# Use definitivni form of the verb in English their semantic-syntactic structure in a sentence
## Baidulaeva B.[1], Pazylova A.[2], Turebayeva N.[3], Alkabay S.[4], Жунис У.[5]
## Использование нефинитивных форм глагола в английском языке, их семантическо-синтаксическая структура в предложении
## Байдулаева Б.Б.[1], Пазылова А.А.[2], Туребаева Н.А.[3], Алкабай С.Е.[4], Жунис У.Д.[5]

[1]Байдулаева Балжанай Байсериковна / Baidulaeva Balzhanay Baiserikovna – магистрант, преподаватель английского языка, Региональный социальный инновационный университет (РСИУ), г.Шымкент, государственное среднее школьное учреждение «Махамбет Отемисулы», с/о Нурлыбаев; Мактааральский р/н, ЮКО, кафедра иностранных языков, Университет «Сырдария»;

[2]Пазылова Алтынай Абуовна / Pazylova Altynai Abuovna - магистр педагогических наук, преподаватель русского языка, кафедра иностранных языков;

[3]Туребаева Нурай Абдимуратовна / Turebayeva Nurai Abdimuratovna – студент;

[4]Алкабай Сымбат Елдибакызы / Alkabay Symbat Eldibaykizy – студент;

[5]Жунис Улжан Динмухамедкызы / Zhunis Ulzhan Dinmuhamedkyzi – студент, факультет физики, университет «Сырдария», г. Жетысай ЮКО, Казахстан

**Abstract:** the article analyzes the non-finite forms of the verb. This verb form does a certain difficulty for students learning English, so the paper presents a constructive study of morphological, grammatical and syntactical aspects of infinitives, participles and gerunds.

**Аннотация:** в статье анализируются нефинитивные (неличные) формы глагола. Данная глагольная форма представляет определённую трудность для студентов, изучающих английский язык, поэтому в статье представлено конструктивное изучение морфологического, грамматического и синтаксического аспектов инфинитива, причастия и герундия.

**Keywords:** вербальный, процессуальный, инфинитив, герундий, причастие, когнитивный, семантика.

**Ключевые слова:** verbal, proccessual, infinitive, gerund, participle, cognitive, semantics.

Grammatically the verb is the most complex part of speech. This is due to the central role it performs in the expression of the predicative functions of the sentence. The complexity of the verb is inherent not only in the intricate structure of its grammatical categories, but also in its various subclass divisions, as well as in its falling into two sets of forms profoundly different from each other: the finite set and non-finite set.

And what are non-finite forms of the verb? Such kind of a question was given for hundred times by each student. Verbals are the forms of the verb intermediary in many of the lexico-grammatical features between the verb and the non-processual parts of speech. The mixed features of these forms are revealed in the principal spheres of the part-of –speech characterization, i.e. in their meaning, structural marking, combinability, and syntactic functions [1, 114].

The proccessual meaning is exposed by them in a substantive or adjectival-adverbial interpretation; they render processes as peculiar kinds of substances and properties. They are formed by special morphemic elements which do not express either grammatical time or mood (the most specific finite verb categories) [5, 220]. They can be combined with verbs like non-processual lexemes (performing non-verbal functions in the sentence), and they can be combined with non-processual lexemes like verbs (performing verbal functions in the sentence).

Non-finite forms of the verb are part of the system of the verbs, whether they do not constitute within this system a special subsystem of purely lexemic nature, i.e. form some sort of a specific verbal subclass. As it is known, the non-finite forms of the verbs, unable to express the predicative meanings of time and mood, still do express the so-called «secondary» or «potential» predication, forming syntactic complexes directly related to certain types of subordinate clauses.

So, the non-finite forms of the verb combine the characteristics of the verb with the characteristics of other parts of speech. Their mixed features are revealed in their semantics, morphemic structural marking, combinability, and syntactic functions.

The English verbids include four forms: the infinitive, the gerund, the present participle and the past participle.

**Infinitive**

It is the form of the verb which expresses a process in general, i.e. a process that is not restricted (i.e. concretized) by person, number, tense, and mood. Because of its general process meaning, the infinitive is treated as the head-form of the whole paradigm of the verb.

The infinitive has two presentation forms: marked and unmarked. The marked infinitive is distinguished by the grammatical word-morpheme *to*, historically a preposition. Similar to other grammatical word morphemes, *to* can be used to represent the corresponding construction as a whole (e.g. You can read any of the books if you want to). It can also be separated from its notional part by a word or phrase, usually of adverbial nature, forming the so-called split infinitive (e.g. We need your participation, to thoroughly investigate the issue). The marked infinitive is an analytic grammatical form.

The other form of the infinitive is unmarked; it is traditionally called the bare infinitive. It is used in various analytic forms (non-modal and modal), with verbs of physical perception, with the verbs let, bid, make, help (optionally), with a few modal phrases (had better, would rather, would have, etc.), with the relative why.

The infinitive combines the properties of the verb with those of the noun, as a result it serves as the verbal name of a process. It has the grammatical categories of voice, aspect and temporal correlation. Consequently, the category paradigm of

the infinitive includes eight forms: the indefinite active, the continuous active, the perfect active, the perfect continuous active; the indefinite passive, the continuous passive, the perfect passive, the perfect continuous passive.

to take — to be taking;

to have taken — to have been taking;

to be taken —to be being taken;

to have been taken — to have been being taken.

**Gerund**

The gerund is originally a verbal noun in – ing. Similar to the infinitive, the gerund is the name of a process, but its substantive meaning is more strongly pronounced than that of the infinitive: unlike the infinitive, the gerund can be modified by a noun in the genitive case or by the possessive pronoun and used with prepositions.

The general combinability of the gerund, like that of the infinitive, is dual, sharing some features with the verb, and some features with the noun.

The verbal features of the gerund.

Like the verb, the gerund distinguishes the categories of voice and temporal correlation:

writing (non-passive, non-perfect) – being written (passive, non-perfect);

having written (non-passive, perfect) – having been written (passive, perfect).

It is obvious that gerunds derived from intransitive verbs have only two forms: non-perfect active and perfect active, e.g. walking vs. having walked.

The gerund has the following syntactic features of the verb: it can function as part of the *verbal predicate* (e.g. If he stops working, he will die); it can be followed by an object (e.g. I remember locking the door) and an *adverbial modifier* (e.g. He avoids driving fast).

The noun features of the gerund.

Similar to the noun, the gerund can be modified by a noun in the genitive case or in the common case, which, when *pronominalized*, turn into the possessive and objective forms, respectively:

She did nothing to encourage John's going abroad (possessive).

She did nothing to encourage John going abroad. vs (objective).

**Participles**

*Participle I (present participle)* is fully homonymous with the gerund: it is also an *'ing-form'* (or, rather, four *'ing*-forms', cf.: *writing, being written, having written, having been written*). But its semantics is different: it denotes *processual quality*, combining verbal features with features of the adjective and the adverb; participle I can be characterized as *a phenomenon of hybrid processual-qualifying nature*, intermediary between the verb and the adjective/adverb. The triple nature of <u>participle I</u> finds its expression in its mixed syntactic functions. The verb-type combinability of <u>participle I</u> is revealed in its combinations with nouns denoting the subject and the object of the action, e.g.: *her entering the room*, with modifying adverbs and with auxiliary verbs in the analytical forms of the verb; the adjective-type combinability of <u>participle I</u> is manifested in its combinations with modified nouns and modifying adverbs of degree, e.g.: *an extremely maddening presence*; the adverb-type combinability of the participle is revealed in its combinations with modified verbs, e.g.: *to speak stuttering at every word*. In its free use, <u>participle I</u> can function as a predicative, e.g.: *Her presence is extremely maddening to me*; as an attribute, e.g.: *The fence surrounding the garden was newly painted*; and as an adverbial modifier, e.g.: *While waiting he whistled*.

Like any other verbid, <u>participle I</u> can form semi-predicative constructions if it is combined with the noun or the pronoun denoting the subject of the action; for example, *complex object with participle I*, e.g.: *I saw her entering the room*; *complex subject with participle I* (the passive transformation of the complex object constructions), e.g.: *She was seen entering the room*. In addition, participle I can form a detached semi-predicative construction, known as the *absolute participial construction*, which does not intersect in any of its components with the primary sentence part, e.g.: *The weather being fine, we decided to take a walk; I won't speak with him staring at me like that*.

In complex object and complex subject constructions the difference between the infinitive and participle I lies in the aspective presentation of the process: <u>participle I</u> presents the process as developing, cf.: *I often heard her sing in the backyard. – I heard her singing in the backyard*.

The dubious cases can be clarified if the gerund and the participle are distinctly opposed as polar phenomena. In gerundial constructions the semantic accent is on the substantivized process itself; the nominal character of the verbid can be shown by a number of tests, for example, by a question-forming test, cf.: *I remember the boy's singing (his singing). - What do you remember?*; the noun denoting the subject of the action semantically and syntactically modifies the gerund –*Whose singing do you remember?* In participial constructions the semantic emphasis is on the doer of the action, e.g.: *I remember him singing. - Whom do you remember?*; the present participle modifies its subject, denoting processual quality. In half-gerund constructions the semantic accent is on the event described, on the situational content with the processual substance as its core, cf.: *I remember the boy singing in the backyard. – What do you remember about the boy?* This case can be treated as the neutralization of the opposition, as a transferred participle, or *a gerundial participle*.

In the attributive function, the semantic differences between participle I and the gerund are unquestionable: the noun modified by <u>participle I</u> denotes the actual doer of the action, and the participle denotes its processual qualification; the meaning of the gerund in the attributive function is non-dynamic; the difference can be demonstrated in the following tests, cf.: *a sleeping girl - a girl who is sleeping* (participle I); *a sleeping pill - a pill taken to induce sleep* (the gerund).

*Participle II*, like participle I, denotes *processual quality* and can be characterized as *a phenomenon of hybrid processual-qualifying nature* [6:80]. It has only one form, traditionally treated in practical grammar as the verbal "third form", used to build the analytical forms of the passive and the perfect of finites, e.g.: *is taken; has taken*. The categorial meanings of the

perfect and the passive are implicitly conveyed by participle II in its free use, for example, when it functions as a predicative or an attribute, e.g.: *He answered through a firmly locked door* (participle II as an attribute)*; The room was big and brightly lit* (participle II as a predicative). The functioning of participle II is often seen as adverbial in cases like the following: *When asked directly about the purpose of her visit she answered vaguely.* But such constructions present cases of syntactic compression rather than an independent participle II used adverbially, cf.: *When asked directly ⇓ When she was asked directly…* Thus, participle II can be characterized as a verbid combining verbal features (processual semantics and combinability) with the features of the adjective.

The existence of non-finite form of verbs is evidence of inner systemacy and orderliness of a language. Language as a living organism produces lucking elements with the help of other language units as we see in examples of non–finite form of verbs, which combine incompatible qualities: some verb properties and noun, adjective and adverb functions, extending their pragmatic opportunities.

### *References*

1. «A Course Theoretical English Grammar» M. Y. Blokh, High School, 2008.
2. «Practical Grammar of English», K. N. Kachalova, E. E. Izrailevich, 2014.
3. *Бархударов Л. С.* Структура простого предложения современного английского языка М., 1966.
4. *Бархударов Л. С., Штелинг Д. А.* Грамматика английского языка. М., 2012. Гуманитарные и социальные науки 2015.
5. *Кравченко А. В., Баклашкина О. Н.* «Когнитивный аспект семантики английского глагола», 2012.
6. *Angel J.* Gollego «On the prepositional nature of non-finite verbs», Catalan Journal of Linguistics 9, 2010. 79-102.