non-boundary verbs, on the contrary, do not have the meaning of the finality of the action they express to live, to belong. But here we meet a difficulty in our way, which is that there are many verbs in English that have a dual species character, their limit depends on the context, because they can act with the meaning of both limit and non-limiting action to laugh, to feel, to move, to look. Examples of limiting verbs: He drank a cup of coffee. She built a house. I ran home. Verbs in the extended tense forms are usually indefinite, and those in the past tense forms are usually limiting.

Since the interpretation of the category of limitation of English verbs is not unambiguous, it is recommended to distinguish between the final spatial endpoint associated with the feature and the final temporal endpoint of the event, which refers to their allocated feature. The difference between the temporal endpoint and the spatial endpoint is the scope of the (Xiao & McEnery, 2004, p. 334)

Spatial expressions are common grammatically and semantically. Thus, a limitation in space always involves a limitation in time, but not vice versa. For example, the situation "to walk to school" indicates a specific distance and has a spatial boundary. It also has a finite time point, for example, "It usually takes the child a quarter of an hour to walk to school" (to cover the distance). However, if the child has spent not fifteen minutes on the distance today, but only ten minutes, that is, the situation is limited in time, but without reaching the final spatial point (Lyons & John, 1995).

Supporting the statement (Van Voorst, 1988), we consider a situation to be limiting only when it has a finite object (object of termination), that is, an object with a change of state.

For example, in the sentence "John wrote a letter" the indicative is expressed because "a letter" is a finite object, whereas "John walked" does not express liminality because there is no such object in this situation. But we have no right to say that only combinations with transitive verbs can express a limiting action. For example, the situation "The window broke", in which the verb to break is non-transitive, is considered limiting because it contains an object that has undergone a change of state. And in the example "John wrote letters", the action has no internal boundary, because prefixed, uncounted nouns as well as plural nouns cannot act as finite objects and are spatially bounded. They form predicates representing not a series of separate actions, but a single indefinite event: "Sand fell on the roof all morning". This is because collected, uncounted nouns denote a single substance, regardless of its quantitative indicators. For example, if we add a little more milk to milk, it is still milk, and part of running is still running, whereas a letter plus another letter is having two letters (pl.), and if in the situation of running a mile we run only part of a distance, it cannot be "called running a mile" (Derdzakyan, 2021).

That is, the boundaries between the groups of limiting and non-limiting verbs are not always stable in the languages mentioned. A non-limiting verb may in some contexts express a threshold meaning; but limiting verbs do not, as a rule, lose their intrinsic limit meaning. In addition, between these two groups resides a large group of verbs of a dual nature capable of acting in one sense or another.

The absence of an indication of the facet of an individual action characterizes it as unrestricted in its manifestation, i.e., the indefinite and corresponding indefinite verbs are of the imperfect form, e.g., look, sleep. In other words, odd imperfect verbs can always be regarded as indefinite. The difference between the imperfect meaning of unsubstantial and limiting verbs is that in the former there is no limit, and in the latter, it has not yet been reached. What the imperfect verbs have in common is that there is no limit to the manifestation of the action. In the case of repeated action, for example: "I walk the promenade every day." The boundary may be in a separate action, but the cycle of action is not completed.

In Ukrainian, all verbs of the perfect form are limiting, they have a sign of actually reaching the limit of action, which is the basis of the categorical meaning of the perfect form: integrity, limited by the limit. The imperfect forms may be both limiting and non-limiting. The categorical meaning of the imperfect form is defined negatively in relation to that of the perfect form as "the meaning of an action unlimited by a material boundary, having no sign of wholeness". The division of verbs into limiting and non-limiting is also important in English grammar, so their distinction is closely related to the use of species and temporal forms.

Semantic divisions of verbs and aspectuality

Another peripheral component of aspectuality is the mode of action, i.e., semantic divisions of verbs. If the core of the semantic category of aspectuality is the grammatical category of kind, then at its periphery is the lexicalandgrammatical category of modes (genera) of verbal action. Methods of verbal action are related to the semantics of the verb, and their meaning is determined by the entire grammatical system of language and semantic-paradigmatic lexical relations. Now the problems of opposing connection and interaction of the type and mode of action of verbs are considered in more detail, calling verb genera the series of verbs which are characterized by morphological uniformity and semantic commonality.

The content side of the species category and the modalities category of the verbal action are sufficiently close in their semantic content, and therefore we may even argue that they belong to the same sphere of meanings (Kruty et al., 2022).

Since both kind and ways of a verbal action convey certain differences in the types of realization of a verbal action or in the types of expression (interpretation) of this realization by the speaker (Melnyk et al., 2021). To give an example: the verbs jump, bite show the single mode of verbal action with respect to the verbs jump, bite and are their correlates. Vocabular modes play an important role with respect to the verb mode, as they form new verbal lexemes with qualitatively new meaning according to the primary verb: to play - to lose, and have, as a rule, correlate species pairs: to lose - to lose.

The further away from the core the linguistic means are, the less grammatical and more lexical they are. Nowadays, they associate the modes of verbal action with the category of kind, calling them semantic-verb groupings of verbs. Some verbs denote the beginning, the occurrence of action, others show that the course of action is limited to what interval of time, others denote action performed in a single act, the fourth express action, repeatedly repeated (Melnyk et al., 2021).

English ways of the verb also convey different ways of action, such as beginning, iteration, completeness, which, in turn, form their own microfield and are expressed by different levels of means. For example, the repetition of a verbal action in the past tense is expressed by the construction used to i would: *"Clement **used to** say this was a case of envy", "She **would** spend an hour a day 'doing her face", "The policeman **used to** stand at the corner for two hours each day", "The old professor **used** always **to** arrive late".*

One way of expressing the beginning of a verbal action is with the verb constructionsstart, become, begin, get, commence: "*She said: "Why blue when it is white, why blue for heaven's sake?"and **started to cry** again".*

There are various ways and ways of studying the relationship between kind and modes of verbal action. However, modern linguistics makes a clear distinction between kind as a grammatical category of the verb and the various ways of expressing the characteristic of an action, which are collectively called ways of action.

Discussion

The functional-semantic field of aspectuality in Ukrainian is monocentric. In its center is the category of kind, which covers the whole system of Ukrainian verbs. To the periphery of the Aspectuality field belong the modes of verbal action, aspectual features in the lexical meaning of verbs (limitation/non-limitation). If we represent aspectuality in English as a functional-semantic field, then in the center we can probably locate aspectual meaning regularly expressed by morphological temporal forms, while aspectual lexical-grammatical characteristics of verbs and other means will be located towards the periphery. In contrast to the functional-semantic field of the Ukrainian language, in English it is polycentric. Formalization of aspectual constructions in English is the most difficult to study, since the category of kind has no clear grammatical expression, but is reflected in a ramified system of aspectual genders, which include multiplicity. The peculiarity of the aspect in English consists in the fact that it is represented by a significant number of categories characterizing the way the action proceeds in time with the help of multilevel linguistic means.

So, if the verb kind is a special grammatical category, not peculiar to all languages of the world, then the way of action is the lexical meaning of the verb of each language. Since the category of aspectuality (according to the two-component theory) includes not only grammatical component, but also non-grammatical, in Ukrainian language cannot be limited to the verb category of kind. According to affirmatively assert that the category of aspectuality in the Ukrainian language is a complex phenomenon, which is not yet fully investigated requires further fundamental research.

In our opinion, it is interesting to study in a comparative aspect the functional-semantic field of aspectuality in the Turkish and Ukrainian languages at all levels. After all, in the Turkish language the set of means is wider; for example, purely syntactic means of realization of causality semantics: participles, pseudo-participles and derivative complexes -dığııçin, -dığından, -dığındandolayı, -acağııçin, -acağından (dolayı). A similar concept (or group of concepts united within the conceptual field) in Turkish is verbalized by means of participles, derivative complexes and gerundial complexes with prototypical meaning of causality and the presence of an additional semantic component - temporality (more precisely relative temporality,

or cabs Panov (2021) for example (for the verb gelmek in the third person singular): geldiğiiçin; geldiğinden; geldiğindendolayı, the possibility of using gerundial complexes to objectify the concept in question is related only to their combination with periphrastic forms. A detailed study of participles, participles and grammatical complexes formed on their basis - their semantics, communicative functions as well as "conceptual content" (i.e., concepts of linguistic world pictures of Ukrainian and Turkish languages, which are verbalized by means of these formal means) - is the task of our further research.

Conclusion

In the network of modes of action there is no structure peculiar to morphological categories, there is no grammatical opposition of morphological forms, modes of action by their nature are subclasses of the verb lexicon, lexical and grammatical classes. Such aspectual features as limitation/non-limitation, immediacy/static/dynamic are associated with the category of verb kind. Liminality characterizes an action in terms of its directionality/non-directionality to the limit, upon reaching which the action ceases. There is a certain difference in the interpretation of liminality for Ukrainian and English verbs. In Ukrainian, limiting verbs form limiting pairs, where the imperfect verb denotes a process that is potentially aimed at reaching the limit. It is very easy to define a limit verb pair: you can take them in a phrase like "to build, to build and to build". In addition, verbs that are non-limiting in some meanings can become limiting when combined with a complement (of a certain type) or circumstance: To drink and drink coffee, to walk slowly and come to market. This is the behavior characteristic of English verbs: One and the same verb can act as a limiting and as a non-limiting.

Summarizing the material, we conclude that the functional-grammatical field of aspectuality in the English and Ukrainian languages do not have complete isomorphism. Functional and semantic branching of the considered grammatical forms its constant development in language and speech, the completeness of its field representation in the studied languages separately and in their typological comparison.

In Ukrainian, according to many linguists, there are no pure grammatical forms of species expression, and the meaning of species is closely related to the ways, that is, changing the ways of

the verbal action inevitably leads to a change in the species meanings. English has grammatical forms of species expression that are independent of the species character and modes of verbal action. The spheres of Ukrainian and English aspectual-temporal network can by no means be considered equivalent. Ukrainian has the opposition of perfect and imperfect kinds with different semantic relations within verb pairs, a narrow temporal paradigm and ways of verbal action, which have specific and rather subtle aspectual meaning.

An extensive network of verb tenses and verb groups is available in English, denoting similar aspectual situations. The grounds for comparing languages of different types, should become the object of linguodidactics gives us an allocation in linguistics of functional-semantic categories. The conducted research allows us to deepen somewhat the scientific knowledge on the application in general and specific conditions, and clarify the definition of the structure of the functional-semantic field of aspectuality as a tool for a comparative study of the multisystem as to identify their differences and common features.

Bibliographic references

Bączkiewicz, A., Kizielewicz, B., Shekhovtsov, A., Yelmikheiev, M., Kozlov, V., & Sałabun, W. (2021). Comparative analysis of solar panels with determination of local significance levels of criteria using the MCDM methods resistant to the rank reversal phenomenon. Energies, 14(18), 5727. https://doi.org/10.3390/en14185727

Britsyn, V., Sukalenko, T., Ladyniak, N., Kaleniuk, S., & Zhelyazkova, V. (2021). Modern tendencies of development of norms of Ukrainian language. Linguistics and Culture Review, 5(S4), 102–113. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5ns4.1653

Comrie, B. (1976). Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems (Vol. 2). Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Derdzakyan, H. A. (2021). Functional category of aspectuality in the Russian and English languages. RUDN Journal of Language Studies Semiotics and Semantics, 12(1), 41–60. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2021-12-1-41-60

Dietrich, R., Klein, W., & Noyau, C. (1995). The Acquisition of Temporality in a Second Language (Studies in Bilingualism).

Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kruty, K., Chorna, H., Samsonova, O., Kurinna, A., Sorochynska, O., & Desnova, I. (2022). Genesis of grammatical structure of a preschool child language. Romanian Journal for Multidimensional Education [Revista Romaneasca Pentru Educatie Multidimensionala], 14(1Sup1), 495–528. https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/14.1sup1/563

Kuzmina, J., University of Latvia., Vinčela, Z., & University of Latvia. (2021). Technology-enhanced course in English theoretical grammar and phonetics at tertiary level. Baltic Journal of English Language Literature and Culture, 11, 79–97. https://doi.org/10.22364/bjellc.11.2021.06

Kvitka-Osnov'yanenko, G. (1982). Romance and stories. Dramatic create. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CK%5CV%5CKvitka6OsnovianenkoHryhorii.htm

Lykhosherstova, M. (2018, May 11). Sentence as Important Component of Functional-Semantic Field of Temporality in the Ukrainian and Arabic Languages. Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development, 15, 163-171. Retrieved from https://sjnpu.com.ua/index.php/journal/article/view/88

Lyons, J., & John, L. (1995). Linguistic semantics: An introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Melnyk, N. I., Bogush, A. M., Vertuhina, V. M., Trofaila, N. D., & Rohalska, N. V. (2021). Comparative research in the field of professional education of preschool teachers: comparative content analysis as a method of authentic interpretation of concepts. Linguistics and Culture Review, 5(S2), 231–245. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5ns2.1342

Panov, V. (2021). Untangling the functions of aspectual distinctions in the Lithuanian imperative against the background of Slavonic. Baltic Linguistics, 12(1), 295-321. https://doi.org/10.32798/bl.926

Pérez-Sabater, C. (2021). Moments of sharing, language style and resources for solidarity on social media: A comparative analysis. Journal of Pragmatics, 180, 266–282. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.04.034

Radyuk, A. V., & Kozubenko, A. V. (2021). Semantic classification of phraseological verbs in publicistic discourse of economic orientation. Revista Amazonia Investiga, 10(37), 107–115. https://doi.org/10.34069/ai/2021.37.01.11

Smith, C. (1997). The Parameter of Aspect. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Van Voorst, J. (1988). Event structure (Vol. 59). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Xiao, R., & McEnery, T. (2004). Aspect in Mandarin Chinese: A corpus-based study. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. https://www.academia.edu/19701300/Richard_Xiao_Tony_Mc_Enery_Aspect_In_Mandarin_Ch_Book_Fi_org