Is the great aspect theory possible?
Perspectives and reality

Abstract

This paper seeks to find an answer to the question of whether an all-embracing "great theory" on aspect is possible. First, the author describes shortly the situation in aspect research of our days, then he draws a comparison between the present state of aspect research and that of the theoretical physics. Refuting existing views of human language and its category, the aspect as a stable, once and for all fundamental and completely rational system which acts by rules the paper presents arguments in favour of the existence of communication fragments being the fundamental units of language (and aspectual) usage.

1. Apparently we have to agree with linguists who draw our attention to the fact that there isn't a uniformly accepted theory[1] within acpectology, but a great variety of theories[2] (cf. Pete 2009: 29, Stambolieva 2008: 16). The same idea is suggested in the conclusion of Ferenc Kiefer's 350-page book *Aspektus és akcióminőség* (Aspect and manner of action), which is an important – if not the most important – piece of his oeuvre. As the author summarizes briefly his opinion in the closing chapter of his book "at present we do not dispose of an aspect theory which could account for all the important angles of the aspect."[3] However, we should not be surprised by this, and not only because of the complex, almost inextricable team-work of linguistic phenomena related to this category.[4] Probably we should also take into consideration the fact that linguists and grammar scientists have been dealing for quite a long time whith the phenomenon of the aspect. If you just think that we can already find semantic verb groups with Sanskrit grammarians (5 c. B.C.), even though the first category of events was set up by Aristotle and he was the first to write about opposition between condition and action and result. Nevertheless, the term *aspect* appeared in linguistic literature around the mid-19th century, followed shortly by another close-related term *manner of action* (aktionsart). The latter was created by Wilhelm Streitberg (Kiefer 2006: 10) and was used in its present context by Sigurd Agrell in a study on Polish manners of action, which appeared in 1908 (Agrell 1908). We are indebted to Agrell for the distinction between aspect and manner of action, as originally there was no unanimous difference between the two concepts (Frączek 2000: 206). The issue of differentiating aspect and manner of action has vividly concerned aspectologists since ever Agrell, if only we think about the works of Koschmieder, Isačenko, Bondarko, Maslov, Piernikarski, Czochralski, Czarnecki, Kątny and Egg or the Hungarian Jászay, Krékits, Pete or Kiefer. As József Bokor aptly remarks "There is such a strong bound between verbal aspect and manner of action that some languages have acknowledged the existence of only one, while others accepted only the other. Slavonic languages have an aspectology approach, while in the Hungarian linguistics [not to mention the English linguistic literature, as well] the manner of action distinction is more common."[5]

1.1. As a matter of fact, it is the same whether the main reason for the richness in authors and literature is due to the great variety and amazing complexity of linguistic phenomena related to aspect or rather the significant amount of time that has been spent on its research so far. The truth is, literature concerning aspect has grown vastly and it is almost impossible to find one's way around it. Those who will still take the effort to get somewhat immersed in the topic can be helped by the summaries/reference books containing the aspect research results of some languages.[6] Whilst on the other hand, there are many debatable questions even within the Slavonic aspectology[7](cf. Jászay 1995, 1998, 2003, Lebieď 1993: 97−103), paradoxically it is getting more general to accept the opinion that we can hardly make new statements about some issues, or we can only make new statements about some fragments of questions. The situation is quite similar to the problems characteristic of contemporary theoretical physics. As science is trying to establish the so-called Grand Unified Theory (GUT) which would be able to describe the whole universe (Hawking 2003: 11−25), similarly there are pursuits within aspectology to create a general theory. Aspectology requires a theory which would at once describe not the whole universe, but at least the operation of a linguistic category called aspect. However, as this is an extremely difficult task and many linguists rather tend to chop up the problem into bits and elaborate theories with partial validity. These partial theories cover only specific groups of the observation process, for instance they focus only on a specific language or languages, or on the operation of certain structures in a given language. Thus the descriptions neglect or simply ignore the other languages or linguistic categories. All the same, the misinterpretation or the inaccuracy of some linguistic issues can cause serious problems as well (cf. Stambolieva 2008: 18). Moreover, there is also the danger when some linguists (mainly influenced by their own mother tongue) tend to overestimate or underestimate respectively some specific linguistic phenomena, thus creating a false image of a language (cf. Pátrovics 2004: 66−67, 112).

1.2. Nevertheless, it is also conceivable that the approach based on particulars is underlyingly erroneous. If in language (Bańczerowski 2009: 253−263), as well as in the universe, everything fundamentally depends on something (see cognitive linguistics holistic language approach), the observation of separate segments of a problem might never bring us within reach to a thorough solution. As Tabakowska warns us "hardened habits, which force researchers to see sharp boundaries where cognitivism proclaims the continuity of elements, hinder them from observing linguistic phenomena in their absolute semantic dimension."[8] With regards to Polish language, she later adds that "only aspect, verb prefixation and the holistic investigation of the case can help demonstrate whether verb government in prepositional constuction is motivated semantically or pragmatically, and also whether the opposition between certain grammatical cases (e.g. genitive vs accusative) is motivated not only by the semantics of the given case, but also by the verb's aspect[9] and the semantics of the noun phrase within the verb group.[10] However, it is undoubtable that in the past, in physics as well as in linguistics, progress was made possible by the method of
partial investigation. Despite their controversy and error, the currently existing partial theories serve satisfying explanation related to aspect. As Kiefer notes "they all have contributed to the clarification of the notion of aspect, to the description of the relationship between aspect and

syntax, to the investigation of the connection between event structure and aspect."[11] Therefore, if we consider language as a (sign)system, which consists of different structural units and whose

functioning is controlled by strict rules, as the structuralists believe, in that case we only have to harmonize the partial theories, thus creating a uniform theory with which we could describe the operation of the aspect category. However, it is possible that the all-embracing and slightly mystical idea of "the great theory" in aspectology, similarly to the Grand Unified Theory in physics, is but *une grossière erreur de calcul*, that is to say a great error. At least this is argued by Marcelo Gleiser, according to whom our constraint to integrate rules on all fields of knowledge and to create great, comprehensive theories is being fed by uncoscious religious impulses.[12]

A further problem related to "the final theory" is that such theories are based on the supposition that rules are eternal, absolute, irrefutable and all-controlling. Although we are aware that some linguistic rules are not implicit, while some are more or less inaccurate than others.[13] Well-formedness itself is not absolute either. It is a criterion characterized by graduality, which has suffered changes with time (Cseresnyési 2004: 5). With a little exaggeration we can say that what used to be sensible yesterday, today it might not be anymore, and vice versa, what is unacceptable today might become a civil right by tomorrow.[14] This means linguistic rules are *relative* and some linguistic manifestations are also *relatively* correct and canonical. Then how could we comprise their operation into an absolute theory?[15]

2. Furthermore, it is also possible that not only the all-embracing "great theory" on aspect category is erroneous, but the partial theoretical models on aspect also fail to adequately reflect the way this segment of language resides in native speakers of a language. Indeed Bańczerowski might be right when he affirms that the rationalization of our whole linguistic activity (namely the use of aspect) is secondary, it is the product of a preceeding state and in reality this activity is based on other principles (Bańczerowski 2008: 28). Probably the linguistic and aspect models we form through our explicit knowledge based on the analysis of ready-made linguistic products do not reflect the functioning of language (and the aspect category). They also do not reflect the way native speakers create and use language and aspect during they everyday communication. In this case, however, languages can be considered the rational arrangements of a research object and the aspect categories (and aspect as well) resulted this way do not show the exact state which forms the conditions and bases of language usage. A structure built by the rules of logic, like the metalanguage model, will not be able to explain and model they way man operates language (and its partial systems like the aspect) in everyday usage. That is the reason why Bańkowski, the etymologist also considers "traditional" grammar ficto- rather than factographic (Bańkowski 2000: 20). As Bańczerowski affirms "none of the linguistic [and also aspectual] theories or models will be able to reach what language users can through their linguistic intuition,"[16] which is another argument against the reason for the existence of a "great theory". He considers that "language and the world concept registered in it make a very complex and colourful formation [...] and though at first it might sound convincing that when generating speech, [...] it would be more economical to rely on rules above all and not to store ready-made objects in our memory. [...] This alleged 'profit', however, can only be reached by considering language as a stable, once

and for all fundamental and completely rational existence which acts by rules."[17] Nevertheless, we have already clarified that language is not like this. It could be described rather like a "continuous activity", which does not dispose of an organized structure. On the contrary, it is constantly changing, offering place for countless irregularities and abnormalities. It is relatively easy to admit

that we can only operate a linguistic corpus containing an X unit successfully if we memorise each of its segment separately so that in case of emergency we can recall these from our memory. This strategy, which also means the ignoration of rules[18], was called reproductive by Bańczerowski. He is of the opinion that "if we consider language on a longer term, as a condition which secures its existence, and if we try not to imagine language as an 'abstract object' but as an 'existence', reproductivity − even though it sometimes seems disordered and illogical − will be more economic and sensible than generative strategy.[19] More precisely this is the only possible way to comprehend the endless, gigantic and extremely complex phenomenon called language, which represents speakers throughout their whole life in their linguistic existence".[20]

2.1. Based on the above mentioned data, the communication fragment (CF) can be considered the fundamental unit of language usage. This fragment is "the constant and differently shaped speech segment of the linguistic memory stored in the human brain, which is used by the speaker for making and interpreting statements."[21] It is also worth mentioning that not only in Hungarian, but in Russian and Polish also there are certain verbal prefixes (besides their function of forming the perfective aspect) to evoke particular schemes and scenarios. Also pre-made units bigger than words (so-called discourse chunks) and their positional interpretations are stored together with their context of meanings in our memory (cf. Cseresnyési 2004: 26). As the fundamental units of a language consist of these pre-made and completely equal communication fragments, we must refuse the thought of a hierarchic structure of language systems. The aspectual usage of a given language is mainly influenced by what structures are defined as situation adequate by a given language community when describing a specific situation (e.g. in Polish we use CFs containing a perfective verb to describe sudden events, or completed actions with a result, while we use CFs containing an imperfective verb to express habit) and also the compatibility of certain CFs. Both cases depend on how certain structures manage to reach a level of conventionality based on certain situations (situation potential) and compared to each other (merger potential/compatibility) in a given language community. For instance in the case of Russian and Polish languages the difference in aspectual usage may be due to the different situation potential of CFs, as these two languages have undergone dissimilar conventionalization throughout history. The result was that despite the significant number of similarities in the aspectual usage of the two languages, there are cases when different CFs are considered situation adequate by both languages for describing the same situation, while on the other hand some structurally similar constructions are compatible in Russian (so they can merge), but not in Polish.

2.2. Considering all these, statemets like "in the existential version of expressing past facts in Russian it is obligatory to use the imperfective verb even for activities which are accidental or unwanted, as opposed to the West Slavonic languages, where basically both aspects can be used,

even though it is more adequate to use the perfective verb to emphasize result" (Krékits–Jászay 2008: 169−170) seem to be rather sophisticated, posterior explanations. For describing such situations, native speakers in their full communicative competency use the situation adequate CFs which are in accordance with the traditions of the specific language community and which are "correct"[22] by *intuition*, without realising what the meaning of "the existential version of expressing past facts" or "imperfectivity" vs "perfectivity" is. Thus, the speakers manage to reach from a

theoretical field to the practical field of a particular realization not by applying abstract rules, but using the particular CFs stored in their memories as starting points. Therefore, they choose the proper CFs to establish a fusion based on their conventionalized and internalized situation potential, as well as on their compatibility schemes.

3. Accordingly, we can state that the existing theory models on language (and aspect) have not been able to accurately express how language is stored in us and how we use its different components. However, following up on Hjelmslev and Chomsky, Cseresnyési emphasizes that "there is a real pondering to justify the reason why structural linguistics makes every effort to define language ... as a formal system."[23] Bańczerowski also mentions that there are cases when it is necessary to follow this approach (Bańczerowski 2008: 28). This is not about stigmatizing language or its partial systems built on theoretical structures which themselves were based on logical principles as the ideas of linguists struggling in the intellectual straitjacket of rationalism. However, there are some language and aspect theories, which are not more than art for art's sake, intellectual games created in order to entertain their conceivers and which probably belong to the category of *um so schlimmer für die Tatsachen* type theories. Nevertheless, far greater is the number of useful theories, which though deficient, can help the human intellect create (somewhat rational) order in the mushy jungle of linguistic reality, by categorizing the uniform continuity of language and setting up rules to control the governing elements within some system parts (thus, within aspect as well). There is real possibility which supersedes every theory and that is the idea of mapping the aspect[24]. This can/might have positive effect on language teaching as well. The Slavonic aspect is a hard nut to break. It is not by accident that Ferenc Papp wrote the following about the verbal aspect in Russian "There are hardly any who are not Hungarian native speakers and who are familiar with the subjective-transitive conjugation and the number of those who are not Russian native speakers and who are familiar with the Russian verbal aspect is the same or even less."[25] Therefore, if we speak about language or aspect, we also have to speak about many, simultaneous and different approaches and consequently about the different research strategies. However, strategy can influence the research outcome. Language and its segment, the aspect behaves like a picture made with anamorf technique. What it shows depends on the perspective of the viewer.

Notes

1. The Vendler categorization which has been mentioned on numerous occasions in literature is not an aspect theory. In the study published in 1957 the author does not even mention the word "aspect". The linguist of Hungarian origins,

Zeno Vendler divided verbs into four groups based on formal linguistic criteria. However his main idea was not to study verbs, but the Aristotelian categories. Despite of this, his categorization has significantly influenced aspect researchers later on. According to Henk Verkuyl's basic supposition, aspect is a category existing on syntactic level in German languages and it can be compositionally derived from the meaning of the verb and its complements. Due to this theory, it is possible to speak of aspect even in those languages which are not lexically defined (for example German or Dutch), as opposed to the Slavonic languages for instance, where aspect is expressed through the morphology of the verb, thus determining the aspect of the whole sentence. Though Verkuyl's formalism has not influenced posterity significantly, the terms of 'sentence aspect' and 'compositionality' were introduced by him and later they have become the enduring components of aspect research. They also appear in Dowty's works who dismantled the meaning of aspectual verbs into information units and borrows the semantic marks and some parts of

analysis from generative semantics. However, it would be difficult to call his theory an aspect theory, as the problems discussed by him are only indirectly related to aspect. Dowty's ideas were later developed and applied to German by Marcus Egg (Egg 1994 about Egg see Pátrovics 2004: 20−24). Carlota Smith's controversial two-component approach already mentions the situation aspect and the viewpoint aspect related to Vendler's event types. Not many are familiar with F. Antinucci and L. Gerbert's structural semantical model (it is more popular in Polish aspectology), which is considered to be a classic one. The authors in their aspect analysis consider aspect to be a grammatic-semantic category and they analise it with methods used in generative grammar. For the brief summary of the theory see Pátrovics (2004: 13−16), its further development can be found in Karolak (1996: 9−56). Kreisberg, another Polish linguist relies on Kurylowicz's aspectual and temporal oppositions to analise the Italian functional counterparts of Polish aspectual meanings. There are many theories about the aspect and tense system, as well as the suitability of aspect and different tense levels in certain languages (Desclés - Guentchéva 2006: 11- 38, Guławska 2000, Harweg 1976: 5-28, Kozłowska-Raś 1980: 35-46, Lindstedt 1985). For instance, Kiefer identifies aspect with the inner tense structure of the sentence. Bankowski's theory (on the origins of Slavonic aspect) is also notable. He believes that there is a strong relationship between the formation of the aspects of Slavonic verbs (perfective or imperfective) and the two possible positions (before and after the verb) of the so-called converbiums, which are linked to the verb. In a postpositive position the converbium marks the activity in its continuous process (e.g. *jechać do rzeki* 'travel to the river'), while its prepositive position (*do-jechać rzeki* 'to the river travel') emphasizes the punctuality of the action. With time the converbium in the second structure has begun to be repeated as: *do-jechać do rzeki* (but cf. in older version: *dojść prawdy* 'realize the truth'). Bańkowski considers this repetition of the converbium in front of the verb (doubled usage) to be the precedents of prepositions as parts of speech. All these data take us to the Slavonic line of aspect research, which gave birth to a great variety of theories, oddly enough, completely ignored by Kiefer. It is worth mentioning A. V. Bondarko's theory that discussed the issue of aspect in the frame of functional grammar and introduced the notion of aspectuality as a functional-semantic field (cf. Bondarko 1983: 76−115). Jászay summarizes briefly Bondarko's theory (Jászay 1993: 7−9). We also have to note that Bondarko's theory is far more elaborate and consistent than Carlota Smith's theory and in the same time it allows us to speak of aspect in those languages, where it is not expressed morphologically (on how to apply this on non-Slavonic languages, see Jászay 1993: 64− 69, Pátrovics 2004: 54−77, Kątny 1989). The only disadvantage of the Bondarko theory is that it is not or hardly popular apart from Slavonic studies, though this is the deficiency of aspectologists unaware of this theory rather than the theory's. Amongst the many aspect theories we can find some which are quite unusual, for example in Kabakchiev's theory the aspect is a Slavonic equivalent of the article (!) (Kabakchiev 2000).

2. The multitude of theories results in the variety of terminology. In one of his articles Plungjan states that today's terminology of aspectology is in a "feudal division" state (Plungjan 1997: 191). According to Jászay, though the richness of technical terms prove the development of aspectology (quoted by Pete 2009: 29). Plungjan's opinion seems to be understated by the fact that some linguistic studies, which are related to German and English studies rather than Slavonic the terms of aspect and aspectology do not always occur representing the same meaning (cf. Jászay 1993: 64 and Czarnecki 2000: 9−20). Moreover, some linguists abundantly create completely new terms we have never heard of before (cf. Czarnecki 1998). Considering all these, it is not an exaggeration to say that today's aspectology is threatened by terminology chaos.

3. In original language: *"jelenleg még nem rendelkezünk olyan aspektuselmélettel, amely az aspektus minden fontos szempontjáról számot tudna adni"* (Kiefer 2006: 311 English translation mine)

4. As Ferenc Kiefer writes at the end of his book "the notion of aspect has traditionally been listed amongst the most difficult terms to define in linguistics" in original language: *"Az aspektus fogalmát hagyományosan a legnehezebben definiálható nyelvtudományi fogalmak közé szokták sorolni"* (Kiefer 2006: 313. English translation mine).

5. In original language: *"Az igeszemléletnek az akcióminőséggel való kapcsolata annyira szoros, hogy egyes nyelvekben csak az egyiknek, másokban csak a másiknak a létezését ismerték el. A szláv nyelvek tudományára az aspektológiai megközelítésű leírás a jellemző, a magyar nyelvtudományban [...] az akcióminőség szerinti különbségtevés terjedt el"* (in: Jászó 1994: 202 English translation mine).

6. In one of the chapters of Kiefer's book we can find a good summary of the main tendencies in aspect research (Kiefer 2006: 259−311). However, it ignores Slavonic aspectology despite its significant results. In a study from 2005 Jászay (Jászay 2005) and the Krékits − Jászay's recent work (Krékits−Jászay 2008) related to the topic have both given an account on the results achieved so far by the Slavonic and mainly the Russian aspectology. We can read about the results of Polish aspectology in Cockiwicz's work (see Cockiewicz 1992). I have also started my monograph on aspect with a short overview of certain aspect theories (Pátrovics 2004: 13−35).

7. One of these highly debated matters is whether we can speak of word-formation or just form-creation in the case of aspect-relation. Is it acceptable to declare that aspectual pairs created during perfectivization or imperfectivization form one verb and their members are parts of a lexical item, and as it follows the aspect-formation is not more than form-creation? Or we shall consider only the suffix pairs as "purely" grammatic, therefore in their case we can speak of form-creation, while on the other hand we can speak of word-formation in the case of prefixal aspectual pairs as they are results of the word-formation process. Related to this, we have to find out whether transparent prefixes exist, i.e. prefixes that can only modify the meaning of the base verb in its perfective aspect. Is it right to consider as separate words the members of a verb pair, as the morphological and structural arguments would require? After all we are trying to decide whether to rank the grammatical subcategory of Slavonic aspect as flexing or word-formational or whether we should put it into a transition category. On the basis of Breu (1984: 18−20) I also accept the latter idea (cf. Pátrovics 2004: 148) and Jászay seems to be of the same opinion (cf. Krékits− Jászay 2008: 216, 317). Pete argues against the concept of "transition category" (Pete 2007: 358− 359). It would be also important to decide whether the Slavonic aspectual opposition has a privative or an equipolent character, as in the light of the latest research results we must affirm that there is no categorical answer without reserves to this question. There are also problems with the categorization of aspect as essentially subjective and of the manner of action as essentially objective (Cockiewicz 1992: 55−56). Moreover, researchers do not agree on whether the Slavonic aspect category is an organic continuity of the Indo-European heritage or it is a thoroughly independent formation.

8. In original language: *"Utrwalone nawyki, które wciąż każą badaczom widzieć ostre podziały tam, gdzie kognitywizm postuluje kontinuum elementów, nie pozwalają im jednak dostrzec zjawisk gramatycznych w ich pełnym wymiarze"* (Tabakowska 2001: 3−4 English translation mine).

9. I have also mentioned from language history's point of view the connection between aspectuality, case, referentiality and temporality in relation to Germanic and Slavonic languages (Pátrovics 2000: 69−86, 2004: 112−131).

10. In original language: *"Tak więc dopiero "holistyczna" analiza aspektu, derywacji prefiksalnej i przypadka pozwala wakazać, że związek rządu w wyrażeniach przyimkowych jest w gruncie rzeczy motywowany semantycznie lub pragmatycznie, a opozycja między przypadkami gramatycznymi (np. dopełniaczem i biernikiem) jest uwarunkowana semantyką nie tylko samego przypadka ale także semantyką aspektu czasownika oraz znaczeniem frazy nominalnej w grupie werbalnej"* (Tabakowska 2001: 10 English translation mine).

11. In original language: *"mindegyikük hozzájárult az aspektus fogalmának tisztázásához, az aspektus és a szintaxis kapcsolatának leírásához, az eseményszerkezetek és az aspektus viszonyának a vizsgálatához"* (Kiefer 2006: 311 English translation mine).

12. Forget theories of everything [...] the urge to unite laws of nature into an elegant whole is driven by unconscious religious impulses [...] I now think that the very notion of a final theory is faulty (Gleiser 2010: 28−29).

13. Also proved by Tabakowska's two Polish examples: *wypić lekarstwa*, *dosłodzić herbaty*. Even though none of the sentences is good, the first one is less faulty opposing to the second which is completely unacceptable. Though it is possible to drink medicine bit by bit, however, the sweetener put in the tea will not melt only in some parts of the liquid, but in its whole entity (Tabakowska 2001: 9-10).

14. Related to aspect the linguistic record what is called *Lavrentevskaya letopis* might be a good example to illustrate how some verbs with prefixes which are perfective in modern Russian were not perfective in Old Russian, thus they could be used with a continuous meaning (Pátrovics 2004: 95).

15. We have to admit that language rules are not eternally valid (Leech 1983: 21) and that our knowledge of a language comprises data, which cannot be defined absolutely, just relatively (Cseresnyési 2004: 33). Even the most basic grammar categories, the parts of speech are of a gradual, fuzzy character (Cseresnyési 2004: 3−6). It might be more difficult to accept the idea that the laws of nature which were also considered eternally valid, their relativity, constant change or evolution has also risen in theoretical physics (Frank 2010: 33−37). In the light of the latest research results it seems that we cannot affirm neither of language nor of the universe that it is a stable system, based on eternal rules and which functions absolutely rationally (Banczerowski 2008: 29, Powell 2010: 6−7). Paradoxically, the only thing language and the universe can consider their constant characteristic is change itself

16. In original language: *"semelyik lingvisztikai elmélet nem vagy modell nem képes elérni azt, amit a nyelvhasználók elérnek saját nyelvi intuíciójuk alapján"* (Bańczerowski 2010: 33 English translation mine).

17. In original language: *"a nyelv és a benne rögzült világkép nagyon összetett és sokszínű képződmény [...] s bár első pillantásra meggyőzőnek tűnik, hogy a beszéd generálásakor [...] gazdaságosabb lenne elsősorban szabályokra támaszkodni, nem pedig kész objektumokat tárolni a memóriában. [...] Ez a vélt "haszon" azonban csak akkor állna fenn, ha a nyelvet egy stabil, egyszer s mindenkorra adott és teljesen racionálisan, azaz szabályszerűen viselkedő létnek tekintjük"* (Bańczerowski 2008: 29 English translation mine).

18. Related to aspect it is an easily controllable fact that throughout their communication the average users of a language do not think about rules or they are not even familiar with them. Most of the average Polish speakers are not even familiar with notions such as "aspect" or "manner of action", not to mention "boundedness". Certain rules are implicit for the native speaker, therefore they are not conscious or developed. Average Polish native speakers could only explain with great intellectual efforts the rules of connecting Polish phase verbs (cf. Cseresnyési 2004: 16).

19. Generative strategy sets out from the idea that the linguistic material needed for communication is not directly at our disposition. It has to be created first with the help of a definite set of rules.

20. In original language: *"ha a nyelvet hosszabb időtartamban nézzük, amely nélkül a nyelv reálisan nem is létezhet, és ha a nyelvet nem "absztrakt objektumként", hanem "létezésnek" képzeljük el, akkor a reproduktív mód, annak ellenére, hogy néha rendezetlennek és illogikusnak tűnik, sokkal gazdaságosabb és értelmesebb, mint a generatív stratégia. Pontosabban fogalmazva, ez az egyetlen lehetséges mód, amely képes felölelni azt a végeláthatatlan, gigantikus terjedelmű és rendkívüli mértékben összetett jelenséget, amelyet a nyelv képvisel a beszélői szubjektum egész élete folyamán fennálló nyelvi létezésében"* (Bańczerowski 2008: 31 English translation mine).

21. In original language: *"az emberi memóriában tárolt nyelvi tapasztalatnak az olyan állandó és különböző nagyságú beszédszegmense, amelyet a nyelvhordozó felhasznál a megnyilatkozások létrehozásakor és értelmezésekor"* (Bańczerowski 2008: 36, 2010: 35-36 English translation mine).

22. According to Gombocz "Those expressions are correct, which are in agreement with the traditions of a language community, and those which are opposed to it are to be considered false." In original language: *"Helyes az a nyelvi kifejezés, amely egy nyelvközösség szokásával megegyezik, helytelen az, ami vele ellentétben áll."* (Gombocz 1931: 11). "For the speakers something is 'correct' to the same extent as the frequency of its occurence." says Cseresnyési (2004: 10). In original language: *"A beszélők számára valami pont olyan mértékben "helyes", mint amilyen mértékben előfordul."* (English translations mine)

23. In original language: *"reális megfontolás indokolja azt, hogy a szerkezeti nyelvészet a nyelvet ... formális rendszerként törekszik megadni"* (Cseresnyési 2004: 8 English translation mine)

24. "From theoretical point of view it seems expedient ... to map the aspect" in original language: *"Z teoretycznego punktu widzenia wydaje sie ... celowym "skartografowanie aspektu"* (Pátrovics 2001: 57 English translation mine)

25. In original language: *"Alig van nem magyar anyanyelvű, aki az alanyi-tárgyas ragozást tudja: ugyanennyi, vagy még ennél is kevesebb a nem orosz anyanyelvű, aki a szemléletet tudja"* (Papp 1979: 229 English translation mine).

References

Agrell, S. 1908. Aspektänderung und Aspektbildung beim polnischen Zeitworte. Lund

Antinucci, F. - Gerbert, L. 1977. Semantyka aspektu czasownikowego. In: Studia gramatyczne. Ossolineum, Wrocław - Warszawa - Kraków - Gdańsk, pp. 7–43.

Bańczerowski, J. 2008. A világ nyelvi képe. A világkép mint a valóság metaképe a nyelvben és a nyelvhasználatban. Kiss Gábor (ed.) Tinta Könyvkiadó, Budapest.

Bańczerowski, J. 2009. A nyelvészeti strukturalizmus és kognitivizmus tézisei és alapelvei. In: Magyar Nyelvőr, 133. évf./3. pp. 253–263.

Bańczerowski, J. 2010. Nyelv, nyelvhasználat és a világ nyelvi képe. In: Világkép a nyelvben és a nyelvhasználatban. Bárdosi Vilmos (ed.), Tinta Könyvkiadó, Budapest, pp. 31–40.

Bańkowski, A. 2000. Etymologiczny Słownik Języka Polskiego. A-K. t. I. Wyd. Naukowe PWN, Warszawa

Bondarko – Бондарко, А. В. 1983. Принципы функциональной грамматики и вопросы аспектологии. "Наука", Ленинград, pp. 76–115.

Breu, W. 1984. Grammatische Aspektkategorie und verbale Einheit. In: Aspekte der Slavistik. Slawistische Beiträge 180. München.

Cockiewicz, W. 1992. Aspekt na tle systemu słowotwórczego polskiego czasownika i jego funkcyjne odpowiedniki w języku niemieckim. Rozprawy habilitycyjne nr 231., Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków

Cseresnyési, L. 2004. Nyelvek és stratégiák avagy a nyelv antropológiája. Tinta Könyvkiadó, Budapest.

Czarnecki, T. 1998. Aspektualität im Polnischen und Deutschen. Bedeutungen und Formen in einer konfrontativen Übersicht. Wyd. Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, Gdańsk.

Czarnecki, T. 2000. Zur Verwendung des Terminus "Aspektualität" in der sprachwissenschaftlichen Forschung. In: Aspektualität in germanischen und slawischen Sprachen. Kątny, A. (ed.), Wyd. UAM, Poznań, pp. 9–20.

Declés, J-P. – Guentchéva, Z. 2006. Référentiels aspecto-temporels dans les textes. In: Studia Kognitywne 7. Semantyka kategorii aspektu i czasu. PAN - Instytut Slawistyki, Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy, Warszawa, pp. 11–38.

Egg, M. 1994. Aktionsart und Kompositionalität. In: Studia Grammatica XXXVII. Akademie Verlag, Berlin.

Frączek, A. 2000. Zur Darstellung von Aktionsarten in den polnisch-deutschen Wörterbüchern des XIX. Jahrhunderts. In: Aspektualität in germanischen und slawischen Sprachen. Kątny, A. (ed.), Wyd. UAM, Poznań, pp. 205–225.

Frank, A. 2010. Who wrote the Book of Physics? In: Discover 2010, april, pp. 33–37.

Gleiser, M. 2010. Perfectly imperfect. In: New Scientist 2010, may 8, pp. 28–29.

Gombocz, Z. 1931. Nyelvhelyesség és nyelvtudomány. In. Magyar Nyelv 27. pp. 1–11.

Guławska, M. 2000. Aspektualität im Polnischen und Deutschen. Eine praktische Untersuchung am Beispiel der Übersetzungen beider Richtungen. Slavistische Beiträge 393, Verlag Otto Sagner, München.

Harweg, R. 1976. Aspekte als Zeitstufen und Zeitstufen als Aspekte. In: Linguistics 181. pp. 5–28.

Hawking, S. 2003. Az idő rövid története. Akkord Kiadó, Budapest.

Jászay, L. 1993. Лекции по глагольному виду. Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest.

Jászay, L. 1995. На грани словообразования и словоизменения (в связи с категорией вида).

In: Slavica XXVII, Debrecen, pp. 27−38.

Jászay, L. 1998. К дискуссии видовой оппозиции. Привативность или эквиполентность? In: Slavica XXVII, Debrecen, pp. 270−275.

Jászay, L. 2003. Видовая пара и проблема лексического тождества ее членов. Русское слово в мировой культуре. (Русский текст и русский дискурс сегодня) X Конгресс МА-ПРЯЛ. Санкт-Петербург: Политехника Изд-во, pp. 340−346.

Jászay, L. 2005. Видовые корреляции русского языка в системе грамматических оппозиций. ELTE, BTK, Szláv és Balti Filológiai Intézet, Budapest.

Jászay, L. - Tóth, L. 1987. Az orosz igeaspektusról - magyar szemmel. Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest.

Jászó, A. (ed.) 1994. A magyar nyelv könyve. Trezor kiadó, Budapest.

Kabakchiev, K. 2000. Aspect in English. A 'Common Sense' View of the Interplay between Verbal and Nominal Referents. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Karolak, S. 1996. O semantyce aspektu (w dwudziestą rocznicę publikacji rozprawy F. Antinucciego i L. Gerbert "Semantyka aspektu czasownikowego"). Bulletin de la Société Polonaise de Linguistique. facs.L II.

Kątny, A. 1989. Zu ausgewählten Aktionsarten im Polnischen und deren Wiedergabemöglichkeiten im Deutschen erste Vorüberlegungen. In: Theorie und Praxis der deutsch-polnischen Konfrontation und Traslation. Kątny, A. (ed.), Wyd. Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej, Rzeszów, pp. 121−136.

Kiefer, F. 1992. Az aspektus és a mondat szerkezete. In: Strukturális magyar nyelvtan. I. Mondattan. Kiefer, F. (ed.) Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. pp. 799−886.

Kiefer, F. 2006. Aspektus és akcióminőség különös tekintettel a magyar nyelvre. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

Kozłowska - Raś, R. 1980. Kategoria czasu, aspektu i rodzaju czynności w systemie konjugacyjnym języka szwedzkiego i polskiego. Zestawienie kontrastywne. In Zeszyty Naukowe Wydziału Humanistycznego. Studia Scandinavica. Gdańsk. 3. pp. 35−46.

Kreisberg, A. 1980. Kategorie czasu i aspektu w języku polskim i włoskim. Ossolineum, PAN, Komitet Neofilologiczny.

Krékits, J. − Jászay, L. 2008. Szláv igeaspektus különös tekintettel az orosz nyelvre. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Kuryłowicz, J. 1975. Die Stelle des Verbalaspektes im Konjugationssystem. Esquisses Linguistiques II. München.

Lebieď – Лебедь, С. 1993. О некоторых спорных вопросах славянской аспектологии. In: Badania nad czasownikiem w językach słowiańskich. Wyd. Uniwersytetu warszawskiego, Warszawa, pp. 97–102.

Leech, G. 1983. Principles of Pragmatics. Longman, London

Lindstedt, J. 1985. On the Semantics of Tense and Aspect in Bulgarian. Slavica Helsingiensia, No. 4, Helsinki

Papp, F. 1979. Könyv az orosz nyelvről. Gondolat, Budapest.

Pátrovics, P. 2000. Aspekt - Kasus - Referentialität - Temporalität. Ihre Relation im Deutschen und in den slawischen Sprachen. In: Aspektualität in germanischen und slawischen Sprachen. Kątny, A. (ed.), Wyd. UAM, Poznań. pp. 69–86.

Pátrovics, P. 2001. Aspekt czasownika polskiego w świetle glottodydaktyki. In: Studia Slavica Savariensia 1-2. Gadányi, K. (ed.), Berzsenyi Dániel Főiskola, Szláv Tanszékcsoport, Szombathely, pp. 57–64.

Pátrovics, P. 2004. Az aspektus története és tipológiája. Akadémiai Kiadó, Philosophiae Doctores 29., Budapest.

Pete, I. 2007. Pátrovics, P. Az aspektus története és tipológiája. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 2004. Philosophiae Doctores 29, 212. o. (recenzió) In: Magyar Nyelvőr 131. évf. 2007/3. pp. 348–365.

Pete, I. 2009. Аспектуальность и трехступенчатость. In: Studia Slavica Hung. 54/1. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, pp. 29–46.

Plungjan – Плунгян В. А. 1997. Вид и типология глагольных систем. In: М. Ю. Черткова (ed.) Труды аспектологического семинара филологического факультета МГУ им. М. В. Ломоносова. т. 1 Москва. pp. 173–190.

Powell, C. S. 2010. Fads in science move at a very different pace from fads in popular culture. In: Discover, 2010 april 6-7.

Stambolieva, M. 2008. Building Up Ascpect. A study of aspect and related categories in Bulgarian, with parallels in English and French. Contemporary studies in descriptive

linguistics vol. 6, Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers, Bern.

Tabakowska, E. 2001. Kognitywizm: Obrazki z polskiej sceny. Glossos 1.
http://www.seelcr.org/glossos/issues/1/