VERBAL ASPECT AND RELATIVE TIME

The when-Clause Test*

MIROSLAV KRAVAR

The verbal categories of aspect and tense, however different in their grammatical expression, are more and more reduced, at least ultimately, to the common notional concept of 'time', which is linguistically realized either as 'internal' time, i. e. aspect, or as 'external' time, i. e. tense. On this point there can be cited a whole series of theoretical opinions professed by various scholars in the last fifty years, from Koschmieder (1929: 13) and Guillaume (1929: 31) up to Galton (1976: 9 and 285): all of them insist on the temporal content of both aspect and tense, although the basic idea of the common 'substance' of the two categories in question is far from being identical in various systems.

As regards the present study, it sets aside these more or less speculative approaches to the general relation between aspect and tense in order to concentrate on a concrete case of their functional interference. It is a typological and comparative attempt to demonstrate the syntactic structure of the temporal when-clause in its capacity as a general aspect test on material of several well-known languages and language groups: Ancient Greek, Latin, Romance, English, German and Slavic; isolated examples are given from Modern Greek and Hungarian. The application of such a model to some different linguistic systems has a double purpose: firstly, to emphasize the importance of verbal aspect among linguistic means by which in various languages the category of so-called 'relative time' is expressed and, secondly, to investigate aspectual values of the verb and/or its forms in the same function in the languages taken here into account. Further we shall see that relative time and aspect, as nowadays is more and more pointed out, are two verbal categories that in the domain of syntax greatly overlap.

* Wider version of a paper read at the XIIth International Congress of Linguists (Vienna 1977) under the title »When-Clause as a General Aspect Test«.
As to the typological-comparative direction of the paper I refer to some general views of Vendryes (1946: 1), Bazell (1966: 29) and Greenberg (1970: 11).

The notion of 'relative time' as against 'absolute time' is a matter of traditional grammar, treated already by Brugmann-Delbrück (1916: 274) and their followers until Jespersen (1955: 11). However, the distinction is today renewed in connection with the theory of deixis, notably by Kuryłowicz (1974: 39), where in the teaching on the verb among other things two 'deictic' indexes of the verbal action are distinguished: the moment nunc as an 'absolute' index and the moment tunc as a 'relative' one. In this sense it may be said that an action determined temporally from the viewpoint of the nunc-moment, i.e. the moment of speech, is 'absolute', whereas an action determined temporally from the viewpoint of the tunc-moment, i.e. the moment referred to, is 'relative'.

By when-clause one should understand the temporal when-clause introduced by particles with the meaning of English when or as, consequently Greek, Ancient and Modern alike, hôte or hótan, Latin cum/quando, French quand/lorsque, Italian quando, Spanish cuando, German wenn/als, Russian kogda/kak, Serbo-Croat kad(a), Czech když, Hungarian mikor, etc. The function of when and its analogies in other languages is usually denoted as expression of simultaneity of the action of the when-clause with that of the main clause. Such a statement, indeed, is exact as far as it implies that the two actions in question are accomplished within the same sphere of time, i.e. in the present — actual or generic — past and future. But how the two actions refer temporally closer to each other in the same time section, defined here as the syntactic nexus cum—tum in which different cases of relative-temporal relation are possible, the particle when of itself is not capable to clarify. For this purpose some other data must be given in the sentence which normally are found in the framework of the verb and/or its forms.\footnote{So today in Grebe (1966: 561) for German wenn and als or, although not explicitly, in Grevisse (1953: 892) for French quand and lorsque.}

In order to find out in which way in various languages, regardless of the degree of their relationship that may be greater or lesser and even non-existent, the opposition between simultaneity and anteriority, as two cases of relative-temporal relation we here deal with, is linguistically formed, we shall make use of the representation of a natural phenomenon, that of sunset. Such a representation can
be linguistically fixed in very different ways, but it is commonly expressed so that, at least in the languages here at issue, it is articulated in two, more rarely in three phases.

Which lexical or grammatical data come here into account we shall see in our further exposition.

As a specimen of when-clause we shall take here the following sentence in its Russian version:

\[
\begin{align*}
Kogda & \text{ solnce} \\
& \begin{cases} 
zaxodit \\
zajdet \end{cases}, (togda) \text{ my vyxodim v gorod.}
\end{align*}
\]

That is to say: 'When the sun sets (i. e. 'is setting' vs. 'has set') we go out to town'.

The connection kogda-togda, i. e. 'when'-then', which retains the two actions, that of the when-clause and that of the main clause, within the same sphere of time, in the given case that of the so-called 'generic' present, is here a special type of syntactic nexus cum—tum covering, otherwise, various cases of relative-temporal relation, in the given instance that of simultaneity and anteriority. In itself it is, as for relative time, a context-free nexus, say, 'when A then B', where only the verb and/or its forms introduce one or another relative-temporal datum. The essence of the correlation zaxodit vs. zajdet may be represented in the following diagram:²

² This diagram was demonstrated ten years ago at the Xth Congress in Bucharest, but without being published in my contribution (cf. K r a v a r 1970: 961).
structures of relative time will be based. In the quoted instance the deictic index kogda refers to, or, as it were, 'hits', in the case of the non-completed action kogda ... zaxodit any point, i.e. moment, of its development and in the case of the completed action kogda ... zaždeť the given point of its accomplishment. So the former action is relatively present, i.e. simultaneous with the main clause correlate togda (= 'at the same time'), whereas the latter action is relatively past, i.e. immediately anterior to togda (= 'at once after'). Indeed, from the viewpoint of the nunc-moment one would say: 'Solnce zaželit (= present), i my vyxodim v gorod' resp. 'Solnce zašlo (= preterite), i my vyxodim v gorod'. The corresponding English correlation when the sun is setting vs. when the sun has set makes use of the analogous tense-forms in the same relative-temporal function.

Should we try to express this type-sentence in all the languages here at issue, in its lexical verb choice as well as in all possible grammatical correlations of aspect and tense, or mood and voice, we should obtain a huge number of structures of the when-clause not easy to survey. However, the relative temporal relation should be here in one or another way expressed, unless, like in the case of lexical type, as we shall see later, it should be abandoned to the context or even wholly absent.

In this labyrinth of syntactic means for the expression of relative time within the when-clause where, as we see, different linguistic levels and/or grammatical categories are involved, it is hardly possible to find one's way even in the framework of our limited number of languages. We shall, therefore, examine this wealth of structures successively according to the levels and categories being here in play. As Ariadne’s thread we shall use the relative-temporal relation itself.

In accordance with the principle of binarism we shall consider aspect, as well as aspect-like phenomena, within binary oppositions, and that, at the general level, under the terms 'parataxic' vs. 'syntelic', i.e. 'expanded' or 'non-completed' vs. 'completed', which terms derive from the Greek grammatical tradition (cf. Wackernagel 1926: 15 and 150). We profit in this way terminologically, since we obtain general terms able to include all single sorts of aspect: the Ancient Greek ternary correlation 'present' vs. 'aorist' vs. 'perfect'...
as well as the Slavic opposition 'imperfective' vs. 'perfective' and, to a certain degree, the lexical relation 'durative' vs. 'non-durative', which we shall speak about later.

As far as the linguistic forms of the when-clause are concerned, it will be useful to distinguish in relation to the languages in question three main types, namely when + aspect unit or 'aspectual', when + tense unit or 'temporal' and when + verb unit or 'verbal' type. The former two are grammatical and the latter lexical. This means that our conceptual structure of relative time, in the absence of special relative-temporal verbal means, will at the surface level, that is in language, either remain limited to lexical items, occasionally making use of the context, or resort to other verbal devices, such as aspect and tense forms.

Now we turn to the analysis of the single types.5

1. **Structure when + aspect unit**

Let us first consider from our point of view the aspectual type of expression of relative time, i. e. the structure when + aspect unit, as we already know it from Russian, where it functions within the well-known aspecual opposition 'imperfective' vs. 'perfective' on all planes of the verbal system, and that ceteris paribus as to time. To confine ourselves to the temporal plane alone, we obtain the following diagram of the type:6

```
| Past | Present | Future |
```

Here is another example: *Kogda prixodit / pridet leto, my sobiraemsja na more* 'When summer comes (i. e. 'is coming' vs. 'has come') we set about going to the sea'. This sentence is able to 'generate' a series of analogous structures differing in voice, mood and tense, but having in common the aspectual opposition prixodit' vs. prijti which functions in the relative-temporal sense.

The same type is found, of course, in the other Slavic languages, too, functioning in all temporal spheres with the same relative-temporal values; thus, for instance, in Serbo-Croat: *kad sunce zalazi vs. kad sunce zadj*, and in Czech: *když slunce zapadá vs. zapaď*, etc. In other words, the aspectual opposition at issue,

---

5 In this oral exposition I operate mainly with the above type-sentence, but more concrete examples are given in the full version of my paper.

6 Explanation of the sings for aspect: → = 'paratatic', | = 'syntelic' and = 'neutral'.
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consisting of two lexemic members, functions as a complete grammatical system, where the two members are in all positions commutable.

It should be added, however, that the iterative context of the sentence as a case of 'verbal plurality' (Dressler 1968: 56) can, like in our type-instance, cause a neutralization of the opposition, which is then reduced to imperfective aspect only. Such a case is very frequent in Russian (Bondarko 1971: 230), notably in colloquial speech.

A similar system exists in Greek as well, whether Ancient or Modern.

As to Ancient Greek, relative time appears within the mentioned ternary correlation between the present, aorist and perfect forms, or, otherwise, the one 'infective' vs. 'confective' vs. 'perfectic' (for the terms cf. Debrunner 1950: 252), e. g. Hótan hélioś dûētai vs. dûēi vs. dědûkēi, exerkhómetha eis tēn pólin (= 'when the sun is setting vs. 0 [or sets?] vs. has set'). The correlation occurs in a great number of temporal forms, except in the future where the first two members are neutralized, as well as in those of mood and voice. But aspect is the only category able to decide on the relative-temporal relation in the sentence. The ternary structure may in various ways be reduced to the binary principle. According to the old teaching of Apollonios Dyscolos (Schneider-Uhlig 1910: passim) this can be made in the form of two binary oppositions, namely 'paratatic' involving 'paratatic I', i. e. present, and 'paratatic II', i. e. perfect, vs. 'syntelic', i. e. aorist. With regard to aspect, it is only the opposition 'paratatic' vs. 'syntelic' that comes into account, whereas 'paratatic I' vs. 'paratatic II' is rather a matter of voice ('action' vs. 'state').

Such a system can be diagrammed as follows:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
```

Such is, for example, the concrete sentence: Hótan orgízômetha (vs. possible orgísthômen), muinômetha pântes 'When we are/get angry, we all rage'; here, on the basis of the aspectual opposition orgízesthai vs. orgísthênai, we can produce a number of analogous structures where aspect appears in its relative-temporal function.

(The ternary structure present + perfect vs. aorist is given a binary interpretation present/aorist vs. perfect by Sánchez-Ruipérez 1954: 45.)
The same applies to Modern Greek, but with two important peculiarities: The aspectual opposition is, on the one hand, neutralized in the generic present and, on the other, completed for the future. Thus a sentence such as Ὁταν ὁ ἥλιος ἀνέβη (= 'sets'), χαίνουμε ἐξό τὴν πόλη is only in the past and future aspectually articulated: ἔδυη/ἐδύσε resp. ἡ ἀνέβη/ἡ ἀνέβη. This can be represented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another example is Ὁταν τὸ ἀκοῦσα, μόλις πιστεύο 'When I hear it I hardly believe', which can further be transformed on condition that neutralized ἀκοῦσα should be aspectually articulated, e.g. Ὁταν ἀκοῦα vs. ἀκοοσα resp. Ὁταν θὰ ἀκοῦσα vs. θὰ ἀκοῦσο.

In both Ancient and Modern Greek the opposition, based upon morphemic units, is completely grammatical.

By comparing the Greek type of when-clause with the Slavic one we can see that already in these two linguistic domains different levels are engaged: in Slavic the lexemic and in Greek the morphemic one. At any rate, we meet on both sides with a more or less complete aspectual system which functions ceteris paribus as to time and in all or almost all temporal spheres. It is also in speech wholly actualized as such.

By means of the when-clause we are also able to establish the aspectual character of the opposition 'imperfect' vs. 'aorist-perfect' in Latin, e.g. cum sol occidisset / occidit (= 'cecidit'), a partial aspectual opposition which functions, too, ceteris paribus as to time (Kravar 1961: 239 and 1968: 61). Such is the concrete example Quid, ubi rédæbas (vs. possible réddidistī) aurum, dixisti patri? 'What did you tell the father as you were giving/gave back the gold?', where the opposition reddebas vs. reddidisti would be neutralized in the present and future: rédis resp. reddes. The same is true of Romance where, for instance in French, the opposition imparfait vs. passé simple is more and more recognized or, at least, described as a matter of aspect (especially since Pollak 1960: 129). A when-clause such as French quand le soleil se couchait vs. se couchait resp. s'est couché, Italian quando il sole tramontava...
tava vs. tramontò or Spanish **cuando el sol se ponía** vs. **se puso** is everywhere one and the same structure which is limited to the past, while in the present and future it is neutralized as such; so in French **quand le soleil se couche** resp. **se couche** etc.

Such a partial presence of aspect may be represented in this way:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Past} & \text{Present} & \text{Future} \\
\end{array}
\]

A sentence such as Spanish **cuando vuelvo a casa, oigo ruido** 'When I come (i.e. ‘am coming’ or ‘have come’?) back home I hear noise' cannot be transformed into **cuando volví vs. volvi (‘was coming back’ vs. ‘came [had come] back’) without being supplied additionally with the aspectual datum proper to the past.

Yet, however temporally limited and partial, the opposition in question is in the given temporal sphere wholly grammatical, whereas its yield in speech is dissimilar in various Romance languages.

At a quite different level functions the English mixed aspeectual-temporal type to be doing vs. to do, i.e. when the sun **is setting** vs. when the sun **sets**, where we have on the one side a compound periphrasis or phraseme and on the other a simple tense-form within the semantic opposition ‘actual’ (according to Joos 1968: 106 ‘temporary’) vs. ‘non-actual’. The one member obtains by inference a paratatic value, while the other is aspectually neutral. So the whole opposition is to be considered a quasi-aspectual one.

Nevertheless, this aspectual device is grammaticalized, too, because it functions *ceteris paribus* as to time and in all temporal spheres being, at the same time, abundantly actualized in speech.

As to its aspectual value, it functions as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Past} & \text{Present} & \text{Future} \\
\end{array}
\]

Such a sentence as **When I am opening/open the window I feel cold** can at will be further transformed with the same quasi-aspectual value of the two members, which are, however, different in the relative-temporal sense: while the actual member as such expresses simultaneity, the non-actual one is ambiguous in this respect.

A partial correlation of the same sort is found in Romance, e.g. in Spanish: **cuando el sol está poniéndose** vs. **cuando se pone**, where on the one side stands a quasi-aspectual phraseme of paratatic
value and on the other a simple tense-form aspectually neutral. That such 'aspect' (according to Coseriu) is not sufficiently fitted into the verbal system becomes clear above all in the sphere of the past where both members are necessarily paratactic: estaba poniéndose = se ponía.

The relation in question, being partially grammaticalized and scarcely actualized in speech, is to be treated rather at the lexical level.

* 

On closer inspection, it can be seen that aspectual and aspect-like units occurring in different systems in the same function of relative time are based on similar but not identical semantic contents, which, however, does not obstruct their syntactic functioning. Even the semantic essence of Greek and Slavic aspect seems not to be quite the same (Safarewicz 1963: 145); that their formal structure is unlike we have already seen.

2. Structure when + tense unit

As regards the temporal type of expression of relative time, i.e. the structure when + tense unit, we meet it chiefly in, let us say so, 'temporal' languages, such as Latin and some western European ones, especially in their formal styles.

To this type belong above all Latin structures such as cum sol occidit (= 'cadit') vs. cum sol occidit (= 'cecidit') as well as their Romance and Germanic analogies, e.g. French quand le soleil se couche vs. quand le soleil s’est couché, German wenn die Sonne sinkt vs. gesunken ist or English when the sun sets vs. has set, oppositions which function, notably for repeated action, in all temporal spheres. All of them are grammatical, namely morphemic. However, in sentences such as When the sun sets / has set we go out to town the two tense-forms, the present sets and the perfect has set, stand within the nexus cum—tum upon the same time line, where their temporal meaning is reduced to some kind of aspectual one. But, since we have on the one side an aspectually neutral simple tense-form and on the other a quasi-aspectual compound one, such a type functions, quasi-aspectually regarding, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 In German I take sinken instead of untergehen for a reason that will be made clear later.
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As a concrete example of the temporal type we can take the Latin sentence *Galli cum superaverunt* (vs. possible *superant*), *animalia capta immolant* 'When the Gauls have gained/gain the victory they sacrifice the captured animals', which in various structures of mood and voice keeps the quasi-aspectual, but in reality temporal opposition *superare* vs. *superavisse*.

The inconsistency of such a type of relative-temporal correlations lies in that the member for simultaneity, i.e. the simple tense-form, is in fact aspectually neutral, so that its relative-temporal value is determined, as we shall see later, by the lexical meaning of the verb; cf. English *when we speak about something* and *when we say something*, which is fairly the same as 'are speaking' vs. 'have said'. In this way the temporal type of *when*-clause, as to its member for simultaneity, is frustrated lexically. Among the languages in question only English can avoid this by substitution of the simple form with the aspect-like phraseme *to be -ing*.

Thus comes into being the combined correlation *to be -ing vs. to have -ed*, which is usually denoted as aspectual (cf. Joos 1969: 101 and others). Indeed, its diagram agrees with that of 'aspectual' languages, as Greek and Slavic. But, on looking closer, the English opposition *when the sun is setting* vs. *has set*, when compared with the Ancient Greek ternary set, appears to cover with its second member two cases: the syntelic and perfectic, i.e. paratatic II.

Another example can be: *When I am opening/have opened the window I feel cold*, where the mixed aspectual-temporal correlation is preserved in all spheres of time.

3. Structure *when* + verb unit

The third or verbal type of expression of relative time, i.e. the structure *when* + verb unit, is based upon lexical distinctions of the so-called *Aktionsart* or 'kind of action'. Such distinctions may successfully be reduced to, or, more precisely, generalized as a relation between 'durative', i.e. properly durative, cursive, iterative, etc. and 'non-durative', i.e. momentary, initive, terminative, effective, resultative, etc. verbs, briefly a relation which functions, if at all, at the lexemic level (cf. 'terminative' vs. 'non-terminative' in Maslov 1977). Here are some examples, first from English. The two *when*-clauses: *when we go home (= 'are going') vs. when we come home (= 'have come' rather than 'are coming')* are able to convey a relative-temporal sense. The same applies to Latin and some other, mostly western European, languages, where we have, on the one hand, a clear quasi-paratatic case of simultaneity, such as Latin *cum imus domum*, resp. French *allons*, Italian *andiamo*, Spanish *vamos*, German *gehen*, etc. and, on the other, an actionally more or less neutral case of relative-temporal ambiguity which is able to
cover, more than to express, also anteriority, e. g. Latin *cum veni-

domum*, resp. French *venons*, Italian *veniamo*, Spanish *venimos*,

German *kommen*, etc. Everywhere we have the same: a lexemic

verb couple 'durative' vs. 'non-durative' where the one member is

actionally quasi-paratatic and the other in the same sense more or

less syntelic.

Such syntax of the relative-temporal relations seems to be

proper to colloquial speech of the mentioned languages.

Yet this chapter of relative-temporal syntax is a very delicate

one, the dividing line between durative and non-durative verbs being

not always clear enough. Already our type-sentence *when the sun

sets* as against *when the sun shines* holds hardly good, because

the verb for English *to set* is in some languages felt as more or less

durative; so, for instance, in German: *wenn die Sonne untergeht*

(= 'is setting' rather than 'has set') like *scheint* (= 'is shining'). No

wonder that cases of relative-temporal ambiguity are all but rare;

thus, for instance, English *when I open the window*, French *quand

on rentre à la maison*, or German *wenn man etwas bekommt*, etc.

Though such occasional verb couples function in all temporal

spheres, they have to be regarded as pairs of lexemic items.

Thus we obtain the following alternative diagram: either

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{Past} \\
\text{or} \\
\text{Past}
\end{array} \quad \quad \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{Present} \\
\text{Present}
\end{array} \quad \quad \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{Future} \\
\text{Future}
\end{array} \]

These lexemic verb couples make, in other words, no proper

oppositions, since two verbs of different actional meaning, e. g. *to go*

vs. *to come*, being not commutable, exclude each other. Moreover,

in such a case the member for simultaneity must be pronouncedly
durative and that of anteriority pronouncedly non-durative, say,
momentary, in order to avoid the relative-temporal ambiguity; cf. in

German, where such aspect-like use of *Aktionsart* is common in

all temporal spheres, also in the past: *als ich im Zimmer saß* (= '
was sitting') vs. *als ich ins Zimmer trat* (= rather 'had entered'
than 'was entering').

As to cases of ambiguity, they are, of course, clarified by the

context. If, however, the sentence is contextually more or less uni-

---

9 It may be assumed that the lexical type of *when*-clause in European

languages is native, whereas its temporal type can be derived from the cultural-

linguistic influence of classical Latin in higher styles. The same difference in

Latin itself seems to be that between spoken and written language.
vocal we can replace *when* by *while/as soon as* in order to prove the aspectual neutrality of the verb as such, e. g. *als* (or *während/sobald*) *ich* *s aß / t r a t*.

Also in Hungarian, an 'exotic' language believed to possess some aspectual means (Tompa 1968: 72), our test has given results remainig firmly at the lexical level; thus our type-sentence: *Mikor* (or *mialatt/uhogy* a *nap l e m e g y* yorosba kimégyünk 'When (or while/as soon as) the sun sets we go out to town'. Only in verb pairs such as *jön* vs. *megjön* (= 'to come' / 'to arrive') the latter unit seems to function quasi-aspectually, e. g. *Mikor a barátom jön / m e g jön*, *mindannyian öröltünk 'When my friend comes/has come we all are glad'.

In this respect the lexical type of relative-temporal relation may be regarded as the first surface structure of the category at issue, which by additional application of syntactic rules is transformed into what we already know as its 'aspectual' and 'temporal' types. It goes without saying that in the multitude of languages other types, making use of other grammatical devices for the same purpose, are at work.

*To sum up, it can be concluded that the temporal *when*-clause as a complex structure of relative-temporal relation engages various linguistic levels, such as grammar and lexicon, or, at least, context, as well as various verbal categories, such as aspect and tense, optionally also mood and voice. A closer insight into the structure at issue allows its threefold typology, namely:*

(1) *when* + aspect unit (Greek and Slavic; English)
(2) *when* + tense unit (Latin, Romance, German)
(3) *when* + verb unit (e. g. German; Latin, Romance).

Apart from the temporal type, where time and tense obviously correspond, whereas tense itself is reduced to a certain quasi-aspectual value, the *when*-clause can be applied as an efficient aspect test of fairly wide, if not universal, import, that is, it can identify both the presence and absence of aspectual features in a given verbal system as well as the level at which they operate. The latter may be:

(1) grammatical:  (a) morphemic (Greek)
(b) lexemic (Slavic)
(c) phrasemic (English)
(2) lexical:  (a) lexemic (e. g. Latin)
(b) phrasemic (e. g. Romance)
(3) contextual, i. e. extra-verbal (esp. German).
VERBAL ASPECT AND RELATIVE TIME

We have, however, seen that a more rigorous repartition in this respect is, except in 'aspectual' languages, rather rare; mostly various types occur side by side. At any rate, the typological-comparative significance of the when-clause as a general aspect test, as it has been shown in this paper, ought hardly to be called in question.
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VERBAL ASPECT AND RELATIVE TIME

M. Kravar: GLAGOLSKI VID I RELATIVNO VRJEME
Kriterij kad-rečenice

Sažetak

Glagolske kategorije vida i vremena, koliko god različite u svom gramatičkom izražaju, sve se više svode na zajednički pojmovni sadržaj »vremena« (engl. time), koje se onda lingvistički ostvaruje ili kao »unutrašnje« vrijeme, tj. vid, ili kao vrijeme »vanjsko«, tj. tempus (engl. tense). Ali različiti istraživači, vođeni ovom ili onom predodžbom o vidu, rješavaju pitanje zajedničke podloge dviju kategorija na različit način.

U ovom se prilogu radi o mnogo konkretnijem slučaju odnosa između vida i vremena: ovdje se, na primjerima većega broja više ili manje poznatih jezika i jezičnih skupina, dakle tipološki-komparativno, analizira vremenska kad-rečenica kao opći vidiški kriterij u službi relativno-vremenskoga odnosa. Kao tipičan primjer uzimlje se ruska rečenica Kogda solnce zahodi / zauđe, (togda) my vyhodim v gorod —, gdje vidiška suprotnost zahodi/zauđe izražava ujedno i relativno-vremenski odnos istovremenosti odnosno prijevremenosti. To vrijedi, dakako, samo za »vidske« jezike kao što su grčki, stari i novi, i slavenski, a donekle i engleski, dok u drugim jezicima istu službu vrše ili vremenski oblici ili, štaviše, sam glagol kao takav.

To će reći da izražavanje relativnoga vremena u kad-rečenici angažira različite glagolske kategorije ili/razine, tako da se — bar u okviru jezika o kojima je ovde riječ — može utvrditi trojna tipologija njezine strukture, i to:

1) kad + vidiška jedinica (grčki i slavenski; engleski)
2) kad + vremenska jedinica (latinski, romanski, njemački)
3) kad + glagolska jedinica (npr. njemački; latinski i romanski).

Osim toga, k ad-rečenica se može primjenjivati s uspjehom kao opći vidiški ključ prilično široko, iako ne univerzalna značenja, tj. ona može identificirati i prisutnost i odsutnost vidiških obilježja u danom jeziku, a također razinu na kojoj ona funkcionira. A ova može biti:

1) gramatička: a) morfematska (grčki)
   b) leksematska (slavenski)
   c) frazematska (engleski)
2) leksička: a) leksematska (npr. latinski)
   b) frazematska (npr. romanski)
3) kontekstualna, tj. izvanglagolska (osobito njemački).

Stroža je raspodjela u tom smislu, osim u vidiškim jezicima, dosta rijetka; obično različiti tipovi dolaze jedan uz drugi.

Razumije se samo po sebi da su, s obzirom na mnoštvo jezika, mogući i drugi tipovi, koji se služe drugim gramatičkim postupcima u istu svrhu.