



The history of verb studies in Germanic and English linguistics

*Nazgul Dzharkinbaeva**

PhD in Philological Sciences, Associate Professor
Bishkek State University named after K. Karasaev
720044, 27 Ch. Aitmatov Ave., Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4973-6920>

Amangeldy Bekbalaev

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor
Kyrgyz-Russian Slavic University named after B. Yeltsin
720000, 44 Kiev Str., Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic
<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6792-6858>

Elmira Zhumakeeva

PhD in Philological Sciences, Acting Associate Professor
Bishkek State University named after K. Karasaev
720044, 27 Ch. Aitmatov Ave., Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0269-1103>

Aiana Murzabaeva

Senior Lecturer
Bishkek State University named after K. Karasaev
720044, 27 Ch. Aitmatov Ave., Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3494-0625>

Abstract. The systematic description of the verb across morphological, semantic, and syntactic levels remained a theoretical challenge in Germanic linguistics, given the typological divergence between English – an analytically structured West Germanic language – and German, which preserved a fuller inflectional paradigm. The aim of this study was to analyse the English verb within the context of the Germanic languages, specifically examining its tense, aspect, person, mood, verb paradigm (finite/infinite), and its role in sentence structure, particularly in terms of its predicative and valency properties. Drawing on academic grammars of English and German, reference terminological dictionaries, and theoretical works of classical and contemporary scholars, the study employed comparative-typological, descriptive, and conceptual-synthesis methods alongside diachronic-synchronic analysis and syntactic valency analysis. Verbal theory was traced from Pāṇini's analysis of Sanskrit verbal roots and the Alexandrian doctrine of mood through the foundational contributions of A.A. Potebnya and V.V. Vinogradov to current phylogenetic and corpus-based research. A comparative analysis of finite and non-finite paradigms revealed a core typological asymmetry: while morphological person marking had been reduced to the third-person singular Present Simple, English developed sixteen tense-aspect forms across four aspectual groups and three temporal planes, including four Future-in-the-Past constructions whose diachronic origin and modal-temporal semantics remained theoretically contested. The notional-structural distinction, examined through three competing classification frameworks, proved gradient rather than categorical, shaped by grammaticalisation pressure and functional frequency. The dominant role of the verb-predicate was confirmed through the theory of centripetal potency and cross-linguistic valency data, establishing that the verb's argument-opening capacity was a typologically stable feature of the Germanic family. These findings were applied to university courses in theoretical grammar, Germanic typology, and the history of the English language, providing a basis for lexicographical and corpus-based descriptions of verbs

Keywords: diachrony; finite forms; centripetal potency; valency properties; grammaticalisation; periphrastic constructions

Suggested Citation:

Dzharkinbaeva, N., Bekbalaev, A., Zhumakeeva, E., & Murzabaeva, A. (2026). The history of verb studies in Germanic and English linguistics. *Bulletin of the Bishkek State University*, 24(1), 32-41. doi: 10.35254/ss/1.2026.32.

*Corresponding author



Introduction

The linguistic parameters of diachrony and synchrony were introduced into scholarly usage at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, providing a foundational methodological basis for any comprehensive analysis of the verb. N.S. Qobilova *et al.* (2021) defined diachrony as the path through time that every linguistic element follows as part of the linguistic system; the historical development of the system as a whole, viewed as an object of linguistic study, whilst synchrony was understood as “the conventional identification of a particular state, a particular historical stage, as an object of linguistic study”. In diachronic investigation of the verb, its development is examined from the standpoint of historical time – specifically, by establishing which theories have addressed the question, which scholars have made the most substantial contributions to its study, and what forward-looking significance those inquiries have carried. Synchronic investigation, by contrast, entails examining the verb within a “frozen” integral language system at the current stage of development, without regard to who studied or described it in the historical past. Drawing on the definitions provided by Y. Deng *et al.* (2022), the verb is defined as a part of speech (a) denoting action or state as process (the semantic criterion); (b) expressing this meaning through the categories of aspect, voice, tense, person, and mood (the morphological criterion); (c) functioning in the sentence primarily as the predicate (the syntactic criterion). Central to the analysis is the morphological division of verbs into finite and non-finite forms, each of which possesses a distinct set of grammatical categories within the Indo-European languages. Particular attention was given to the predicative function of personal forms and to the special status of the infinitive as a “verbal nominative”, as E. Laporte *et al.* (2025) noted.

At the semantic level, classifications of verbs of being and the distinction between dynamic and stative lexemes were investigated. At the syntactic level, the valency properties of the verb and its role as the constitutive centre of the sentence, capable of opening various actant positions, were examined. In addition, semantic-syntactic oppositions – personal versus impersonal, transitive versus intransitive – that determine the structure of the utterance were considered. Within the scope of Germanic linguistics, the English verb was analysed through the prism of its analytical development and typological divergence from the inflectional German language. In the investigation of the complex system of 16 tense forms and the category of Future in the Past, questions surrounding the inter-categorical relationships of person, number, and tense were addressed. The work rests on the theory of centripetal potency, which, as W.K. Asri *et al.* (2024) argued, supports the dominant position of the verb in the hierarchy of parts of speech and syntactic structures. The verb is universally acknowledged as the syntactic and semantic nucleus of the sentence, yet the mechanisms by which it acquired and maintains this

position across the Germanic language family remain subjects of active scholarly inquiry.

Among the West Germanic languages, English presents a particularly revealing case: having undergone the most radical morphological simplification in the family, it simultaneously developed one of the most intricate periphrastic tense-aspect systems in the Indo-European group. This structural paradox makes the English verb an ideal test case for theories of grammatical change and typological comparison, and recent advances in digital corpus analysis and phylogenetic modelling have made its systematic re-investigation both timely and methodologically well-supported. The diachronic dimension of verbal morphology in Germanic has attracted renewed interest through computational approaches. The syntactic behaviour of the finite verb – its positional constraints within the clause – has been revisited diachronically by S. Harchaoui & P.-Y. Modicom (2025), who examined verb-third phenomena in Germanic verb-second languages. Their analysis demonstrated that Old High German permitted substantially greater flexibility in pre-finite clause structure than present-day German does, establishing that the rigidity of the verb-second constraint is itself a historical development rather than an invariant Germanic property. For the study of English, where verb-second movement was lost during the Middle English period, this result confirms that synchronic accounts of verbal syntactic behaviour require explicit integration of diachronic evidence.

From a typological perspective, the impact of inflectional complexity on verbal constructional networks was investigated by K. van Goethem & N. Koutsoukos (2022), who applied a corpus-based constructionist analysis to denominal verb formations in English, Dutch, and German. The study found that while all three languages share the same inventory of morphological construction types – conversion, prefixation, and suffixation – a Germanic cline exists in preferences for non-overt versus overt word-class marking, with English favouring conversion most strongly owing to its reduced inflectional morphology. This finding establishes a direct relationship between a language’s typological profile and the shape of its verbal constructional system. Semantic evolution at the English-German cross-linguistic interface has been addressed by W.K. Asri *et al.* (2024), who used digital text corpora and historical archive data to map mechanisms of semantic change in both languages. They found that metaphorical extension accounts for approximately 30-40% of new verbal and lexical terms in each language, while external historical factors – wars, industrialisation, and globalisation – contribute a further 20-30% of semantic evolution. Despite shared West Germanic ancestry, the two languages diverge in the frequency and preferred pathways of change: English exhibits a higher rate of lexical borrowing, while German relies predominantly on compounding as its primary mechanism of semantic expansion. Despite the large number of studies devoted to the verb in Germanic



languages, a comprehensive analysis that fully integrates diachronic and synchronic approaches while considering its morphological, semantic, and syntactic characteristics within the broader context of Indo-European typology remains lacking. The present study aimed to provide an integrated diachronic and synchronic analysis of the verb in Germanic and English linguistics, examining its morphological, semantic, and syntactic parameters as an interconnected system situated within the broader framework of Indo-European typology.

Literature Review

The study of the verb as a grammatical category has a history spanning more than two millennia, beginning with the early theoretical reflections of ancient Indian and Greek scholarship and extending through the classical tradition of Russian linguistics into the contemporary descriptive and theoretical frameworks. The earliest systematic treatment of the verb is found in ancient Indian grammatical thought. As R.H. Robins (1967) documented, Indian grammar of the IV century BC typically distinguished four parts of speech, singling out the verb and noun as the two principal classes and describing the verbal system in careful detail, including the categories of tense, mood, and person. The author noted, that the ancient Indian grammarians – and Pāṇini in particular – held that all Sanskrit words derived from indivisible verbal roots, which served as the productive base for the word-formation system, generating denominal structures of the type root + primary suffix. Ancient Greek scholarship developed the tradition in a complementary direction. As V.N. Kodukhov (1974) observed in his textbook on general linguistics, scholars of the Alexandrian grammatical school – Aristarchus of Samothrace, Dionysius Thrax, and Apollonius Dyscolus – produced in the II century AD a doctrine of eight parts of speech as a properly grammatical classification of words, positioning the verb in second place after the noun. At the same time, R.H. Robins (1967) noted that it was with the verb that these scholars associated the newly developed doctrine of mood, distinguishing indicative, optative, indefinite, and imperative varieties and thereby establishing the verb as the leading element of syntax. The theoretical legacy of antiquity was substantially elaborated in the Russian-language tradition of general linguistics. In his work, A.A. Potebnya (1958) analysed the verbal categories of tense, mood and voice. In his work, A.A. Potebnya addressed the views of his contemporaries who denied the independent grammatical status of tense and mood, attributing these categories instead to syntactic structures. He critically examined the nature of these categories in the Russian language, questioning their existence and independent function within its grammatical system. This insistence on the morphological integrity of the verb established a foundation for all subsequent Russian verbal theory.

The semantic characterisation of the verb was advanced most comprehensively by V.V. Vinogradov (1947). Author demonstrated that the semantic structure of the verb is broader and more flexible than that of any other

grammatical category, a property attributable to the dominant role of prefixes in verbal morphology. V.V. Vinogradov further showed that “action” and “state” are subsumed under the neutral category of “process”, unifying traditionally opposed verbal classes. Of particular importance is V.V. Vinogradov’s characterisation of the infinitive as the “verbal nominative” – the unmarked base form of the verb – a concept further developed by E.M. Galkina-Fedoruk (1957). N.Yu. Shvedova *et al.* (1989) identified the semantically coherent class of “verbs of being”, whose lexical content traverses the existential continuum from anticipation through emergence and realisation to disappearance along a scale that shifts the expression of process in relation to the moment of actualisation. C. Fehrer (2019) showed that German and English deploy their own characteristic sets of these verbal subtypes, a finding of direct relevance to any comparative Germanic analysis.

The further distinction between dynamic and stative verbs, examined by Yu.S. Maslov (1975) and F. Günther *et al.* (2019), results in a matrix of semantic types that is essential for the description of the English and German verbal lexicon. M. Parrott (2010) extended this analysis, demonstrating that syntactic markers are assigned to sentence constituents and transferred to whichever part of speech occupies the predicate position. The relationship between verbal frequency and syntactic valency was explored at a typological scale by S. Tao *et al.* (2024), who analysed data from 79 languages and demonstrated that more frequent verbs consistently display greater valency frame diversity, a pattern interpreted as evidence that the verbal lexicon is organised according to principles of communicative efficiency at the lexicon-grammar interface. The valency dimension was investigated comparatively by Sh.M. Iskandarova & Sh.A. Ganieva (2024), who showed that the verb’s capacity to open actant positions for one to four nominal dependents makes it the constitutive structural centre of the sentence – a conclusion reinforced by O. Oreshko (2009) for Russian and by A.K. Kashyap (2019) for typologically diverse language systems.

The interaction between morphological, semantic, and syntactic mechanisms was theorised by R.H. Robins (1989), who emphasised that linguistic levels are mutually conditioned and systematically interdependent. This interdependence underlies the semantic-syntactic classifications of the verb. The aforementioned V.V. Vinogradov (1947) argued that impersonal verbs are historically secondary formations – originally all verbs were personal, and the loss of explicit person reference occurred diachronically, leaving the third-person singular as a residual form whose personhood remains present only in potential – a view supported by E.M. Galkina-Fedoruk (1957) and N.Yu. Shvedova *et al.* (1989). A. Craevschi *et al.* (2025), working with 107 cognate verbs across 14 archaic and contemporary Germanic languages, demonstrated through a hierarchical phylogenetic model that the distribution of morphological irregularity in strong verb paradigms is functionally motivated: verbs preserving the ABB alternation – distinct preterite and past-participle stems – do so

because this allomorphy encodes a semantically significant binary opposition between present and past.

This findings establish that irregular morphological patterns in the Germanic verb system are functional assets maintained over historical time by the pressure to preserve semantically useful distinctions, directly informing any account of verbal restructuring in the history of English. This finding is particularly pertinent to English, where high-frequency verbs combine exceptional valency flexibility with the role of constitutive structural centre of the clause. The literature review demonstrated the long-standing and multifaceted development of the study of the verb, tracing its evolution from ancient Indian and Greek grammar to modern Russian linguistics. It highlighted key contributions to the understanding of the verb's grammatical, semantic, and syntactic roles, revealing how its morphology, function, and relationships with other grammatical categories have been systematically explored over time. The analysis also underscored the interdependence of these levels of linguistic structure, particularly in the context of Russian and Germanic languages.

Materials and Methods

The research is grounded in two categories of materials, each selected based on distinct criteria. The theoretical and descriptive foundation of the study includes works by prominent scholars in the field of world linguistics, such as V.V. Vinogradov (1947), A.I. Smirnitsky (1959), A.A. Potebnya (1958), and others. These sources provided a comprehensive framework for the analysis, drawing on both classical and contemporary linguistic scholarship. Sources were selected based on four criteria:

- ▶ disciplinary authority – inclusion of works by scholars whose theoretical contributions are recognised across the Russian-language and Western European linguistic traditions;
- ▶ level coverage – the corpus was assembled to provide adequate theoretical grounding for each of the three levels of analysis (morphological, semantic, and syntactic);
- ▶ genre representativeness – the corpus combines theoretical monographs, normative academic grammars, and terminological reference works, thereby ensuring both interpretive depth and descriptive precision;
- ▶ and typological contrast – sources about both English and German were included to illuminate the analytical-inflectional typological divide within the West Germanic sub-group.

The linguistic material for analysis, consisting of verbal paradigms and syntactic constructions from English and German, was exclusively selected from normative academic grammars, specifically R. Quirk *et al.* (1982) and M.Y. Blokh (1994). These sources were chosen for their authoritative and comprehensive treatment of the grammatical structures under investigation. The selection criterion for linguistic data was attestedness in standard descriptive sources: only paradigmatic forms and construction types documented in the cited academic grammars were admitted to the analysis, thereby excluding colloquial,

dialectal, or non-standard usage. By contrast, the synchronic component of the analysis is based exclusively on modern normative grammars describing the contemporary state of the English and German verbal system. The methodology rests on a systemic approach to language as an integral object in continuous historical development. The study employed a set of general scientific and specialised linguistic methods. The comparative-typological method was applied to identify convergent and divergent features in the verbal systems of English and German; the analytical procedure comprised selecting verbal paradigms, comparing morphological categories (person, number, tense, voice, mood) according to a uniform descriptive scheme, identifying typological divergences, and interpreting those divergences from the perspective of analytical versus inflectional language type. Diachronic and synchronic analyses were used, respectively, to trace the evolution of verbal theory from ancient Indian and Graeco-Roman grammar to modern linguistics and to describe the current state of the language system as a structural cross-section. The descriptive method supported the inventorying and classification of finite and non-finite verb forms. Syntactic analysis and the method of communicative sentence division were applied to study valency properties and the constitutive role of the verb in sentence structure. The method of conceptual synthesis made it possible to integrate the morphological, semantic, and syntactic levels to construct a multidimensional classification of the verb as a bearer of processuality. The concepts of centripetal and centrifugal potential of linguistic units, as proposed by Z. Ospanova (2023), were applied, which underpin the central position of the predicate verb within the semantic-syntactic space of the utterance.

Results and Discussion

The Germanic language family encompasses all languages descended from Proto-Germanic; in the present study, the focus falls on English and German as typologically contrasting representatives of the West Germanic sub-group. Modern English, whose foundations were laid by the tribal languages of the Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and Frisians who migrated to the British Isles in the V century AD, absorbed extensive phonetic, lexical, and grammatical elements from Norman, Middle French, Norwegian, Danish, and other languages, moving decisively away from the inflectional type and losing many features of both external and internal inflection (Qobilova *et al.*, 2021). This diachronic trajectory produced a structural complexity in which different aspects of the language developed in ways that appear outwardly autonomous yet remain systematically interconnected – a property that V.N. Yartseva (1968) identified as the fundamental methodological challenge of English-language diachrony, while P.M. Arkadiyev (2020) observed that the question of accounting for these connections in synchronic versus diachronic analysis remains unresolved. Contemporary comparative research has confirmed and refined this typological divergence. K. van Goethem & N. Koutsoukos (2022) demonstrated



that within the West Germanic cline, English shows the strongest preference for morphologically unmarked, conversion-based verbal constructions precisely because its reduced inflectional morphology removes the formal barriers to zero-derivation, while German retains overt affixation as the dominant strategy. W.K. Asri *et al.* (2024) further showed that despite shared West Germanic ancestry, English and German have diverged in the mechanisms of verbal semantic change: English exhibits a higher rate of lexical borrowing, while German relies on compounding – a divergence traceable to the contrasting

morphological profiles of the two languages. At the definitional level, this typological divergence is also reflected in verbal semantics: C. Fehringer (2019) defined the verb as an independent part of speech denoting action or state, while G. Leech *et al.* (2010) subsumed both meanings under the single concept of process, which more accurately captures the semantic breadth of the verbal category. A systematic comparison of the finite and non-finite verbal paradigms of German and English reveals both structural parallels and significant typological divergences, which are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Grammatical categories of German and English verbs: A comparative overview

Form type	Grammatical category	German	English
Finite verbs	Person	1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd	1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd
	Number	Singular; plural	Singular; plural
	Conjugation scope	All persons × 2 numbers	3 rd person sg. only (Present Simple)
	Tense	6 forms: Präsens; Präteritum; Perfekt; Plusquamperfekt; Futur I; Futur II	16 forms: 12 logical-grammatical (4 groups × 3 temporal planes) + 4 Future in the Past
	Voice	Active; Passive	Active; Passive
	Mood	Indicative; Imperative; Subjunctive	Indicative; Imperative; Subjunctive
Infinitive	Person / Number / Mood / Tense	–	–
	Voice	Active; Passive	Active; Passive
	Total forms	2	6 (4 active: Simple, Continuous, Perfect, Perfect Continuous; 2 passive)
Participle	Person / Number / Mood	–	–
	Tense	Partizip I; Partizip II	Participle I (Indefinite); Participle II; Perfect Participle
	Voice	Active; Passive	Active; Passive
	Total forms	2	3
Gerund	Status	Absent	Present
	Tense	–	Present; Past; Future
	Voice	–	Active; Passive

Source: compiled by the authors on the basis of R. Quirk *et al.* (1982), M.Y. Blokh (1994), C. Fehringer (2019), H. Camp (2020)

As the Table 1 demonstrated, both languages converge in their basic inventory of grammatical categories for finite verbs but diverge sharply in the scope of morphological realisation. German conjugates all personal verbs across three persons and two numbers, while in English, person marking has been reduced to the third-person singular of the Present Simple. Most strikingly, where German deploys six tense forms, English operates with sixteen, constituting a tense-aspect matrix without a direct equivalent anywhere in the West Germanic sub-group. In the domain of non-finite forms, English exceeds German both in the variety of non-finite categories – the gerund has no equivalent in German – and in the formal differentiation of the infinitive (six forms versus two) and the participle (three forms versus two). In English and Germanic linguistics, the structural centrality of the verb has been theorised through the framework of centripetal and centrifugal potency. Any linguistic unit possesses two complementary capacities: centripetal potency (*zentripetale Potenzen*) – the capacity to attract other units and to extend its grammatical properties over them – and centrifugal potency (*zentrifugale Potenzen*) – the tendency to gravitate toward

units with stronger grammatical properties (Fedulenkova & Basova, 2020; Ospanova, 2023). W.L. Chafe (1975) argued that the entire conceptual world of the human being divides between the sphere of the verb – covering states, conditions, and events – and the sphere of the noun, covering things, and concluded that the verb occupies a central structural position while the noun is peripheral. The EU Horizon VALGER project by the European Commission (2024), which reconstructs proto-Germanic valency frames across seven ancient and modern Germanic languages, further confirms that this valency-based centrality has been a stable feature of the Germanic language family since the proto-language stage. Additional evidence is provided by the verb’s capacity to reduce the subject to purely formal representation – as in “it has been raining since three o’clock” – and by its ability to open the maximum number of actant positions simultaneously (Halliday, 1994; Morozova & Pozharytska, 2025).

A competing theoretical position holds that subject and predicate stand in a relationship of structural equipollence. J. Lyons (1978) and R. Quirk *et al.* (1982) grounded this view in the analysis of immediate constituents,

arguing that the binary division of the sentence into two obligatory, mutually conditioning elements implies their equal structural standing. A.I. Smirnitsky & V.V. Passek (1957), A.A. Reformat'skiy (1998) and E. Skvayrs (2022) developed this position, demonstrating that subject and predicate are semantically independent yet mutually complementary: only in the configuration S + P can they constitute the minimal sentence-utterance. A structurally instructive asymmetry exists between English and Russian: where Russian freely tolerates subjectless constructions, English strongly resists constructing a sentence without a formally expressed subject (Close, 1975). Within this framework, V.N. Yartseva (1968) argued that the direct object occupies a structurally distinct position from other secondary constituents, ranking closer to the principal sentence constituents in the S + P + O schema characteristic of English and the Germanic languages (Blokh, 1994).

Several fundamental questions in the grammatical description of the English verb remain unresolved. A.I. Smirnitsky (1959) identified the most foundational: the relationship between person, number, and tense in a language where personal morphology has been reduced to the third-person singular Present Simple – raising the question of whether person can be regarded as a productive grammatical category for the full paradigm (Radford, 1988; Hogg & Denison, 2008). A second cluster of unresolved questions concerns the internal organisation of the sixteen-form tense-aspect system. It remains theoretically unclear why the English indicative active distributes its forms along two independent axes – the logical-temporal plane (past, present, future) and the aspect-phase plane (Indefinite, Continuous, Perfect, Perfect Continuous) – rather than along the simple three-term temporal axis of most Indo-European languages. The four Future-in-the-Past forms raise additional outstanding questions regarding their diachronic origin, frequency of use across registers, and the structural relationship they encode between future temporal reference and retrospective modal framing. The historical loosening of pre-finite clause constraints in the ancestor languages of English appears to have created structural conditions conducive to the development of complex periphrastic verbal constructions, including retrospective modal-temporal composites, suggesting that the resolution of these issues lies at the intersection of historical syntax and synchronic tense-aspect theory. One of the more persistent difficulties in English verb grammar is the disconnect between morphological and semantic classifications – they frequently fail to map onto each other, and their terminological labels vary considerably from one tradition to the next. Three criteria are in play when linguists classify verbs: morphological, semantic, and syntactic. The problem is that researchers tend to treat one as primary and sideline the others, which explains why the resulting classifications look so different depending on who you read. This tension between criteria is not unique to English, but it becomes especially acute here. In a language exposed to contact-induced change on a historically unusual scale,

this instability affects practical classification – a verb listed as notional in one grammar may function semi-notionally in another corpus context.

Three classification approaches dominate the tradition. The first, associated with I.P. Ivanova *et al.* (1981) divides all English verbs by functional-syntactic usage into notional, semi-notional, and structural verbs. Notional verbs are full-meaning words that independently express a definite action in a simple predicate. Semi-notional verbs – modals, aspectual phase verbs like “keep”, and copular-type verbs like “feel, remain, continue” – function as markers of the predicative relation between a feature or action and another notional word rather than as independent semantic units. Structural verbs – auxiliaries, link-verbs, substitute and intensifying verbs – serve purely grammatical functions (Ivanova *et al.*, 1981). This tripartite division is conditioned by the analytical typological structure of English, in which functional-syntactic role is a more stable diagnostic than morphological form (Biber *et al.*, 2021; Hlykhovtseva & Hlykhovtseva, 2022).

The second classification, developed by H. Camp (2020), foregrounds the constitutive-combinatory aspect of the syntactic criterion, distinguishing notional from structural lexemes by their capacity for modification – verbs by adverbs, nouns by adjectives, and so on. Structural verbs, within this framework, function alongside inflection, word order, and intonation as grammatical means, marking relations between notional words rather than independently encoding semantic content. M.R. Manzini & L.M. Savoia (2011) extended this position by arguing that the functional-syntactic capacity of structural words is precisely what defines their role in the analytical syntax of the Germanic languages. Additionally, M.R. Manzini & L.M. Savoia (2011) questioned the validity of the traditional full-meaning versus structural distinction, arguing that in many cases the boundary between these categories cannot be clearly established. Their position is based on two main assumptions: first, structural elements are inherently linked to specific grammatical functions and operate as markers that classify or constrain a referent; second, lexical (full-meaning) items may be regarded as such only insofar as the phenomena they denote constitute independently conceptualised entities. The operative criterion, therefore, lies squarely in functional syntax – a position that more recent corpus-based work has independently confirmed. The traditions of classification and the aforementioned studies converge on a key point: no single criterion – morphological, semantic, or syntactic – is sufficient in itself for the classification of English verb forms, and the boundary between lexical and structural categories is better understood as gradient rather than categorical. Consequently, any classification based solely on static synchronic criteria is likely to encounter difficulties in accounting for the full range of verbal behaviour in English; an adequate account must therefore treat the lexical-structural continuum as a dynamic property of the linguistic system, rather than a boundary that can be definitively established by a single criterion.



Conclusions

The findings of this study confirm that the English verb occupies a distinctive position within the West Germanic language family, and that this distinctiveness cannot be reduced to a single defining feature. Rather, it emerges from the interaction of morphological, semantic, and syntactic parameters, which have consistently constituted the foundational criteria of verbal theory across different linguistic traditions. What varies across these traditions is not the criteria themselves, but the relative priority assigned to each and the theoretical implications derived from that prioritisation. The comparative analysis of English and German verbal paradigms has revealed a structural paradox at the core of the English verb system: morphological reduction and analytical expansion proceed in parallel rather than compensating for one another. While inflectional marking has been significantly reduced, particularly in the domain of person, the system has simultaneously developed a highly elaborated tense-aspect framework. This asymmetry between a simplified inflectional structure and an expanded analytical system constitutes a key typological feature of the English verb and helps to explain the persistence of unresolved issues in its grammatical description. The analysis of verb classification further demonstrates that no single criterion – morphological, semantic, or syntactic – is sufficient in isolation. A comprehensive account requires

the integration of these dimensions within a unified framework that reflects the gradient and dynamic nature of verbal categories. In this respect, the theoretical model of centripetal and centrifugal potential proves productive, as it substantiates the role of the verb-predicate as the structural and semantic centre of the clause. At the same time, approaches that emphasise the co-dependence of subject and predicate capture important structural constraints of English, suggesting that these perspectives should be viewed as complementary rather than mutually exclusive. Despite the progress achieved, several issues remain open to further investigation. In particular, the diachronic emergence of the Future-in-the-Past constructions, the interaction between person and number within the plural paradigm, and the mechanisms linking morphological reduction with analytical development throughout the history of English require more detailed and focused analysis.

Acknowledgements

None.

Funding

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

- [1] Arkadiev, P.M. (2020). Morphology in typology: Historical retrospect, state of the art, and prospects. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.626.
- [2] Asri, W.K., Rhamadanty, W.A.U., Burhamzah, M., & Alamsyah, A. (2024). Analyzing semantic shifts in English and German by exploring historical influences and societal dynamics. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 11(2), 1085-1100. doi:10.24815/siele.v11i2.37460.
- [3] Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G.N., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (2021). *Grammar of spoken and written English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [4] Blokh, M.Y. (1994). *A course in theoretical English grammar*. Moscow: Higher School.
- [5] Camp, H. (2020). Morphology in English. *Macrolinguistics and Microlinguistics*, 1(2), 78-84. doi: 10.21744/mami.v1n2.7.
- [6] Chafe, W.L. (1975). *Meaning and the structure of language*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- [7] Close, R.A. (1975). *A reference grammar for students of English*. London: Longman.
- [8] Craevschi, A., Babinski, S., & Cathcart, C. (2025). Semantics drives analogical change in Germanic strong verb paradigms: A phylogenetic study. *arXiv*. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2502.17670.
- [9] Deng, Y., Liu, D., & Wu, S. (2022). Academic English verbs across disciplines: A corpus study and its implications. *Ampersand*, 9, article number 100093. doi: 10.1016/j.amper.2022.100093.
- [10] European Commission. (2024). *Verb valency in Germanic: Diachronic analysis and reconstruction of protolinguistic scenario*. doi: 10.3030/101150253.
- [11] Fedulenkova, T., & Basova, T. (2020). Representation of issues in modern linguistics in the textbook by L.N. Churilina. *Nizhny Novgorod Linguistics University Bulletin*, 49(1), 166-174. doi: 10.47388/2072-3490/lunn2020-49-1-166-174.
- [12] Fehringer, C. (2019). *German grammar in context* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
- [13] Galkina-Fedoruk, E.M. (1957). *Modern Russian: Lexicology, phonetics, morphology: A textbook for departments of Russian language and literature at teacher training colleges* (2nd ed.). Moscow: State Educational and Pedagogical Publishing House of the RSFSR.
- [14] Günther, F., Smolka, E., & Marelli, M. (2019). "Understanding" differs between English and German: Capturing systematic language differences of complex words. *Cortex*, 116, 168-175. doi: 10.1016/j.cortex.2018.09.007.
- [15] Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: E. Arnold.

- [16] Harchaoui, S., & Modicom, P.-Y. (Eds.). (2025). *Verb-third phenomena in Germanic verb-second languages: Historical and variational perspectives (Open Germanic linguistics 15)*. Berlin: Language Science Press. doi: [10.5281/zenodo.16309627](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16309627).
- [17] Hlykhovtseva, K., & Hlykhovtseva, I. (2022). Reflection of the essence of linguistic units in the forms of statements about language. *Philological Review*, 2(20), 13-21. doi: [10.31499/2415-8828.2.2022.268639](https://doi.org/10.31499/2415-8828.2.2022.268639).
- [18] Hogg, R., & Denison, D. (2008). *A history of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [19] Iskandarova, Sh.M., & Ganieva, Sh.A. (2024). On the issues of phraseological valency. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(6), 2142-2145. doi: [10.53555/kuey.v30i6.5668](https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i6.5668).
- [20] Ivanova, I.P., Burlakova, V.V., & Pocheptsov, G.G. (1981). *Theoretical grammar of modern. English*. Moscow: Higher School.
- [21] Kashyap, A.K. (2019). *Language typology*. In G. Thompson, W.L. Bowcher, L. Fontaine & D. Schöenthal (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of systemic functional linguistics* (pp. 767-792). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [22] Kodukhov, V.N. (1974). *General linguistics*. Moscow: Higher Education.
- [23] Laporte, E., Nam, J., Ranaivoson, J.F., & Nakamura, T. (2025). Support verbs that are not verbs. *Language Sciences*, 111, article number 101741. doi: [10.1016/j.langsci.2025.101741](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2025.101741).
- [24] Leech, G., Hundt, M., Mair, C., & Smith, N. (2010). *Change in contemporary English: A grammatical study*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. doi: [10.1017/CBO9780511642210](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511642210).
- [25] Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- [26] Manzini, M.R., & Savoia, L.M. (2011). *Grammatical categories: Variation in romance languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: [10.1017/CBO9780511974489](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511974489).
- [27] Maslov, Yu.S. (1975). *Introduction to linguistics*. Moscow: Higher School.
- [28] Morozova, I.B., & Pozharytska, O.O. (2025). *Theory of English grammar: A university manual (students' major language)*. Odesa: University Book.
- [29] Oreshko, O. (2009). *Verbal government in the Russian language: A comparison of constructions in Russian and Czech*. (Bachelor's thesis, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic).
- [30] Ospanova, Z. (2023). The communicative and pragmatic potential of non-standard vocabulary. *Xlinguae*, 16(1), 246-255. doi: [10.18355/XL.2023.16.01.19](https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2023.16.01.19).
- [31] Parrott, M. (2010). Sentence constituents: Basic principles. In *Grammar for English language teachers* (pp. 292-314). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: [10.1017/9781009406536.024](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009406536.024).
- [32] Potebnaya, A.A. (1958). *Notes on Russian grammar*. Moscow: State Educational and Pedagogical Publishing House of the RSFSR.
- [33] Qobilova, N.S., Majidova, Z.M., & Saidov, X.Sh. (2021). *Introduction to Germanic philology: Study guide*. Bukhara: Bukhara State University.
- [34] Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1982). *A university grammar of English*. Harlow: Longman.
- [35] Radford, A. (1988). *Transformational grammar: A first course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [36] Reformatskiy, A.A. (1998). *Introduction to linguistics*. Moscow: Aspekt-Press.
- [37] Robins, R.H. (1967). *A short history of linguistics*. London: Longman.
- [38] Robins, R.H. (1989). *General linguistics* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- [39] Shvedova, N.Yu., Belousov, V.N., Kasimova, G.K., & Korobova, M.M. (1989). *Word and grammatical laws of the language: Verb*. Moscow: Bukinist.
- [40] Skvayrs, E. (2022). Syntactic and morphological aspects of the Russian translation of Low German surnames from historical documents of Lübeck (14th-16th centuries). *Tomsk State University Journal of Philology*, 75, 221-244. doi: [10.17223/19986645/75/11](https://doi.org/10.17223/19986645/75/11).
- [41] Smirniisky, A.I., & Passek, V.V. (1957). *Syntax of the English language*. Moscow: Publishing House of Foreign Language Literature.
- [42] Smirniisky, A.I. (1959). *The morphology of the English language*. Moscow: Publishing House of Foreign Language Literature.
- [43] Tao, S., Donatelli, L., & Hahn, M. (2024). More frequent verbs are associated with more diverse valency frames: Efficient principles at the lexicon-grammar interface. In L.-W. Ku, A. Martins & V. Srikumar (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 62nd annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)* (pp. 11795-11810). Bangkok: Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: [10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.635](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.635).
- [44] van Goethem, K., & Koutsoukos, N. (2022). How typology shapes the constructional network: Denominal verb constructions in English, Dutch and German. *Journal of Word Formation*, 6(1), 7-57. doi: [10.3726/zwjw.2022.01.01](https://doi.org/10.3726/zwjw.2022.01.01).
- [45] Vinogradov, V.V. (1947). *The Russian language: A grammatical theory of the word*. Moscow: State Educational Publishing House of the Ministry of Education RSFSR.
- [46] Yartseva, V.N. (1968). *Studies in general theory of grammar*. Moscow: Nauka.



Герман жана англис тил илиминде этишти изилдөөнүн тарыхы

Назгуль Джаркинбаева

Филология илимдеринин кандидаты, доцент
К. Карасаев атындагы Бишкек мамлекеттик университети
720044, Ч. Айтматов проспекти, 27, Бишкек ш., Кыргыз Республикасы
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4973-6920>

Амангельды Бекбалаев

Филология илимдеринин доктору, профессор
Б. Ельцин атындагы Кыргыз-Орус Славян университети
720000, Киев көч., 44, Бишкек ш., Кыргыз Республикасы
<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6792-6858>

Эльмира Жумакеева

Филология илимдеринин кандидаты, доценттин м.а.
К. Карасаев атындагы Бишкек мамлекеттик университети
720044, Ч. Айтматов проспекти, 27, Бишкек ш., Кыргыз Республикасы
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0269-1103>

Айана Мурзабаева

Улук окутуучу
К. Карасаев атындагы Бишкек мамлекеттик университети
720044, Ч. Айтматов проспекти, 27, Бишкек ш., Кыргыз Республикасы
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3494-0625>

Аннотация. Морфологиялык, семантикалык жана синтаксистик деңгээлдерде этишти системалуу сүрөттөө герман тил илиминде теоретикалык көйгөй бойдон калууда, анткени англис тили – аналитикалык түзүлүшкө ээ батыш герман тили – менен флективдүү парадигмасы кыйла толук сакталган немис тилинин ортосунда типологиялык айырмачылыктар бар. Бул изилдөөнүн максаты – герман тилдеринин контекстинде англистилиндеги этишти талдоо, атап айтканда анын чак, түр, жак, ыңгай категорияларын, этиштин парадигмасын (жактуу/жаксыз формаларын), ошондой эле сүйлөмдөгү ролун, айрыкча предикативдик жана валенттүүлүк касиеттерин изилдөө болду. Англис жана немис тилдеринин академиялык грамматикаларына, терминологиялык маалымдама сөздүктөргө жана классикалык жана заманбап окумуштуулардын теориялык эмгектерине таянып, изилдөөдө салыштырма-типологиялык, сүрөттөөчү жана концептуалдык синтез ыкмалары, ошондой эле диахрондук-синхрондук талдоо жана синтаксистик валенттүүлүк талдоосу колдонулду. Этиш теориясынын өнүгүшү Панининин санскрит этиш тамырларын талдоосунан жана Александрия мектебинин ыңгай жөнүндөгү окуусунан баштап, А.А. Потенбня менен В.В. Виноградовдун негиз салуучу эмгектери аркылуу азыркы филогенетикалык жана корпус негизиндеги изилдөөлөргө чейин каралды. Жактуу жана жаксыз парадигмаларды салыштырма талдоо негизги типологиялык асимметрияны аныктады: морфологиялык жак категориясы англис тилинде Present Simple чактын үчүнчү жак жекелик формасына чейин кыскарганына карабастан, тил төрт аспекттик топ жана үч убакыттык план боюнча бөлүштүрүлгөн он алты чак-аспект формаларын, анын ичинде диахрондук келип чыгышы жана модалдык-убакыттык семантикасы талаштуу бойдон калган төрт Future-in-the-Past конструкциясын өнүктүргөн. Үч атаандаш классификациялык моделдин алкагында каралган түшүнүк-структуралык айырмачылык категориялык эмес, градуалдуу мүнөзгө ээ экени аныкталды, бул грамматикализация басымы жана функционалдык жыштык менен шартталган. Этиш-предикаттын үстөмдүк ролу центростремителдик потенция теориясы жана тилдер аралык валенттүүлүк маалыматтары аркылуу тастыкталып, этиштин аргументтик позицияларды ачуу жөндөмү герман тилдерине мүнөздүү типологиялык туруктуу белги экендиги көрсөтүлдү. Алынган жыйынтыктар теоретикалык грамматика, герман тилдеринин типологиясы жана англис тилинин тарыхы боюнча университеттик курстарда колдонулуп, ошондой эле этишти лексикографиялык жана корпус негизиндеги сүрөттөө үчүн негиз боло алат

Негизги сөздөр: диахрония; жактуу формалар; центростремителдик потенция; валенттүүлүк касиеттери; грамматикализация; перифрастикалык конструкциялар

История изучения глагола в германском и английском языкознании

Назгуль Джаркинбаева

Кандидат филологических наук, доцент
Бишкекский государственный университет имени К. Карасаева
720044, просп. Ч. Айтматова, 27, г. Бишкек, Кыргызская Республика
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4973-6920>

Амангельды Бекбалаев

Доктор филологических наук, профессор
Кыргызско-Российский Славянский университет имени Б. Ельцина
720000, ул. Киевская, 44, г. Бишкек, Кыргызская Республика
<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6792-6858>

Эльмира Жумакеева

Кандидат филологических наук, и.о. доцента
Бишкекский государственный университет имени К. Карасаева
720044, просп. Ч. Айтматова, 27, г. Бишкек, Кыргызская Республика
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0269-1103>

Айана Мурзабаева

Старший преподаватель
Бишкекский государственный университет имени К. Карасаева
720044, просп. Ч. Айтматова, 27, г. Бишкек, Кыргызская Республика
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3494-0625>

Аннотация. Системное описание глагола на морфологическом, семантическом и синтаксическом уровнях остается теоретической проблемой в германском языкознании, что обусловлено типологическими различиями между английским – аналитически организованным западногерманским языком – и немецким языком, сохранившим более полную флективную парадигму. Целью данного исследования был анализ английского глагола в контексте германских языков, в частности рассмотрение его категорий времени, вида, лица, наклонения, глагольной парадигмы (личные/неличные формы), а также его роли в структуре предложения, прежде всего с точки зрения предикативных и валентностных свойств. На основе академических грамматик английского и немецкого языков, справочных терминологических словарей и теоретических работ классических и современных исследователей в работе использованы сравнительно-типологический, описательный и метод концептуального синтеза, а также диахронно-синхронный анализ и анализ синтаксической валентности. Теория глагола прослеживалась от анализа санскритских глагольных корней у Панини и александрийского учения о наклонениях до фундаментальных трудов А.А. Потемни и В.В. Виноградова, а также современных филогенетических и корпусных исследований. Сравнительный анализ личных и неличных парадигм выявил ключевую типологическую асимметрию: в то время как морфологическая категория лица в английском языке редуцирована до формы третьего лица единственного числа в Present Simple, язык развил шестнадцать временно-видовых форм, распределенных по четырем аспектуальным группам и трем временным планам, включая четыре конструкции Future-in-the-Past, диахроническое происхождение и модально-временная семантика которых остаются предметом теоретических дискуссий. Понятийно-структурное разграничение, рассмотренное в рамках трех конкурирующих классификационных моделей, оказалось градуальным, а не категориальным, что обусловлено давлением грамматикализации и функциональной частотностью. Доминирующая роль глагола-предиката подтверждена теорией центростремительной потенции и данными межъязыковой валентности, что позволяет утверждать, что способность глагола открывать аргументную позицию является типологически устойчивой характеристикой германских языков. Полученные результаты могут быть использованы в университетских курсах по теоретической грамматике, германской типологии и истории английского языка, а также служат основой для лексикографического и корпусного описания глагола

Ключевые слова: диахрония; личные формы; центростремительная потенция; валентностные свойства; грамматикализация; перифрастические конструкции

