

ASPECTUAL CLASSIFICATION OF EVENTS

Musayev Abish Abilkazievich

Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh

Abstract: This article presents a comparative analysis of the course of events as a core component of aspectual semantics based on data from the English and Karakalpak languages. It outlines the principles for classifying situations into types such as states, activities, bounded processes, achievements, and instantaneous events, based on the criteria of dynamism, duration, and boundedness. Comparative examples demonstrate how a single event is conceptualized differently across languages and illustrate the occurrence of aspectual shifts during translation.

Key words: event-event sequence, aspectual classification, lexical aspect, type of situation, dynamism, continuity, telicity, atelicity, situation, activity, borderline process, achievement, semelfactive.

INTRODUCTION

Humans perceive actions and states in reality not merely based on the question “When did it occur?”, but also according to characteristics such as “How did it happen?”, “How long did it last?”, “Did it reach an internal limit?”, and “Was a result achieved?”. Language expresses these conceptual distinctions through verb meaning, grammatical form, objects, adverbial modifiers, word formation, and context. Therefore, classifying the unfolding of events is a shared concern of aspectology, semantics, comparative grammar, and translation theory.

While aspect refers to how the internal temporal structure of an event is viewed, lexical aspect or type of action determines the specific temporal characteristics of the event itself. B. Comrie defines aspect as a way of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation [1: 3]. He analyzes differences in the inherent meaning of verbs and predicates through the oppositions of punctuality versus durativity, telicity versus atelicity, and stativity versus dynamism [1: 41-51]. Thus, the classification of the situation encompasses both the lexical-semantic basis preceding the grammatical form and the final situation resulting from the interaction of form and context.

Z. Vendler classified English verbs into the categories of states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements based on their temporal properties [2: 143-149]. C. S. Smith supplemented this classification with semelfactives and systematically modeled the five types using the features of dynamicity, duration, and telicity [3: 17-35]. This approach is advantageous for cross-linguistic comparison because it relies on general semantic features rather than simply transferring established grammatical terms from one language to another.

The aim of this thesis is to systematize the aspectual types of event progression and to provide a comparative analysis of their expression in English and Karakalpak. The study employs componential, comparative-typological, and contextual methods..

MAIN PART

Event and aspectual situation

The terms “event,” “occurrence,” “process,” “action,” and “state” are used with varying scopes in the literature. In this article, “situation” serves as a generalizing term that encompasses both states and dynamic events. “Course” (or “progression”) refers to the internal temporal organization of a situation such as its division into stages, duration, progression toward a limit, instantaneous occurrence, or persistence without change. Thus, an aspectual classification of the course of events involves grouping situations expressed by predicates according to their internal temporal characteristics.

A. V. Bondarko considers the relation to the border as one of the main signs in the field of aspectuality. In his research entitles “Functional Grammar: A Field Approach” he did analysis on “boundary types”, “boundary relations” and “limiting situations” [4, p. 65-94]. In the functional-semantic approach, classification is not tied to a single verb lexeme. The grammatical form of the verb, the actants, the quantitative nature of the object, the cases of direction and time, and the discourse context together form an aspectual situation.

For example, the English verb “*write*” can denote an activity on its own: “*She wrote for an hour.*” However, in the sentence “*She wrote the report in an hour,*” the specific object and the phrase “*in an hour*” create a process with a definite boundary. The Karakalpak examples “*Ol bir saat jazdı*” and “*Ol esaptı bir saatta jazıp boldı*” illustrate a similar distinction. In the second sentence, the object “*esaptı*” and the analytic construction “*jazıp boldı*” explicitly express a resultant boundary. Thus, the true unit of classification is not the individual verb, but the entire verbal predicate.

The main criteria of classification

Three binary characters are of primary importance in distinguishing the sequence of events: dynamism, continuity and telicity. C. S. Smith describes these symbols as a semantic matrix of basic situation types [3: 19-22].

Symbol	Positive value	Negative value	Check path
Dynamic	Stages change, energy is expended	The situation remains unchanged	Consistency with progressive; “what is he doing?” question
Continuity	It occupies a span of time	Occurs in an idealized moment	for an hour / bir saat dawaminda
Telicity	There is a natural, inherent conclusion or result	Can stop at an arbitrary point	in an hour / bir saatta; “is it finished?”

A **dynamic situation** entails a sequence of distinct stages, whereas in a state, one segment does not differ in content from another. In the case of “*knowing the answer*” (or “*juwaptı biliw*” in Karakalpak), the subject does not need to constantly perform new actions for the situation to persist. In contrast, “*to run*” (or “*juwirıw*”) requires an expenditure of energy to prevent the activity from

ceasing. B. Comrie distinguishes between a state and a dynamic situation based on this requirement for continued effort. [1: 48-51].

A **durative situation** occupies a specific time interval, whereas a punctual situation is conceptualized in language as a single point of change, without internal duration [1: 41-44]. “Walk”, “sleep”, and “build a house” (in KK: júriw, uyqlaw, úy salıw) are durative; “recognize”, “reach”, and “notice” are typically instantaneous. Although every event in the real world requires physical time, linguistic classification is based on how the event is modeled in language.

In “**telic**” **situations**, an internal endpoint is an essential component of the content: for the action “*build a house*” to be complete, a house must come into existence; for “*walk to school*,” one must reach the school. In “**atelic**” **activity**, the stopping point is determined by external conditions: for example, *walk, swim, talk*. B. Comrie explains the distinction between telic and atelic actions based on the presence or absence of a specific terminal point [1: 44-48]. In the Karakalpak language, constructions such as “*-ıp bolıw*” and “*-ıp shıǵıw*” reinforce the telic interpretation.

Five types of situations in the Vendler-Smith model

Situation type	Dynamic	Continuous	Telic	Typical example
State (jagdayı)	–	+	neutral	know, love; / biliw, jaqsı kóriw.
Activity (Iskerligi)	+	+	–	run, work; / juwırıw, islew
Accomplishment (Shegaralı proces)	+	+	+	write a letter; / xattı jazıp bolıw
Semelfactive (semelfactiv)	+	–	–	knock, cough; / qaǵıw, jóteliw
Achievement (natiyje)	+	–	+	recognize, reach; / tanıw, jetip barıw

The table is based on Smith’s classification of case types and tense markers [3: 20-35]. The markers indicate the prototypical case: in real speech, aspectual shift can occur under the influence of plural, repetition, progressive, object, and context.

ASPECTUAL TYPES OF EVENTS

States: a continuous situation

States are not dynamic, but continuous situations. They express the knowledge, feeling, possession, attitude, location in space or a certain characteristic of the subject: *know, believe, love, own, resemble*; / biliw, iseniw, jaqsı kóriw, iye bolıw, uqsaw. Smith describes a state as a single static

5	He knocked once.	Ol esikti bir ret qaqtı.	Semelfactive: punctual, atelic.
---	------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------

In examples 1-5, the semantic types correspond across the two languages, but the encoding methods differ. English frequently relies on verb constructions, articles (definiteness), prepositional expressions of direction, and aspectual forms. In Karakalpak, however, case markers, quantifiers, and converb-auxiliary verb constructions can more explicitly express event boundaries and outcomes.

CONCLUSION

The aspectual classification of events is based on the features of dynamicity, duration, and telicity. Their combination gives rise to the types of state, activity, bounded process, achievement, and semelfactive. However, the aspectual type is determined not merely by the lexical meaning of the verb, but within the scope of the entire predicate, involving the object, direction, temporal adverbial, grammatical aspect, and context.

In English, aspectual meaning is conveyed through progressive and simple forms, articles, prepositions, and object structures; in Karakalpak, it is expressed via converb-auxiliary verb models, case markers, and lexical indicators. Therefore, a comparative analysis should rely on shared semantic functions rather than formal correspondences. This approach is significant for translation, comparative grammar, and language teaching practice.

References:

1. Comrie B. Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976. – 142 p.
2. Vendler Z. Verbs and Times // The Philosophical Review. 1957. Vol. 66, No. 2. – P. 143-160.
3. Smith C. S. The Parameter of Aspect. 2nd ed. – Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997. – 349 p.
4. Bondarko A. V. Functional Grammar: A Field Approach / transl. L. S. Chulaki. – Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1991. – 207 p.