Verb phrase and its grammatical categories

Ergashova Madina
2nd *Foreign language student*
In Preschool and Primary education

Abstract: This article examiners structural discordances in English and Uzbek by providing specific examples of differences and similarities between the two languages. We will study how to employ grammatical categories of verbs in both languages in this post.

The verb as a notional part of speech has the following features:
1 they express the meanings of dynamic process, or process developing in time, including not only actions as such (to work, to build), but also states, forms of existence (to be, to become, to lie), various types of attitude, feelings (to love, to appreciate), etc.;
2 they have the grammatical categories of person, number, tense, aspect, voice, mood, order and posteriority most of which have their own grammatical means;
3 the function of verbs entirely depends on their forms: if they in finite form they fulfill only one function – predicate. But if they are in non-finite form then they can fulfill any function in the sentence but predicate; they may be part of the predicate;
4 verbs can combine actually with all the parts of speech, though they do not combine with articles, with some pronouns. It is important to note that the combinability of verbs mostly depends on the syntactical function of verbs in speech;
5 verbs have their own stem-building elements:
postfixes: -fy (simplify, magnify, identify…)
-ize (realize, fertilize, standardize…)
-ate (activate, captivate…)
prefixes: re- (rewrite, restart, replant…)
mis- (misuse, misunderstand, misstate…)
un- (uncover, uncouple, uncrown…)
de- (depose, depress, derange…) and so on.
There is a peculiar means of rendering the meaning of the process, which occupies an intermediary position between the word and the word-combination: the so-called "phrasal verbs", consisting of a verb and a postpositional element. Some phrasal verbs are closer to the word, because their meaning cannot be deduced from the meaning of the verb or the meaning of the postposition separately, e.g.: to give up, to give in, etc.; others are semantically closer to the word-combination, e.g.: to stand up, to sit down, etc. A separate group of phrasal verbs is made by combinations of broad meaning verbs to have, to give, to take and nouns, e.g.: to give a look, to have rest, to have a bite, etc.
The Types of Verbs
According to their meaning verbs fall under two groups: notional and functional.
Notional verbs have full lexical meaning of their own. The majority of verbs fall under this group: e.g.: to work, to build, to lie, to love, etc.
Functional verbs differ from notional ones of lacking lexical meaning of their own. They

cannot be used independently in the sentence; they are used to furnish certain parts of sentence (very often they are used with predicates).

Functional verbs are subdivided into three: link verbs, modal verbs, auxiliary verbs.

Link verbs connect the nominative part of the predicate (the predicative) with the subject. They can be of two types: pure and specifying link verbs. Pure link verbs perform a purely predicative-linking function in the sentence; in English there is only one pure link verb to be; specifying link verbs specify the connections between the subject and its property, cf.: He was pale. – He grew pale. The specification of the connections may be either "perceptional", e.g.: to seem, to look, to feel, etc., or "factual", e.g.: to grow, to become, to get, etc. The functional link verbs should be distinguished from homonymous notional verbs, e.g.: to grow can be a notional verb or a specifying link verb, cf.: The child grew quickly. – He grew pale.

Modal verbs are small group of verbs which usually express the modal meaning, the speaker's attitude to the action, expressed by the notional verb in the sentence. They lack some grammatical forms like infinitive form, grammatical categories and so on. Thus, they do not have all the categories of verbs. They may express mood and tense since they function as parts of predicates. They lack the non-finite forms.

Besides in present-day English there is another group of verbs which are called auxiliaries. They are used to form analytical forms of verbs. Verbs: to be, to do, to have and so on may be included to this group.

According to the formation of tenses verbs are classified into two groups:

1) Regular verbs which form their basic forms by means of productive suffixes-(e)d. The majority of verbs refer to this class.

2) Irregular verbs form their basic forms by such non-productive means as:

a) variation of sounds in the root:

should - would - initial consonant change

begin - began - begun - vowel change of the root

catch - caught - caught - root - vowel and final consonant change

spend - spent - spent - final consonant change;

b) suppletion (the forms of words derived from different roots):

be – was / were

go – went

c) unchanged forms:

cast - cast - cast

put - put – put

Verbs can also be classified from the point of view of their ability of taking objects. In accord with this we distinguish two types of verbs: transitive and intransitive.

Transitive verbs are subdivided into two:

a) verbs which are combined with direct object: to have a book to find the address

b) verbs which take prepositional objects: to wait for, to look at, talk about, depend on…

Intransitive verbs are subdivided into:

a) verbs expressing state: be, exist, live, sleep, die …

b) verbs of motion: go, come, run, arrive, travel …

c) verbs expressing the position in space: lie, sit, stand ...

In many cases we come across an intermediate stratum. We find such stratum between transitive and intransitive verbs which is called causative verbs, verbs intransitive in their origin, but some times used as transitive: to fly a kite, to sail a ship, to nod approval ...

On the basis of subject-process relations the verbs are subdivided into actional and statal verbs. The terms are self-explanatory: actional verbs denote the actions performed by the subject as an active doer, e.g.: to go, to make, to build, to look, etc.; statal verbs denote various states of the subject or present the subject as the recipient of an outward activity, e.g.: to love, to be, to worry, to enjoy, to see, etc. Mental and sensual processes can be presented as actional or statal; they can be denoted

either by correlated pairs of different verbs, or by the same verbal lexeme, e.g.: to know (mental perception) – to think (mental activity), to see, to hear (physical perception as such) - to look, to listen (physical perceptional activity); The cake tastes nice (taste

Another subdivision of notional verbs is based on their aspective meaning: subdivision of all the verbs into two big groups: the so-called limitive verbs and unlimitive verbs. Limitive verbs present a process as potentially limited, directed towards reaching a certain border point, beyond which the process denoted by the verb is stopped or ceases to exist, e.g.: to come, to sit down, to bring, to drop, etc.

Unlimitive verbs present the process as potentially not limited by any border point, e.g.: to go, to sit, to carry, to exist, etc.

Some limitive and unlimitive verbs form semantically opposed pairs, denoting roughly the same actual process presented as either potentially limited or unlimited, cf.: to come – to go, to sit down – to sit, to bring – to carry; other verbs have no aspective counterparts, e.g.: to be, to exist (unlimitive), to drop (limitive). But the bulk of English verbs can present the action as either limitive or unlimitive in different contexts, e.g.: to build, to walk, to turn, to laugh, etc. Traditionally such verbs are treated as verbs of double, or mixed aspective nature. In terms of the theory of oppositions one can say that the lexical opposition between limitive and unlimitive verbs is easily neutralized; this makes the borderline between the two aspective groups of verbs rather loose, e.g.: Don't laugh – this is a serious matter (unlimitive use, basic function of the verb laugh); He laughed and left the room (limitive use, neutralization). The aspective subdivision of the verbs is closely connected with the previously described subdivision of the verbs into actional and statal (limitive verbs can be only actional, while unlimitive verbs can denote both actions and states) and it is also grammatically relevant for the expression of the grammatical category of aspect.

Grammatical categories of verbs

B.A. Ilyish identifies six grammatical categories in present-day English verb: tense, aspect, mood, voice, person and number. L. Barkhudarov, D. Steling distinguish only the following grammatical categories: voice, order, aspect, and mood. Further they note, that the finite forms of the verb have special means expressing person, number and tense. So, in this question we do not find a generally accepted view-point.

However, this reasoning is not convincing. This is especially clear in the sentences where the verb "will" is used as an auxiliary of the future tense and where at the same time, the meaning of volition is excluded by the context. E.g. I am so sorry, I am afraid I will have to go back to the hotel. The verb "will" cannot be said to preserve even the slightest shade of the meaning of volition here. It can have only one meaning-that of grammatical futurity.

So the three main divisions of time are represented in the English verbal system by the three tenses. Each of them may appear in the common and in the continuous aspect. Thus we get six tense-aspect forms.

The future-in-the-past does not find its place in the scheme based on the linear principle. It's a deviation from this straight line: its starting point is not the present, from which the past and the future are reckoned, but the past itself. Hence, this system is considered to be deficient, not covering all lingual data.

A different view of the English tense system has been put forward by Prof. N. Irtenyeva. According to this view, the system is divided into two halves: that of tenses centring in the present, and that of tenses centring in the past. The former would comprise the present, present perfect, future, present continuous, and present perfect continuous, whereas the latter would comprise the past, past perfect, future-in-the-past, past continuous, and past perfect continuous. The latter half is characterised by specific features: the root vowel (e.g. sang as against sing), and the suffix -d (or -t), e.g. looked, had sung, would sing, had been singing. This view has much to recommend it. It has the advantage of reducing the usual threefold division of tenses (past, present, and future) to a twofold division (past and present) with each of the two future tenses (future and future-in-the-past) included into the past or the present system, respectively.

However, the cancellation of the future as a tense in its own right would seem to require a more detailed justification.

Another theory of English tenses has been put forward by A. Korsakov. He establishes a system of absolute and anterior tenses, and of static and dynamic tenses. By dynamic tenses he means what we call tenses of the continuous aspect, and by anterior tenses what we call tenses of the perfect correlation. It is the author's great merit to have collected numerous examples, including such as do not well fit into formulas generally found in grammars. The evaluation of this system in its relation to other views has yet to be worked out.

Linguists build up new systems of tenses in order to find a suitable place in them for future-in-the past. They express the idea that in English there exist two tense categories.

References

- Akmajian, A. and F. Heny. 1980 An introduction to the principle of transformational syntax. Cambridge,
MA: The MIT Press.

- Finch, G. 2000 Linguistic terms and concepts. New York: St. Martin's Press.

- Klammer, T. and M. Schulz. 1996 Analyzing English grammar. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Kroeger, P. 2004 Analyzing syntax: A lexical-functional approach. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University
Press.

- Matthews, P. 2007 Syntactic relations: A critical survey. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Miller, J. 2011 A critical introduction to syntax. London: continuum.

- Osborne, T., M. Putnam, and T. Groß 2011 Bare phrase structure, label-less structures, and specifier-less
syntax: Is Minimalism becoming a dependency grammar? The Linguistic Review 28: 315–364.

- Sobin, N. 2011 Syntactic analysis: The basics. Malden, MA: Wiley–Blackwell.

- Tesnière, Lucien 1959 Éleménts de syntaxe structurale. Paris: Klincksieck.

- van Valin, R. 2001 An introduction to syntax. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.