The paper presents a contrastive literature review of the grammatical and lexical aspect in English and Serbian. The motivation behind choosing this subject matter was found in the inconsistency that led scholars to class linguistic phenomena related to the grammatical and lexical features of verbs in the same category. Namely, the category of grammatical aspect was approached in different ways for a long time, various meanings were attributed to this category, and new terminology was introduced so as to describe language phenomena related to this grammatical category in a more detailed way. This resulted in the study of the lexical aspect as a subcategory of the grammatical aspect. Therefore, the primary goal of this review paper is to gain insight into the current tendencies related to the grammatical and lexical aspect, as well as to provide a systematic presentation of the approaches to the grammatical and lexical aspect in relevant English and Serbian literature and grammar books. The research revealed that the category of lexical aspect was often studied within the category of grammatical aspect due to its distinctive features stativity, dynamicity, punctuality, and durativity, which make it similar to the category of grammatical aspect. However, contemporary authors in both languages make a clear distinction between these two categories, emphasizing that grammatical aspect is a grammatical and a subjective category because it is expressed by verbal inflectional morphology and periphrases and because it reflects the speaker’s viewpoint on a situation, whereas lexical aspect is expressed by the verb meaning and verbal derivational morphology, thus being considered an objective category.
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“...The study of aspect has been likened to a dark and savage forest full of obstacles, pitfalls, and mazes which have trapped most of those who have ventured into this much explored but poorly mapped territory”.

1. **INTRODUCTION**

The term *aspect* was introduced to the Western grammatical tradition in the 19th century from the study of Slavic grammar and it corresponded...
to the Russian word *vid* which is also used in Serbian. *Aspect* is considered to be the fitting choice of translation because its root *spect-* means ‘see, look (at), view’, so *vid, vision, view,* etc. are regarded as cognates (see Binnick 1991: 136). The logic behind using the terms *aspect* and *vid* in language studies in English and Serbian respectively is that they refer to different ways the same situation may be *viewed*: as a complete whole (*perfective aspect*) or as a structure (*imperfective aspect*). Presenting a situation as a single unanalyzable whole means that the segments comprising the situation are not made explicit, i.e. the beginning, middle, and end of the situation are rolled into one and the situation seems to be looked at from outside. If a situation is presented as a structure, it means that it is viewed from inside, so imperfective aspect is crucially concerned with the internal temporal constituency of the situation (see Comrie 1976: 3, 4).

The problem that arises when analyzing aspect in the two languages primarily results from different ways this category is marked. In Serbian, aspect is overtly and morphologically marked; in English it is not. Serbian verbs express aspectual differences in their base form (e.g. *čitati*<sub>IMPERF</sub>3 – *pročitati*<sub>PERF</sub>; *pisati*<sub>IMPERF</sub> – *napisati*<sub>PERF</sub> – *ispisati*<sub>PERF</sub> – *ispisivati*<sub>IMPERF</sub>), whereas English do not. In Serbian, as in other Slavic languages, aspect is conventionally associated with prefixation. If prefixes are added to the imperfective stem (or root), the imperfective verb often becomes perfective. However, there are certain verbs (such as the verb *ispisivati* already shown above) which contain a prefix and are still imperfective. This phenomenon is known as *secondary imperfectivization* because an imperfective verb becomes perfective after adding a prefix, and then, after adding a suffix, it becomes imperfective again. Furthermore, there are certain verbs such as *dati* (E. *to give*), *reći* (E. *to tell*), *skočiti* (E. *to jump*), etc. which do not have any prefixes, but are still perfective. In some situations, aspect can be even affected by the accent of a verb (e.g. *pâsti* – *pásti*). Finally, even though prefixes and suffixes often formally indicate the aspect of a particular verb phrase, there are *bi-aspectual* verbs which can formally refer to both perfective and imperfective aspect. Because of its fully grammaticalized marking, Slavic aspect is considered to be the prototypical example of aspectual systems (see Binnick 1991: 136–137; Novakov 2005: 44).

Even though in a language such as English the imperfective/perfective opposition has not been grammaticalized, there is a corresponding grammaticalized opposition: *progressive/non-progressive*. The progressive roughly corresponds to the imperfective (e.g. *Oni su čitali*. vs. *They were reading*.), whereas the non-progressive roughly corresponds to the perfective (e.g. *Oni su pročitali*. vs. *They read* or *They have read*.). Therefore, it is possible to indicate certain aspectual meanings, for instance, completion or incompleteness, in English, but such indication is optional. In English, completion is normally, but not necessarily, expressed using the non-progressive for *She read the book*. is neutral in this regard. *She read the book in*
under an hour. is an instance of the non-progressive referring to a finished situation. On the other hand, She read the book for a few minutes, but soon got tired of it. illustrates the non-progressive referring to the activity that has not been finished. Particles can also indicate completion (e.g. eat up, read through, etc.), but their use is not mandatory. In Serbian, as in other Slavic languages, aspectual distinctions are mandatory and they are shown in the form of the verb (see Comrie 1976: 7; Binnick 1991: 139).

There are other complications in the field of aspectology which are not necessarily related to cross-linguistic differences. Brinton (1988: 1) points out that there is uncertainty regarding the definition of aspect as well as the object of research within this category because various diverse phenomena are all subsumed under the label of aspect. Different approaches to aspect contribute to this confusion as well because some of them concentrate on the overt grammatical form, while others focus on the lexical and semantic features of verbs. However, she concludes that these difficulties in the study of aspect can successfully be overcome under three conditions: if the dual nature of aspectual category is recognized, if the variety and pervasiveness of aspectual forms are identified, and if their specific contribution to aspectual meaning is understood.

Brinton recognizes the importance of separating grammatical features of a verb and its lexical and semantic characteristics. She embraces a widespread opinion that aspect refers to the speaker’s perspective on a situation because the speaker chooses to portray an event as completed (perfective aspect) or as ongoing (imperfective aspect), or as beginning (ingressive), continuing (continuative), ending (egressive), or repeating (iterative or habitual). On the other hand, inherent features of a situation such as stativity, dynamicity, punctuality, durativity, (un)boundedness, iterativity, etc. should be analyzed within the category of Aktionsart. Aktionsart is a loan term from German coined by Agrell (1908) to cover the lexicalization of various ‘kinds of action’ such as terminative, resultative, delimitative, perdurative, iterative, semelfactive, attenuative, augmentative (see Filip 2011: 1187). Since it encompasses the study of inherent features of a verb, it is considered to be an inherent or semantic aspect. The relationship between aspect and Aktionsart can be explained in the following oppositions: grammatical vs. lexical, subjective vs. objective, aspect vs. character, and viewpoint vs. situation aspect. Aspect is considered a grammatical category because it is normally expressed through verbal inflectional morphology and periphrases, while Aktionsart is a lexical category because it is expressed through the lexical meanings of verbs, as well as through derivational morphology. Aspect is subjective because it depends on the viewpoint of the speaker, whereas Aktionsart is objective because it refers to the nature of the event. Finally, Brinton (1988: 3) argues that the distinction between these two categories is crucial and that when analyzing aspect, the interaction between these two categories must be taken into consideration.
Since the clear distinction between aspect and Aktionsart has not always been recognized in many major publications in the field in English and Serbian, the main aim of this paper is to provide a review of relevant papers, monographs, and grammar books in the two languages in order to show the way these two categories were presented and studied. There are contrastive studies in the field, but they do not deal with general characteristics of aspect and Aktionsart. Instead, the majority of these works represent empirical studies which focus on particular phenomena within aspectology. For example, Novakov focuses on different aspects of telicity in English and Serbian (2007, 2009, 2016a, 2016b, 2017), English multi-word verbs and their Serbian equivalents (2018, 2019), as well as English progressive aspect and its Serbian equivalents (2021); Milivojević analyzes the analogy between particles of phrasal verbs in English and prefixes of Serbian perfective verbs (2007) and different features of English and Serbian pairs of ingressive aspectualizers (2021a, 2021b); Kljakić (2020) compares English and Serbian aspectualizers and the Aktionsart of their complements, etc. However, having searched through the digital repository of libraries in Serbia, we have noticed a lack of contrastive review papers on the issue of aspect and Aktionsart. To the best of our knowledge, there are a handful of such publications: Novakov (1988, 2005) and Petrović (2013). Despite being a more recent paper, the latter represents a review of the former. The current review paper is going to include previously reviewed works for two main reasons: 1) they represent the foundation of the domain of aspectology and should not be excluded from the study; 2) the aim is to track changes that occurred from early to recent publications. Therefore, a modest contribution of this paper is the incorporation of more recent publications that have not been reviewed in a contrastive manner.

The paper is structured as follows. The first section represents an introduction to the topic, which considers the differences between aspect and Aktionsart and their most general differences in English and Serbian. The second and third sections revise the major existing literature on the topic, from the early studies to the most recent developments, with the idea of tracking the major changes that took place. The fourth section presents the contrastive studies referred to in the previous paragraph. Finally, the fifth section briefly summarizes the results of the review and suggests possible avenues for future work.

2. ASPECT AND AKTIONSART IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

In The Philosophy of Grammar (1924), Otto Jespersen refers to both aspect and Aktionsart. He uses the terms synonymously even though he claims that there are authors who use them for different phenomena: “[...] a subject that has already been touched upon and which has been very warmly discussed in recent decades, namely what has generally in English...
been called the aspect of the verb, and in German aktionsart, though some writers would use the two terms for two different things" (ibid.: 286).

Jespersen recognizes aspect as an idea which is fundamental and clear in Slavic languages. Furthermore, he identifies problems that scholars faced when they began to find similar aspectual meanings in other languages because many of them set up a terminology of their own. As a result, they ended up with long and complicated lists of terms and definitions related to the verb aspect (ibid.).

The four possible expressions of aspects that Jespersen distinguishes are the ordinary meanings of the verb itself, the occasional meaning of the verb as occasioned by the context or situation, a derivative suffix, and a tense-form (ibid.). On the grounds of this, it follows that he did not separate lexical and grammatical verb features.

Jespersen (ibid.: 287) comes up with his own aspectual classification because he purposefully rejects bringing together different phenomena under a single class (aspect) or two classes (aspect and Aktionsart). Since he claims that these different phenomena should be distributed into completely different pigeonholes, he suggests seven aspectual oppositions: aorist/imperfect, conclusiveness/inconclusiveness, durativity/punctuality, completion/incompletion, stability/change, implication/non-implication, and the distinction between what takes place only once and repeated happenings.

Finally, Jespersen considers his classification more appropriate than the imperfective/perfective classification because, according to him, this distinction and the notions themselves have a definite sense only in Slavic languages.

Etsko Kruisinga dedicates an entire chapter to aspect in his grammar book *A Handbook of Present-day English* (1931). He recognizes the confusion when it comes to this topic, which he ascribes to the absence of forms that clearly express the contrasting aspects in English. He states: “aspect is a translation of a term used in Slavonic grammar to denote the meaning of a verbal form in so far as it expresses whether the speaker looks upon an action in its entirety, or with special reference to some part (chiefly the beginning or end)” (ibid.: 221).

The author (ibid.: 221) starts the discussion on aspect by referring to Slavic languages, claiming that aspect is an inherent characteristic of Slavic verbs. He also adds that Slavic verbs are inherently either imperfective or perfective, which means that Slavic languages distinguish between imperfective and perfective aspect. Kruisinga illustrates the difference between these two types of aspect by contrasting two verb phrases: to sit and to sit down. The imperfective aspect is expressed by the first verb phrase, while the perfective is expressed by the second. Kruisinga emphasizes that the English equivalents are not the same as Slavic because in English to sit and to sit down are considered two separate actions, while in Slavic they are seen as two aspects of the same action. Therefore, Slavic verb phrases necessarily express aspect and the choice of one aspect over the other is a
matter of usage, while English verbs (e.g. give, lend, revenge, explain, greet, etc.) are neutral in terms of aspect in the vast majority of cases.

An important point in Krusinga’s reflection on aspect is the introduction of a new term – character (ibid.: 230–231). Namely, he states that the verb pairs such as to crack – to crackle, to climb – to clamber, etc. represent different, but related actions. What is different about them is their character. He states that the difference of character is objective, while the difference of aspect is subjective. The aspect/character opposition defined in this way can be considered a precursor of aspect/Aktionsart.

Kruisinga makes reference to inchoative aspect, claiming that it is used for verb phrases that denote the beginning of an action: to catch the sight of, to take possession of, etc. He also states that sometimes two completely different verbs may reflect aspectual differences: to live (imperfective) – to settle (perfective), to say (imperfective) – to tell (perfective), etc. Finally, he considers “the verbal form in ing” the only form in living English which expresses aspect. He explains that its true aspectual nature can be fully understood when compared to the verbal stem and the simple predicative verbs (ibid.: 232, 235, 237).

In A New English Grammar (1955), Henry Sweet studies aspect in a close relationship to tense. For instance, he distinguishes between complete and incomplete tenses (e.g. The clock has just struck twelve. vs. The clock is striking twelve.). He also refers to tense-aspect as a separate category and pays special attention to duration. The author (ibid.: 101–103) concludes that duration does not necessarily depend on, or is conditioned by grammatical forms. Rather, it can depend on the meaning of the verb phrase (e.g. fell down is an instance of a short tense, while lay down represents a long tense). The author emphasizes that the long tenses are either continuous or recurrent, denoting repetition, habit, etc. On the other hand, there are point-tenses which are used when narrating a succession of occurrences. Finally, he refers to inchoative tenses which express the beginning of an action or an attempted action.

According to Sweet (ibid.: 103) a tense which was originally meant to express distinctions of time may come to imply a variety of special meanings. So, the present time is normally incomplete, the past time is normally, though not necessarily, complete, and the future time is uncertain. The author claims that these implied meanings make it difficult to compare tenses in various languages as well as to define their exact meanings.

Another crucial distinctive feature of tenses that Sweet addresses is definiteness. The author makes a correlation between definiteness and duration and observes that the shorter a tense is, the more definite it is in duration and its relation to the past, present, or future. On the other hand, long tenses, continuous or recurrent, are indefinite (ibid.).

While grammarians primarily focused on aspect as a grammatical category, language philosophers focused on verb semantics. Language phi-
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Philosophers came up with various verb typologies, and such verb typologies in fact represent typologies of Aktionsart (see Brinton 1988: 23).

The essential distinction in the grammar of natural languages between actions that involve some kind of motion with an end or limit (e.g. leave, find, die) and those without (e.g. walk, see, know) is based on Aristotle’s dichotomy between kinesis (‘motion’, ‘change’) and energeia (‘actuality’, ‘actualization’, ‘activity’) (see Filip 2011: 1186–1187). This kind of dichotomy served as a starting point for works of language philosophers such as Ryle (1949), Vendler (1957), and Kenny (1963).

Vendler’s classification has enjoyed the most widespread use. He comes up with a verb typology which consists of four classes: activities (e.g. walk, run, push a cart, etc.), states (e.g. want, love, hate, etc.), achievements (e.g. recognize, reach, start, etc.), and accomplishments (e.g. run a mile, grow up, recover from an illness). His classification can be defined by means of semantic features such as stativity, durativity, and telicity. In accordance with these features, activities are characterized by [-stativity], [+durativity], and [-telicity], i.e. activities imply a process, consist of equal successive elements, can last for a certain amount of time, do not imply a goal, and do not have a natural final segment in which the situation ends. States are characterized by [+stativity], [+durativity], and [-telicity], i.e. states are homogenous, which means that they do not imply a process, they do not consist of segments, and they do not strive towards a goal or a natural endpoint, but rather indicate the duration of a particular situation. Finally, accomplishments and achievements are both characterized by [-stativity] and [+telicity], which means that they imply a process and strive towards a goal, but accomplishments are durative and therefore characterized by [+durativity], while achievements are instantaneous and characterized by [-durativity].

Brinton (1988: 28–31) points out some weaknesses of the verb typologies. Namely, she claims that Vendler failed to place his study in a wider linguistic context and that he generally ignored the influence of aspect. In addition, she notices a tendency to speak in terms of types of verbs, rather than in terms of ‘categories of verb predication’, which means that we must recognize that Aktionsart is a feature of the entire sentence and that it is difficult to specify the ‘basic’ Aktionsart of any verb. Finally, there is a failure to recognize agency as a feature separate from aspect.

In A Course in Modern Linguistics (1958) Hockett compares tense, mode, and aspect. He claims that “tenses typically show different locations of an event in time”, while “aspects have to do, not with the location of an event in time, but with its temporal distribution or contour” (ibid.: 237). The author observes that English verbs have inflections for present and past time, whereas future time is expressed by other means. To the contrary, English does not have inflectional aspects, but the aspectual contrasts are shown in the structure of the verb phrase: he sings - he is singing,
he has sung - he has been singing, he sang - he was singing, he had sung - he had been singing (ibid.).

It seems that Hockett’s attitudes on tense and aspect are by far most similar to contemporary attitudes. He shows the aspectual differences using simple, progressive and perfect aspect, even though he does not label them as such explicitly.

According to Curme (1966: 55), “aspect indicates the aspect, the type, the character of the action”. Curme distinguishes among three types of aspect: terminate aspect, progressive aspect, and point-action aspect. Curme emphasizes that terminate aspect “takes the common verb form and represents an action as a whole, as a fact, habitual, customary, characteristic, or as a general truth” (ibid.). Progressive aspect, on the other hand, represents an action in progress or “as going on”. Point-action calls attention to either the beginning or the end of an action. Therefore, there are two subtypes of this aspect: ingressive aspect, which refers to the initial phase of the action and effective aspect, which calls attention to the final stage of the action, or the result/goal that has been reached. (ibid.: 56)

Curme (ibid.: 259) claims that terminate and progressive aspects represent the main aspects. While the common form of the verb is normally used to represent an objective state of affairs (e.g. There he comes.), the present participle, which is in the progressive form, has descriptive force (e.g. He is coming down the road.) In other words, “Both the simple and the progressive form represent the acts as habitual, but the latter has the warmth of feeling in it” (ibid.: 260) The author further elaborates on this “warmth of feeling” by saying that we consider the progressive a modal form expressing “joy, sorrow, pleasure, displeasure, praise, censure, also emphasis, implying that the person in question is convinced of the truth or importance of the statement”.

One of the essential studies in the field of aspectology is Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect (1976) by Bernard Comrie. It’s a typological study in which the author compares aspect in English and other languages such as Russian, French, Spanish, and Italian. This study is one of the essential ones because Comrie defines aspect in a general way and that kind of definition is applicable in languages such as English, which does not have formal markers of aspect, and Russian, in which aspect is an inherent verbal feature. Namely, he refers to aspect as “different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation” (ibid.: 3).

According to Comrie, the main aspectual meanings in English are perfective and imperfective and this aspectual opposition was referred to in the introduction of this paper. He explains that “the perfective looks at the situation from outside, without necessarily distinguishing any of the internal structure of the situation, whereas the imperfective looks at the situation from inside, and as such is crucially concerned with the internal structure of the situation...” (ibid.). Comrie emphasizes that the difference between perfective and imperfective aspect is not objective, but rath-
er subjective because the speaker chooses the way they want to present the situation. Finally, the author dedicates an entire chapter to aspectual meanings. Namely, he makes a distinction between punctual and durative, telic and atelic, and stative and dynamic situations (ibid.: 41–51). He considers such oppositions “inherent aspectual (i.e. semantic aspectual) properties of various classes of lexical items” and observes their interaction with other aspectual oppositions (i.e. perfective and imperfective). It is interesting to note that even though he includes semantic features of verbs in his analysis of aspect, he does not refer to them as Aktionsart. What is more, he explicitly uses the term Aktionsart in a footnote claiming that in addition to aspect, some linguists use this term as well. He explains that this German word stands for ‘kinds of action’. In regard to the main difference between aspect and Aktionsart, Comrie claims that aspect is “grammaticalization of the relevant semantic distinctions, while aktionsart represents lexicalization of the distinctions, irrespective of how these distinctions are lexicalized” (ibid.: 7).

Finally, Comrie introduces the third aspectual meaning, the perfect, as in John has read the book. Comrie states that the perfect is quite problematic for two main reasons: there are studies which do not regard it as aspect and the definition of aspect given above cannot be really interpreted to include it as an aspect. On the other hand, the perfect cannot be regarded as tense either, mainly because it is incompatible with past and present tense adverbials (ibid.: 5–6). Since Comrie sees aspect as different ways of representing the internal temporal constitution of a situation, he classifies the perfect as a different kind of aspect because it does not tell us anything about the situation itself, but rather relates it to a preceding situation (ibid.: 52). He identifies different kinds of perfect aspect: perfect of result, experiential perfect, perfect of persistent situation, and perfect of recent past. Finally, he shows that perfect aspect can be combined with the imperfective and perfective.

Zandvoort writes about verbs in the first part of his grammar book A Handbook of English Grammar (1977). However, he does not really pay much attention to aspect. The author contrasts the present participle, claiming that it refers to an action represented as being in progress and having a certain duration, and the plain infinitive, which represents the action as such, either because its length is considered irrelevant, or because it actually occupies just a moment. (ibid.: 33). He then explicitly points out that such difference is sometimes called aspect. He claims that the aspect expressed by the present participle is called imperfective or durative and that the aspect expressed by the infinitive is called perfective.

In his publication Word Meaning and Montague Grammar (1979) David Dowty deals with certain problems centering around the semantics of the so-called Aristotelian verb classification, which is, in fact, the distinction among states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements in Vendler's terminology. One of the main goals of his work is to present analyses
of this classification relying on the framework of generative semantics and syntactic and semantic framework developed by Richard Montague and his associates, as well as the grammatical constructions which provide the diagnostic tests for differentiating among these classes in English.

When it comes to the diagnostic tests, Dowty (ibid.: 55) compares states and activities first. He suggests that only non-statives can occur in the progressive, as complements of verbs such as *force* and *persuade*, as imperatives, and with the adverbials like *deliberately* and *carefully*. Next, he (ibid.: 56–57) compares activities and accomplishments. Namely, activities and accomplishments appear with different types of adverbials: accomplishments normally take the adverbials with *in* (e.g. *in an hour*), while activities can only take the adverbials with *for* (e.g. *for an hour*). Almost parallel to these constructions are the constructions with *spend* and *take*. Accomplishments appear with both of these verbs (e.g. *John spent an hour painting a picture*, *It took John an hour to paint a picture*), while activities appear only with *spend* (e.g. *John spent an hour walking*). In terms of entailments of these verbal situations, there is a noticeable difference. The following applies for activities: *If John walked for an hour, at any given time during that hour it was true that John walked*. However, the same cannot be stated for accomplishments: *If John painted a picture for an hour, then it is not the case that he painted a picture at any time during that hour*. In addition to this, if *walk* is an activity, then *John is walking* entails that *John has walked*, while if *paint a picture* is an accomplishment, then *John is painting a picture* does not entail that *John has painted* the picture. Finally, only accomplishments can occur as complements of the verbs such as *finish*. When it comes to achievements, they normally appear with *in* and *took*-phrases and they are unacceptable with verbs like *finish* and *stop*. Finally, certain adverbial phrases, such as *attentively*, *studiously*, *vigilantly*, *conscientiously*, *obediently*, *carefully*, etc. are anomalous with achievements because they combine with verb phrases that imply duration (ibid.: 58–60).

Dowty also lists some problems with Vendler’s classification. Some of these problems are related to indefinite plurals and mass nouns (ibid.: 62–65). For instance, accomplishments which take plural direct objects become activities (e.g. *John is painting a picture* vs. *John is painting pictures*). Dowty confirmed that we cannot talk about the *Aktionsart* of a single verb, but of an entire verb phrase or clause.

Carl Bache (1982) discusses the differences between aspect and *Aktionsart* and presents his viewpoint in relation to other attitudes existing in the literature. When it comes to the precise differentiation between these two categories, Bache concludes the following:

*Aktionsart concerns the procedural characteristics (i.e. the ‘phasal structure’, ‘time extension’ and ‘manner of development’) ascribed to any given situation referred to by a verb phrase whereas aspect reflects the situational focus with which a situation is represented. Sometimes the speaker/writer has a ‘subjective choice’ between two ways of representing the situation*.
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(in cases of pure aspectual opposition), sometimes he MUST choose one or the other way of representation (in cases where the aspects function in different ways in relation to tense and Aktionsart). This interpretation of the difference between aspect and Aktionsart is thus stated not in terms of ‘subjectivity’ versus ‘objectivity’ but rather in terms of what might be called ‘quasi-subjectivity’ and ‘quasi-objectivity’ (ibid.: 70–71).

In terms of terminology, Bache observes the very term Aktionsart and compares it with other existing terms such as ‘inherent meaning’ and ‘aspectual character’ used by scholars such as Comrie and Lyons. He explains that these scholars avoid the term Aktionsart because they consider it confusing. However, he is of the opinion that terms ‘inherent meaning’ and ‘aspectual character’ cause no less confusion and therefore encourages keeping the term Aktionsart until a better term, which would cover the aspect-independent, ‘quasi-objective’ nature of the relevant distinctions, is proposed. (ibid.: 71).

A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language (1985) by Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik is one of the most influential grammar books of English. These authors claim that aspect is a grammatical category which reflects the way in which the verb action is regarded or experienced with respect to time. They identify two aspect constructions in English: the perfective and the progressive. The perfective is used when an action is viewed as complete, while the progressive refers to actions in progress. In addition, they use the word simple to describe a verb phrase totally un-marked for aspect. In other words, in this grammar book, simple aspect refers to those actions that are considered perfective in other grammar books. Furthermore, the term perfective used in this grammar book refers to actions considered perfect in other books, for example in Comrie’s.

Present perfective (also called the Present Perfect) is considered to refer to past events with current relevance because it is used for state(s) leading up to the present, indefinite event(s) in a period leading up to the present, and habits (i.e. recurrent events) in a period leading up to the present. (ibid.: 192). The past perfective (i.e. the Past Perfect) has the meaning of ‘past-in-the-past’ because it can be seen as an anterior version either of the present perfective or of the simple past. (ibid.: 195)

When it comes to the progressive, it indicates an action in progress at a given time. The authors emphasize three basic meaning components of the progressive: the happening has duration, the happening has limited duration, the happening is not necessarily complete (ibid.: 198). Finally, they discuss the perfective and perfective progressive combinations (ibid.: 210).

Palmer (1988: 54–56) identifies two main aspects, progressive and non-progressive. He explains that the progressive refers to an action that is in progress and that is in a sense durational, while the non-progressive just reports an action. He emphasizes that the non-progressive can also refer to actions with duration in cases when the meaning of the lexical verb includes a sense of duration.
As per other durational uses, Palmer points out that the progressive often suggests that the activity is not finished, whereas the non-progressive normally refers to completed actions. Moreover, the progressive does not imply unbroken activities and therefore can be used with adverbials and adjectivals more and more, faster and faster, etc.

He also claims that both the progressive and non-progressive can be used to refer to “action at the time indicated, to action in the future or to habitual (or repeated) action.” (ibid.: 56) Even the non-progressive can be used to refer to non-habitual present, despite the fact that its habitual use is most often emphasized. Some of the situations where the non-progressive, simple present, is used are the following: in a radio commentary where the commentator is reporting something that the audience cannot see, in demonstrations, where the audience can see what is happening, yet the commentator is reporting to avoid misinterpretations, where the words themselves form part of the activity they report, e.g. I name this ship..., and when reporting an action that contains an adverbial indicating the manner or the cause of the activity, e.g. Yesterday he talked nonsense. Today he talks like an expert.

When it comes to habitual meanings both the progressive and the non-progressive are possible. If the progressive is used, the adverbial is required (e.g. those days, in those days, etc.), and such progressive use implies that the habitual activity takes place over a limited period of time. The progressive is also used to refer to sporadic or repeated habitual activity, normally with a tone of disapproval: The car’s always breaking down.

When referring to future actions, both the progressive and non-progressive need to be marked by an adverbial. The progressive is normally used to indicate a future prediction, or speaker’s intention, while the non-progressive refers to an activity that is scheduled.

Finally, it is important to note that Palmer does not consider perfect to be an aspect, but a phase referring to an activity which happened before a particular moment and which lasts at least up to that point.

Brinton (1988: 52–57) observes that we need an aspectual theory which recognizes aspect and Aktionsart as two separate systems. An aspect model that she proposes consists of five categories: perfective, imperfective, phase, habitual, and perfect. The perfective views a situation as complete, total, whole, and it is most commonly expressed by simple forms. The imperfective views a situation as incomplete and it consists of two subcategories: the progressive and the continuative. The progressive views a situation as ongoing or progressing (and therefore incomplete), while the continuative views the situation as continuing rather than ending (and, again, incomplete). The progressive is expressed by be + V-ing and the continuative is expressed by continue to V, V-ing and keep on V-ing. When it comes to the phase aspects, Brinton observes them as a separate category which consists of ingressive and egressive aspects. They are expressed by a variety of aspectualizers: start to V, V-ing; begin to V, V-ing (ingressive), and stop V-ing;
cease to V, V-ing; finish V-ing (egressive). Habitual aspect views a situation as repeated on several occasions and it is expressed by simple forms, as well as by (be) used to V and be accustomed to V. Finally, the perfect has no subcategories and is expressed by have V-en.

Brinton’s matrix of Aktionsart categories includes states, achievements, activities, accomplishments, and series. These types of situations can be determined based on the following distinctive features: dynamicity, durativity, homogeneity, telicity, and multiplicity. The final distinctive feature serves to differentiate series from activities: series can be described as [+multiple], whereas activities are [-multiple].

Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English (1999) by Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan is another capital grammar book of English. The authors relate aspect to completion or lack of completion of events or states which a verb denotes. They distinguish between two types of aspect: the perfect which “designates events or states taking place during a period leading up to the specified time”, and the progressive which “designates an event or state of affairs which is in progress, or continuing, at the time indicated by the rest of the verb phrase” (ibid.: 460). In this grammar book, aspect is dealt with in the same way as in Quirk et al. (1985). What is different about this book is that the authors provide a distribution of simple, perfective, and progressive aspect across registers and dialects.

There is a noticeable difference regarding aspect in the third capital grammar book of English, The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language (2002), by Huddleston and Pullum in comparison to the first two grammar books. These authors adopt Comrie’s definition of aspect, make a clear distinction between form and meaning, and pay special attention to the terminology they use. Namely, they (ibid.: 117–118) differentiate between progressive and non-progressive aspect, and between imperfective and perfective aspectuality. Aspect is a term which refers to the formal system, while aspectuality refers to the meaning of the forms. Perfective aspectuality presents a situation as a complete whole, and it is viewed, as it were, from outside, without any reference to the internal temporal structure of the situation. Imperfective aspectuality, on the other hand, does not present a situation as a whole, but rather focuses on some element or segment of the internal temporal structure of the situation and is viewed from inside.

These authors (ibid.: 124–125) claim that in English, forms such as simple present and preterite, which refer to non-progressive aspect, can be used both perfectly and imperfectively. For instance, He died last week., I’ll write again soon., He reigned for a year. would all be instances of non-progressive aspect used perfectly. On the other hand, examples such as He lives in Bonn. and He often cycles to work. would be instances of the non-progressive used imperfectively. Imperfectivity can be also expressed by the be + gerund-participle construction, which represents progressive aspect: He is working. This is an example of a dynamic situation presented as ongoing, or, in progress.
These authors make an explicit distinction between the terms the perfect and the perfective: “It will be clear, then, that ‘perfective’ has a quite different sense from ‘perfect’; in some works of English, however, ‘perfective’ is used with the meaning (following the most usual practice) we give to ‘perfect’” (ibid.: 124). Namely, they consider the perfect to be a tense. They compare it to the preterite (i.e. simple past) and say that both of these tenses express the temporal relation of anteriority (see ibid.: 139).

Finally, Huddleston and Pullum pay a lot of attention to lexical aspect. They refer to states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements and provide detailed explanations on linguistic differences among these situations. This is also an improvement in comparison to the previous capital grammar books which do not refer to lexical aspect as a separate category.

Susan Rothstein deals with lexical aspect in her monograph Structuring Events: A Study of the Semantics of the Lexical Aspect (2004). Rothstein emphasizes a difference between grammatical and lexical aspect in the introduction of her work. In terms of grammatical aspect, she embraces Comrie’s definition, and in terms of lexical aspect, she states the following: “Lexical aspect, sometimes called “Aktionsart” and corresponding to Smith’s situation aspect, covers distinctions between properties of event-types denoted by verbal expressions, which linguists have tried to capture by classifying verbs into verb classes” (ibid.: 1).

Rothstein’s verbal typology is based on Vendler’s typology, though, besides states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements, Rothstein introduces the fifth class known as semelfactives. Semelfactives are instantaneous just like achievements, but, in contrast to achievements, they are atelic. Their instantaneous character can be checked by using adverbials with a preposition at: e.g. John coughed/winked at 10 p.m., and they are considered atelic because, unlike achievements such as die, arrive, etc., they do not bring about any change of state (ibid.: 28).

Rothstein provides a detailed and comprehensive study of aspectual classes. She dedicates entire chapters to achievements, accomplishments, resultative predication, as well as distinctive features such as telicity, atomicity, quantization, etc. One of the interesting problems that she brings about is the interrelation between grammatical and lexical aspect, i.e. the possibility of grammatical aspect affecting the Aktionsart of a situation marked by a verb. The problem concerns the use of achievements in the progressive. The author states that achievements are almost instantaneous and therefore should be incompatible with the progressive which refers to actions in progress and which should be restricted to activities and accomplishments. However, achievements occur in the progressive: Dafna is finding her shoes., The plane is landing., Jane is just reaching the summit., etc. Rothstein explains that there are authors who suggest that achievements used in the progressive in fact represent disguised accomplishments (e.g. Verkuyl 1989), i.e. that progressive achievements shift into an accomplish-
ment reading (e.g. Mittwoch 1991). However, she dismisses this standpoint explaining that in that case accomplishments and achievements should behave in the same way in the progressive, which she shows is not the case. She agrees that the intuition behind this statement is right and she proposes a semantic account of what underlies it. Namely, the progressive does not treat the achievement as a special type of lexical accomplishment, but it triggers a type-shifting operation which results in an accomplishment being derived from the achievement (ibid.: 37).

In *Meaning and the English Verb* (2004) Geoffrey Leech provides a precise description of various aspectual meanings, listing the linguistic contexts in which they occur. He starts by defining aspect as different ways of representing a situation, and then represents numerous verb forms combining tense and aspect. The author first presents the Simple Present and the Simple Past tenses stating their different uses. Namely, Leech recognizes the *stative, habitual, and event* uses as the primary uses of the Simple Present tense. When it comes to the Simple Past tense, its basic meaning is referring to events that happened before the moment of speech. Leech makes a distinction between those that happen *simultaneously* and those, characteristic of narrative contexts, that happen *in sequence*.

In regard to the progressive, Leech points out that it is used to refer to *temporary* happenings, emphasizing features such as *duration, limited duration*, as well as *incomplete* happenings. Furthermore, he addresses the relationship between the progressive and different verb classes. Finally, the author considers the *habitual or iterative* use as well as the use of the present progressive to indicate future events as *other uses* of the progressive.

The next chapter deals with the *Present Perfect* and its uses such as *state-up-to-the-present, habit-up-to-the-present, indefinite past, and resultantive past*. Then, the author introduces the *Past Perfect*, as well as the combination of perfect and progressive aspects. The last chapter relevant to our research presents expressions denoting future events, including modals, semi-modals, progressive and non-progressive forms of the present tense, as well as combinations of modals and progressive verb tense.

Since Leech studies aspect in combination with tense, it would be appropriate to point out Comrie’s (1976: 5) position that these two grammatical categories are closely related to *time*, but in different ways. Namely, tense is a deictic category, which means that it locates situations in time, normally (but not exclusively) with reference to the present moment, while aspect is concerned with the internal temporal constituency of a situation. Therefore, aspect refers to *situation-internal time*, while tense refers to *situation-external time*. 
3. ASPECT AND AKTIONSART IN SERBIAN LITERATURE

Aspect is dealt with in a similar manner in many grammar books of the Serbian language, including the contemporary ones. Namely, as it is going to be shown in the following paragraphs, linguists talk about two fundamental aspec
tual oppositions: \textit{perfective} and \textit{imperfective} as well as \textit{bi-aspectual} verbs. The most frequent notions used to refer to these aspec
tual oppositions are \textit{svršeni glagolski vid} (corresponding to \textit{perfective}) and \textit{nesvršeni glagolski vid} (corresponding to \textit{perfective}). These terms have a long
tradition of use in Serbian. For example, Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1814:
46–47) and Đuro Daničić (1850: 39–40) use terms such as \textit{soveršitelni} and
\textit{nesoveršitelni glagoli}. As Spasojević (2017: 230) shows in her paper deal-
ing with Slavic aspec
tual terminology, these notions were introduced into Slavic grammar from the Latin language. Aelius Donatus, a Roman scholar
from the 4th century, played a key role in establishing the terminology
related to the category of verb aspect when his grammar book was trans-
lated into Russian in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century. Melantije Smotricki made calques
based upon Donat’s terms \textit{formae perfectae}, \textit{formae frequentativae} and \textit{for-
mae inchoative}. He used the word \textit{vid} instead of \textit{formae}, and then created
the term \textit{совршенный вид} which corresponds to \textit{formae perfectae}. However,
the terms \textit{svršeni} and \textit{nesvršeni} refer to duration, and as it is going to be
shown, duration is not the basic distinctive feature of the category of verb
aspect. Therefore, some authors advise against using these terms.

Aleksandar Belić (2000: 218–219) differentiates between two types
of aspect: \textit{unbounded} or \textit{imperfective} (S. \textit{neograničeni}) and \textit{bounded} or \textit{per-
fective} (S. \textit{ograničeni}). Unbounded aspect refers to actions that last without
any interruption as in \textit{spavati}, \textit{pevati}, etc. (E. \textit{to sleep}, \textit{to sing}) or to those
actions which are repeated \textit{ad infinitum} like \textit{kuckati}, \textit{poskakivati} (E. \textit{to keep
on knocking, bouncing}). Accordingly, the author differentiates between two
types of unbounded verbs: \textit{durative} and \textit{iterative}.

Bounded aspect refers to actions that always express one completed
moment: the beginning or the end of an action, as well as an action under-
stood to last for one moment only (i.e. \textit{a momentaneous} action). Therefore,
it includes verbs which are bounded or perfective in their meaning, like
\textit{sesti}, \textit{pasti} (E. \textit{to sit down}, \textit{to fall down}), or verbs normally formed by prefix-
ation, like \textit{pisati} – \textit{napisati} (E. \textit{to be writing} – \textit{to have written}).

Finally, Belić refers to the so-called \textit{bi-aspectual} verbs. These verbs
can express both perfective and imperfective aspect without any change in
their form, and their exact aspect is determined in the linguistic context.
Verbs such as \textit{telefonirati}, \textit{videti}, \textit{čuti} (E. \textit{to talk on the phone}, \textit{to see}, \textit{to hear})
are considered bi-aspectual.

Đuro Grubor (1953: 5–10) takes \textit{completion} to be the main distinctive
feature of aspect. He claims that an action that is incomplete, i.e. still in
progress, is expressed by \textit{imperfective} aspect, while the completed, i.e. fin-
ished action is expressed by \textit{perfective} aspect. Moreover, he classifies verbs
into two types: R-verbs and S-verbs. The first refer to an action which develops or unfolds gradually, whereas the latter refer to states that do not involve any change. He combines these two types of aspect and two types of verbs and comes up with the following classification: imperfective aspect of R-verbs, imperfective aspect of S-verbs, perfective aspect of R-verbs, and perfective aspect of S-verbs. Imperfective R-verbs refer to actions that develop and unfold, while perfective R-verbs refer to the amount of action that has been completed. S-verbs do not involve any action, development, or completion, but they still have imperfective and perfective aspect. Namely, imperfective S-verbs denote a state somebody or something is in, while perfective S-verbs refer to the amount of time someone or something was in a particular state.

The author (ibid.: 5–6) refers to perfectivization and imperfectivization which are processes related to aspectual pairs. Aspectual pairs represent pairs of verbs which have the same meaning, but express different aspects. For instance, pisati (E. to write) is an imperfective verb which becomes perfective after adding a prefix – napisati (E. to have written). This is an instance of perfectivization. Imperfectivization is the reverse process, i.e. the process of creating imperfective verbs out of perfective.

Grubor (ibid.: 12–13) also presents a detailed list of aspectual meanings based on the degree of completion of the action. Some such meanings are inchoative which refers to the beginning of an action as in pevati – zapevati (E. to sing – to start singing), egressive, which refers to the completion of the final stage of an action as in graditi – dograditi (E. to build – to build on), diminutive, which refers to actions which last shorter than a regular action denoted by a particular verb as in zviždati – pozviždati (E. to whistle – to whistle for a short time), augmentative, which refers to actions that are exaggerated as in peći – prepeći (E. to cook – to overcook), etc.

Furthermore, he (ibid.) classifies verbs into three groups depending on the type of action they denote. Creative verbs refer to the process of creation as in graditi – sagraditi (E. to build – to have built), transformative verbs refer to the process of change as in orati – uzorati (E. to plow – to have plowed), and motive verbs denote actions that refer to a change of place as in ići – doći (E. to go – to come). Finally, the author presents and elaborates on different combinations of these aspectual meanings and types of verbs.

According to Stevanović (1969: 508), aspect is a morphological category because aspectual differences are most often reflected in the verb form. However, it can also be regarded as a syntactic category because the exact aspect of bi-aspectual verbs is determined in the context, i.e. within a sentence.

Stevanović (ibid.: 513) considers duration to be the main distinctive feature of aspect. Therefore, he distinguishes between imperfective and perfective verbs (i.e. aspects) and he explains that the former refer to actions or processes with indefinite duration, while the latter normally refer to one completed moment of the action denoted by a verb. However, Stevanović
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carefully goes on to explain that some perfective verbs also imply the time that passed before the moment of completion. For instance, verbs such as pročitati, prevesti, etc. (E. to have read, to have translated) include the process of reading, i.e. translating before the moment of completion has been reached. However, the author still emphasizes that the moment of completion is crucial.

Like Belić, Stevanović (ibid.: 513–514) also refers to two types of imperfective verbs: durative which denote an action with indefinite duration and without any interruptions such as čitati, pevati, raditi, pisati, etc. (E. to read, to sing, to do, to write), and iterative with indefinite duration and interruptions such as skidati, spuštati, ulagati, etc. (E. to keep on taking off, to keep on putting down, to keep on investing). In fact, according to Stevanović, durativity and iterativity are considered to represent the character (S. lik) of the imperfective verbs. In addition, Stevanović (ibid.: 515–518) specifies different characters of perfective verbs. For instance, there are momentaneous verbs (S. trenutno-svršeni) such as trepnuti, kucnuti (E. to blink, to knock), different types of ingressive verbs (S. početno-svršeni) which refer to different aspects of the beginning of an action such as zapevati (S. to start singing), and different kinds of egressive verbs (S. završeno-svršeni) which refer to different aspects of the end of an action such as poginuti, pročerdati, etc. (E. to perish, to waste).

Stevanović (ibid.: 518–521) also refers to perfectivization and imperfectivization and like many other linguists defines them as morphological processes for forming perfective and imperfective verbs. Perfectivization refers to adding prefixes (and some suffixes like –nu) to imperfective verbs in order to make them perfective, while imperfectivization refers to transforming perfective verbs into imperfective by means of changing the base of the perfective verbs.

Stevanović (ibid.: 521–524) finishes the discussion on the verb aspect by referring to bi-aspectual verbs. His explanation is the same as the one provided by Belić and other scholars dealing with Serbian grammar. Accordingly, he defines these verbs as the ones that have the same form for perfective and imperfective aspect, and whose exact aspect depends on the context.

Riđanović (1976: 2) claims that in Serbo-Croatian (SC), verbs are traditionally seen to belong to one of at least two verbal aspects: imperfective or perfective, depending on whether the action denoted by a verb is considered to be in progress or completed. In other words, according to Riđanović, completion is traditionally regarded as the main distinctive feature of aspect. The author also refers to the difference between aspect and Aktionsart. While the first notion refers to the two basic categories of Slavic verbs, those showing the action as completed or in progress, the second notion, taken from the German language, refers to semantic functions of verbs. In other words, aspect is related to grammar, while Aktionsart is related to lexicology (ibid.: 7). The author further explains that there
is a universal agreement on the number of aspects, as well as on the fact that they are affected by morphology, syntax, and semantics. However, one of the main points of disagreement refers to the number and nature of sub-aspects of the two major aspeccal categories (ibid.: 75).

Riđanović (ibid.: 8–9) then provides a list of some of the most recognized Aktionsarten in SC such as ingressive (or inceptive, inchoative), referring to the beginning of an action as in začevati (E. to start singing), terminative, which marks the end of a prolonged action as in ispričati (E. to finish telling a story), resultative which refers to an action whose end brings about a result as in izgraditi (to build let’s say a house), momentaneous, referring to an action conceived of as taking place at a point in time as in poznavati (E. to recognize), and diminutive, which denotes actions viewed with an endearment attitude or as ones that last for a short period of time, as in kupnuti se (E. to take an enjoyable short swim) or popričati (E. to talk for a little while). These represent the Aktionsarten of perfective verbs because they are incompatible with the idea of duration. On the other hand, durative, iterative, indeterminate, determinate, and distributive represent the Aktionsarten of imperfective verbs. Durative Aktionsart is used to refer to those actions that last without reaching a climax of any sort as in disati (E. to breathe), iterative Aktionsart refers to actions that exist by virtue of being composed of smaller segments of the same activity as in koracati (E. to stride or make steps) or to actions whose instances are repeated throughout a certain period of time as in davati (E. to give habitually), indeterminate denotes a multidirectional action as in letati (E. to fly around) and can be compared to its determinate counterpart as in leteti (E. to fly in a particular direction). Finally, distributive Aktionsart can occur with both imperfective and perfective aspect and it indicates that the performance of the action expressed by an intransitive verb is distributed among a number of subjects as in the imperfective-perfective pair razboljevati se – porazboljevati se (E. to get sick).

However, in terms of aspect, Riđanović departs from the widely accepted tradition in Slavistics and states that the major feature of the opposition between these two types of aspect should be indivisibility versus divisibility of the temporal dimension associated with the action and not imperfectivity versus perfectivity (ibid.: 83). Therefore, he suggests a new tripartite categorization of aspect in SC: stative, cursive, and totive. The first category includes verbs which denote properties, relations, and states, the second includes verbs referring to activities and processes (traditionally called imperfective), and the third includes the verbs traditionally referred to as perfective. Moreover, since stative and cursive are defined negatively in relation to totive, they can be labeled as non-totive (ibid.: 91).

This classification into stative, cursive, and totive aspects can be further classified. The further classification in fact represents Aktionsart. Namely, stative aspect is comprised of permanment and non-permanent stative verbs, cursive aspect consists of generic cursive on the one hand, and specific cursive, durative, iterative, and distributive verbs on the other hand,
while totive aspect can be divided into extensive, terminative, and instantaneous. Extensive are further divided into simple-extensive, diminutive, and augmentative, terminative are divided into perfective, finitive, sative, majorative, and distributive. Finally, instantaneous verbs can be classified into simple-instantaneous, semelfactives, inceptive (divided into ingressive and inchoative), perfective, finitive, sative, etc. Ridanović (91–112) provides detailed explanations of these Aktionsarten and summarizes them in a diagram.

Stanojić and Popović (2005: 104) also take duration to be the main distinctive feature for determining aspect. They point out that Serbian verbs can be classified into three big categories: imperfective, perfective, and bi-aspectual. Imperfective verbs denote actions with indefinite duration, perfective verbs denote actions seen as completed or finished and bi-aspectual verbs can refer to both aspects.

These authors also discuss the character of verbs. Like previous authors, they agree that imperfective verbs can be classified depending on their character into durative verbs, i.e. the verbs with durative character and iterative verbs which are also indefinite in terms of duration, but which occur with interruptions. When it comes to the character of perfective verbs, these authors refer to the momentaneous verbs, ingressive, egressive, and indefinite-perfective verbs.

Klajn (2005: 105) also distinguishes between imperfective and perfective aspect. He claims that imperfective verbs denote actions in progress, as well as actions that last for some time in the past, present or future, without any limitation. In addition, the author states that almost all imperfective verbs can be used as iterative. For example, Učenici pišu zadatak. (E. The pupils are writing a task.) would be an instance of the verb pisati being used as imperfective, whereas Pisaću ti svakog dana. (E. I’ll write to you every day.) would be an instance of its iterative use. In this example, iterativity has been achieved by the use of the adverbial svakog dana, but Klajn (ibid.) points out that there are verbs such as večeravati, vidati (E. to keep on dining, to keep on seeing) which have an iterative meaning.

Perfective aspect, on the other hand, refers to completed actions as in Napisao sam pismo. (E. I wrote/have written a letter.). Klajn (ibid.) refers to three subcategories of perfectivity: momentaneous verbs, different types of ingressive verbs, and egressive verbs.

Then, the author (ibid.: 106–110) introduces bi-aspectual verbs, aspectual pairs, as well as perfectivization and imperfectivization. The representation of verb aspect in this grammar book is almost the same as in other grammar books of Serbian. However, the author does not explicitly refer to lexical meanings, he does not refer to aspectual character, but he considers iterative, ingressive, egressive, momentaneous verbs as subcategories of imperfective and perfective aspect.

Pavica Mrazović and Zora Vukadinović (2009: 77) study Aktionsart and aspect as two separate categories. When it comes to Aktionsart, the authors use a Serbian term akcionalnost and explain that it refers to the
kind of action and to the combination of different semantic components expressed in the lexical meaning of a verb. They point out that lexical-semantic verb classes do not represent a grammatical system, but rather the nature of the situation expressed by a verb. In other words, Aktionsart is related to distinctive features such as stativity, durativity, and punctuality because of which it was studied as a subclass of aspect in many contemporary grammar books of Serbian. However, these authors make a clean-cut distinction between these two categories emphasizing that Aktionsart is a lexical-semantic category, whereas aspect is a grammatical category. They (ibid.: 78–80) present a long list of Aktionsarten such as inchoative, transformative, creative, egressive, resultative, semelfactive, sative, distributive, durative, iterative, punctual, diminutive, augmentative, to name just a few.

In terms of aspect, the authors (ibid.: 80) explain that it represents a mandatory binary grammatical category (with the exception of bi-aspectual verbs). It involves verbs with the grammatical meaning of perfectivity as in leći (E. to lie down) and imperfectivity as in ležati (E. to lie). When defining these two types of grammatical meanings, Comrie’s influence can be noticed. Namely, Mrazović and Vukadinović state that perfectivity refers to presenting a situation as a single indivisible whole with a clearly marked result or an achieved goal without emphasizing the duration of that situation. Imperfectivity, on the other hand, refers to those actions whose segments can be divided, lacking the final segment. Imperfectivity refers to durative or iterative processes, actions, or states, so the action cannot be understood as a single whole. Therefore, these authors, just like Riđanović, take indivisibility and divisibility as main aspectual features. In addition, Mrazović and Vukadinović explain that unlike Aktionsart, an optional semantic category which modifies and specifies the meaning of a verb, aspect is a mandatory grammatical category, which means that almost all verbs can be classified as either perfective or imperfective. For instance, ingressive, egressive or punctual verbs are perfective, while durative and iterative verbs are imperfective (ibid.: 81).

When it comes to terminology, the authors make several important comments. Namely, they point out that Serbian notions trenutni and trajni glagoli (E. punctual and durative verbs) should not be used because only a handful of perfective verbs such as trepnuti, sesti (E. to blink, to sit down) in fact last for one moment only. Many other perfective verbs like napisati (E. to finish writing, to have written) imply duration. Therefore, these perfective verbs can be modified by adverbials which also denote duration. Furthermore, they explain that the idea of duration is quite subjective. Consequently, they suggest a slightly modified classification. Perfective aspect includes verbs which denote an action perceived as a single whole, with a clearly defined goal or result as in Otac je došao. (E. The father came/arrived). Imperfective aspect can be divided into habitual and durative. Habitual aspect would include examples like Prijatelji nam dolaze svako veče.
(E. Friends visit us every evening.). Durative aspect can be divided into non-progressive which includes examples like Dete spava. (E. The child is sleeping.) and progressive, which denotes actions which unfold and develop, such as Otac piše pismo. (E. The father is writing a letter.).

Finally, the authors (ibid.: 84–90) also refer to bi-aspectual verbs and aspectual pairs. As other grammarians, Mrazović and Vukadinović explain that bi-aspectual verbs are the verbs which can be both perfective and imperfective and that their aspect is determined in the linguistic context. As per aspectual pairs, they are defined as pairs of verbs which have the same meaning and different aspect as vratiti – vračati, pògledati – poglédati (to return – to keep returning, to look at – to keep looking at). Aspectual differences can be marked by adding prefixes, suffixes, or by changing the accent. However, the authors also refer to those verbs which do not have their aspectual pair, but are either only imperfective (S. imati – E. to have) or perfective (S. briznuti u plač – E. to burst into tears). Such verbs are called imperfectivum tantum, i.e. perfektivum tantum. In relation to aspectual pairs, Mrazović and Vukadinović comment on prefixation, perfectivization, and imperfectivization. They explain that prefixation is a lexical process because in many cases prefixes add a new meaning to a word, as in pasti (E. to fall) and dopasti se nekome (E. to be liked by someone) or they can modify the meaning of a word as in pisati (E. to write) and napisati (E. to finish writing or to have written). Perfectivization is a lexical-grammatical process because it involves changing the verb aspect by adding prefixes, which simultaneously change or modify the basic verb meaning. Imperfectivization is considered a grammatical process only because adding suffixes just changes the aspect, but the verb meaning remains the same.

Piper and Klajn (2013: 175) refer to aspect in a similar manner as Mrazović and Vukadinović (2009). Namely, they state that in Serbian, every verb is marked in terms of aspect which can be either imperfective or perfective. They explain that imperfective aspect does not contain any limit or goal towards which the action is directed as in ležati, gledati, disati (E. to lie, to watch, to breathe). Iterative verbs, i.e. verbs which denote a certain repetition, are also imperfective. However, they also point out that iterativity can be denoted by the verb itself as in kuckati (E. to keep on knocking) or by an adverbial as in Pisaču ti svakog dana. (E. I’ll write to you every day.).

These authors (ibid.: 175–176) point out that aspectual meanings can be expressed by lexical and syntactic means. For instance, if an adverbial such as svake subote (E. every Saturday) is used in a sentence, the verb in that sentence needs to be imperfective. However, that is not necessarily the case because a sentence like Svake subote upecao je ribu. (E. Every Saturday he caught a fish.) is perfectly acceptable in Serbian.

Like Mrazović and Vukadinović, these authors refer to the category of Aktionsart which they also call akcionalnost. However, Piper and Klajn (ibid.: 176) explain that this category is a lexical-grammatical category quite close to the category of aspect and that it refers to the manner in
which the action is presented by means of prefixes and suffixes. They distinguish among three basic types of Aktionsarten: temporal-phasal, quantitative, and resultative. These basic Aktionsarten consist of various subtypes. For example, temporal-phasal Aktionsart includes sub-categories like in-gressive, finitive, etc., quantitative Aktionsart involves sub-classes like semelfactive, iterative, etc., and resultative Aktionsart consists of sub-classes like cumulative, sative, etc.

The authors (ibid.: 177) also explain that aspect can be expressed by suffixes, prefixes, by changing the base of the verb, by changing the accent or by using aspectual verbs like početi, prestat, etc. (E. to start, to finish). Finally, their discussion on aspect also includes bi-aspectual verbs, aspectual pairs, as well as the processes of imperfectivization and perfectivization (ibid.: 177–180).

Finally, Marina Lj. Spasojević (2017: 229–230) systematized basic concepts and terms in the field of aspectology. She explains that introducing new terms related to studying aspect and Aktionsart is sometimes justified, but that in the vast majority of cases, new terms are mere calques for the already existing terms in Serbian grammar and that such accumulation of terminology represents one of the problems in this field. Then, the author refers to the term aspektologija (E. aspectology) and explains that it is a linguistic discipline which deals with the grammatical category of aspect, as well as with related lexical-grammatical categories like Aktionsart (which she refers to as akcionalnost), telicity, etc.

The author (ibid.: 230–231) then goes on to explain the etymology of the notions glagolski vid in Serbian and Slavic literature and aspect in other world languages. She also explains that in Serbian terms glagolski vid and aspekt are used synonymously, as well as aspectual oppositions nesvršeno/imperfektivno – svršeno/perfektivno. In terms of verb semantics (e.g. ingressive, durative verbs, etc.) she lists some terms used to refer to this category: Aktionsart (E. aktionsart), vidski lik (E. character), podvid (E. sub-aspect), vrsta akcije (E. type of action), tip glagolske situacije (E. type of the verb situation), eventualnost (E. eventuality), etc.

Spasojević (2017: 232) explains that aspect was normally studied in relation to the verb. However, some authors (e.g. Verkuyl 1972, 1993) introduced other elements like predicate and its arguments into the study of aspect as well. The term used in literature to refer to this kind of understanding of verb aspect, where aspectual characteristics can be expressed by other linguistic means is aspectuality (S. aspektualnost). On the other hand, Spasojević emphasizes that this term can be also used as a hypernym to include both aspect and Aktionsart. The same confusion can be noticed with the term aspect because in some traditions (e.g. Slavic) it is synonymous with the term vid, but in other traditions, it can refer to verb semantics, or it can be used as a hypernym for aspect and Aktionsart, or it can refer to any aspectual information.
4. ASPECT AND AKTIONSART IN CONTRASTIVE STUDIES

As it was mentioned in the introduction of this paper, there are empirical studies that focus on particular segments of aspect and Aktionsart in English and Serbian. They are going to be presented in this section in a chronological order.

In Telicity in English and Serbian (2007), Novakov addresses telicity and its relation to verbal aspect, as well as the influence of the object NP on telicity. When it comes to English, the author makes several comments: telicity is not normally indicated at the lexical level; it could be cancelled when interacting with imperfective (specifically progressive) aspect; the perfective (i.e. non-progressive) implies the attainment of a goal which is why normally (though not exclusively) there is a correlation between telicity and perfectivity. Since in English telicity is not normally indicated at the lexical level, the object NP reinterprets telicity at the syntactic level.

In Serbian, on the other hand, telicity, as well as perfectivity, is already indicated at the lexical level. Therefore, perfective verbs are normally considered telic, while imperfective verbs are considered a telic. However, Novakov (2007: 305) explains that pisati pismo (E. to write a letter) represents a telic situation despite the imperfective verb, because the NP pismo (E. a letter) adds a goal to an atelic situation, making it telic, while imperfective aspect does not specify the attainment of the goal. However, in the conclusion of the paper, Novakov (2007: 306) states that the object NP does not reinterpret telicity at the level of syntax in Serbian, because telicity is fully determined at the lexical level, which contrasts with the previously mentioned statement. In subsequent papers (which are going to be addressed in the following paragraphs), the author proposes a theoretical framework including four different combinations of telicity and aspect, which seem to clarify this potential inconsistency.

Milivojević (2007) deals with English phrasal verbs and Serbian verbs with prefixes. More precisely, she analyzes the correlation between particles that, together with a lexical verb they follow, comprise a phrasal verb and prefixes of Serbian perfective verbs. The author claims that there is at least one crucial similarity between particles and prefixes: at the lexical level, both particles and prefixes mark Aktionsart, which is why they should be considered lexical or semantic, rather than aspectual (i.e. grammatical) markers. Moreover, particles and prefixes modify the verb meaning.

Milivojević further explains that particles can either slightly modify the original meaning of the verb as in wake – ‘to cease to sleep’ and wake up – ‘to become conscious again after being asleep’ or they can completely change the meaning of the original verb as in write – ‘to form letters or words on a surface such as paper’ and write off – ‘to decide that something is unimportant, useless, or unlikely to be successful and that is not worth further consideration’. In both cases, particles mark telic verb situations.
On the other hand, Serbian prefixes influence verb aspect. Not only do they turn an imperfective verb into perfective in the vast majority of cases, but they also influence the specific features of perfective aspect. In other words, based on the perfective prefix, the verb situation can be considered ingressive, effective, terminative, etc. Therefore, the author concludes that Serbian prefixes influence both aspect and Aktionsart. Finally, as regards the differences between particles and prefixes, the author shows that telic particles in English can be combined with the imperfective verb form, while perfective prefixes in Serbian cannot, except in cases of secondary imperfectivization.

In Verbal Aspect and Telicity in English and Serbian (2009), Novakov focuses on the interaction between telicity and aspect, emphasizing that telicity denotes the presence or the absence of a goal, while verbal aspect indicates boundedness, i.e. whether the existing goal has been reached. In other words, the author argues that it is necessary to include both the notion of boundedness (aspect) and telicity in order to fully interpret a verb phrase. Novakov analyzes different kinds of examples in both languages and tests the relationship between telicity and perfective and imperfective aspect, telicity and transitive verbs, telicity and punctual verbs, as well as some examples which are unspecified in terms of telicity. For example, Ben filled the glass with water. can be modified with for-adverbials, which indicate that the situation is atelic, as well as with in-adverbials, which refer to telic situations (Novakov 2009: 196). The author (2009: 196) concludes that in English, a verb situation can be telic, atelic, and neutral. Moreover, he states that non-progressive (perfective) situations are bounded, while progressive (imperfective) situations are unbounded. As per Serbian, the author (ibid.: 198) concludes that aspect, which is closely related to telicity, is determined at the lexical level, so telic situations are simultaneously perfective (and bounded), while atelic situations are imperfective (and unbounded).

In 2016, Novakov gets two more papers on the issue of telicity and aspect published. Borderlines of Meaning – Verb Semantics and Verbal Aspect (2016a) is a type of a review paper in which the author studies the relation between telicity and aspect (boundedness). He states that telicity should be considered a general semantic feature which refers to the presence or absence of a goal. On the other hand, boundedness should be separated from telicity, i.e. it should not be studied in relation to the goal/result, but in relation to the representation of a situation. As a result, Novakov (2016a: 38) suggests the following combinations: a) telic and perfective: the goal exists and it has been attained, there is a result; b) telic and imperfective: the goal exists, but it is not indicated that it has been attained; c) atelic and perfective: the goal is not present, so perfective aspect cannot indicate whether the goal has been attained or not; d) atelic and imperfective: the goal does not exist, and the imperfective does not indicate the attainment of the goal.
The author (ibid.: 39) refers to examples in English and Serbian: *Ona je punila bocu vodom* (E. *She was filling the bottle with water*), *Ona je napunila bocu vodom* (E. *She filled a bottle with water*.) Novakov explains that the first pair of sentences contains the imperfective verb phrases, but the situations are telic. In other words, the goal is present, but imperfective aspect does not indicate that it has been achieved. On the other hand, the second pair of sentences contains the perfective (and telic) verb phrases – the goal is present, and the perfective verbs indicate that it has been achieved, there is a result.

*Telicity and Perfectivity in English and Serbian* (2016b) is an empirical paper in which the author applies the theoretical framework presented in the previous paper and confirms the attitudes presented there. Based on the analysis that he conducted in this paper, the author (2016b: 404) confirms the existence of all four combinations in English (telic and perfective, telic and imperfective, atelic and perfective, and atelic and imperfective). When it comes to Serbian, the author (ibid.: 405) emphasizes the fact that aspect can be determined at the lexical level, so the question that he focuses on is how that fact affects telicity. The author confirms the following combinations in Serbian: telic and perfective (because all perfective verbs, the ones with and without a prefix, imply a goal), telic and imperfective (in situations when the goal is syntactically indicated as in *pisati pismo* – *write a letter*), and atelic and imperfective (which is quite frequent in Serbian). The only combination which cannot be found in Serbian is atelic and perfective. As it has been explained, perfective verbs always imply a goal which is why such verbs cannot be considered atelic.

In 2017, Novakov wrote another paper on telicity – *Components of English Telic Structures and of Their Serbian Equivalents*. The focal point of this paper is the influence of animacy, agentivity, and intentionality on telicity, as well as the kinds of goal realized in a given context (e.g. creation of a specific physical object, movement of an object to a certain position, changed mental state of the subject, etc.). The results of the research have revealed examples which include animate and inanimate subjects, which means that telicity is not conditioned by the animacy and intentionality.

Novakov also dealt with English multi-word verbs and their Serbian equivalents in two papers: *From Physical to Cognitive Space – English Multi-Word Verbs and Their Serbian Equivalents* (2018) and *English Particles Up, Off and Down in English Phrasal Verbs and Serbian Verb Prefixes: Spatial and Extended Meanings* (2019). These papers present a cognitive-semantic analysis of particles in English and prefixes in Serbian, which is not of particular importance for the topic we deal with in this paper. However, in the parts of the works that deal with English phrasal verbs and their semantics, the author (2018: 538; 2019: 224) points out that the literature considers whether the particles of English phrasal verbs convey aspectual or telic meaning.
Kljakić (2020) deals with aspectual verbs and non-finite complement constructions in English and Serbian in her PhD thesis. Her study included eleven aspectualizers: begin, start, continue, keep, keep on, go on, resume, finish, stop, quit and cease and corresponding Serbian phase verbs početi/počinjati, nastaviti/nastavljati, ne prestati/ne prestajati, prestati/prestajati, prekinuti/prekidati. One of the most important goals in this study was to determine situation types (i.e. Aktionsarten) of the phase verb complements. Accordingly, the author concludes that accomplishments, activities and states turned into activities or iterative achievements can function as complements of English phase verbs. When it comes to Serbian phase verbs, Kljakic points out that they had only imperfective, i.e. durative complements – activities and states in the analyzed corpus.

Milivojević also dealt with ingressive aspectualizers start and begin and their Serbian equivalents in two papers – *A Contrastive Account of Phase Verbs Begin and Start in English and Serbian* (2021a) and *The Event-Canceling Semantics of the English Aspectualizer Start and Its Serbian Equivalent Krenuti* (2021b) ⁴. The first paper has three objectives: to establish a true linguistic equivalency between English phase verbs begin and start and Serbian phase verbs početi and krenuti; to refer to a class of atypical phase verbs where the verb krenuti belongs and its complementation; to provide a theoretical account for the combination of a phase verb and its complement from the perspective of Lexical-projectionist semantic model combined with Construction Grammar (see Milivojević 2021a: 209). Milivojević (ibid.: 215) concludes that even though these aspectual pairs are close synonyms at the lexical level, there is a difference between projected complements at the level of syntax. According to the equivalency of argument projections, the author proves that the true equivalent of the English verb start is the Serbian verb krenuti, which allows for perfective complementation. The account that Milivojević proposes in her paper also allows for an innovative representation of phase verbs in the lexicon, where a single lexical entry connects the possible meanings and argument structure for each phase verb.

The second paper (Milivojević 2021b) also revisits the issue of equivalency of the aspectual pair start – krenuti, but it also investigates the aspects of “additional” semantic features such as causality and dynamicity, as well as event initiation and event cancelation phenomena. Milivojević (ibid.: 43) concludes that start and krenuti are semantically marked for dynamicity and causality, that they can combine with the full range of aspectual arguments, and that in terms of phase, start is prior to begin, while krenuti is prior to početi. Finally, in terms the event cancellation, the author concludes that the prototypical event-cancellation in both languages constitutes an aspectual construction combined with a dynamic complement.

⁴ These two papers were then included in her monograph *Semantika i sintaksa glagolske fraze u engleskom i srpskom jeziku* (2021c).
Finally, Novakov analyzes English progressive aspect and its Serbian equivalents: *English progressive aspect: Trends, uses and Serbian equivalents* (2021). The author (2021: 162–163) identified different uses of progressive tenses. For instance, there were examples in which the present progressive referred to situations in progress at the point of speech, situations with limited duration, future situations, or to an emotionally colored tone. As regards possible new tendencies, Novakov states that the present progressive is sometimes used instead of the non-progressive to underline current, ongoing, often simultaneous events.

When it comes to the past perfect progressive, the author explains that it refers to past situations emphasizing temporary duration before another past situation. Novakov also identified sentences with the present perfect progressive which all referred to the situations that started in the past and continued up to the point of speech (the so-called perfect of persistent situation). There were examples which contained the future progressive referring to a temporary process going on around a point in the future, with some duration, or an ironic tone. Finally, the author identified the past progressive, which typically implied temporariness.

When it comes to Serbian equivalents, Novakov states that the present or future progressive were normally translated using Serbian imperfective verbs in the present tense. Moreover, the past perfect and past progressive were translated by *perfekat* (and not *pluskvamperfekat*), the future progressive was translated by Serbian *futur*, and the present perfect progressive was translated by the present of imperfective verbs.

### 5. CONCLUSION

As regards aspect in English, many scholars identify it as a category inherent in Slavic verbs. However, despite the fact that the imperfective/perfective aspectual opposition, the basic aspectual opposition in Slavic languages, is not grammaticalized in English, there is a corresponding grammaticalized opposition which expresses aspectual meanings found in other languages, including Slavic: progressive, roughly responding to perfective, and non-progressive, corresponding to imperfective. In terms of perfect aspect, it is quite problematic because different authors classify it within different categories (e.g. tense, aspect, phase). Comrie, for instance, considers it a special type of aspect because it does not tell us anything about the situation, but it connects the situation with another situation.

What is problematic about the field of aspectology is the accumulation of different terminology referring to the same phenomena, which was recognized in the reviewed works. Moreover, if we track changes from the early works until the most recent ones, we can see that the attitude on aspect has changed. Namely, many authors studied aspect in relation to completion, incompletion, duration, etc., i.e. these were considered to
represent the main aspectual features. However, Comrie’s work seems to have greatly influenced the understanding of aspect. As a result, scholars began to associate perfective aspect with presenting a situation as an unanalyzable whole and imperfective aspect with presenting a situation as a structure. This kind of definition is a product of a typological study and can therefore be applied to different types of languages.

In terms of aspect and Aktionsart, it was noticed that many grammarians, especially the early ones, did not separate grammatical and lexical verb features into two different groups, but they were rather intertwined. However, in more recent works, authors began to recognize grammatical and lexical features as two different types of verb features, but they also recognized the importance of the interrelationship of the two.

When it comes to aspect in Serbian, it was observed that it is presented in the same way in the majority of grammar books. Namely, authors normally differentiate between perfective and imperfective aspect or verbs and their characters, as well as bi-aspectual verbs. In addition to this, they often refer to perfectivization, imperfectivization, and aspectual pairs. Many authors take completion and duration to be the main distinctive features of aspect, which is obvious in their use of terminology: nesvršeni (referring to imperfective) translates to ‘not finished’ or ‘incomplete’ and svršeni (referring to perfective) translates to ‘completed’ or ‘finished’. However, linguists agreed that duration and completion should not be considered the main aspectual features, but rather indivisibility and divisibility (which correspond to observing the situation as a whole or as a structure).

The study and presentation of Aktionsart in Serbian is similar as in English. Different Aktionsarten were studied and analyzed as sub-types of aspect or aspectual characters. However, in contemporary grammar books scholars distinguish between aspect and Aktionsart (referred to as akcionalnost).

When it comes to the contrastive papers, the authors made a clear distinction between aspect and Aktionsart. Furthermore, the majority of the contrastive papers included in this paper represent empirical studies that focused on particular phenomena in aspectology: telicity, aspectualizers, particles and prefixes, etc.

Finally, in terms of future avenues, we suggest that aspect and Aktionsart should be clearly separated, without disregarding their interrelationship. Noteworthy examples of such presentation can be found in Brinton (1988), Huddleston and Pullum (2002), Novakov (2005), Mrazović and Vukadinović (2009), and Piper and Klajn (2013).
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