

The Ministry of Higher and Secondary Special  
Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan  
Uzbek State World Languages University

## **C o u r s e p a p e r**

Perfect forms in English

Done by: the student of the  
group # 214 O. Akhrarov

Checked by: K. Rashidov

Tashkent - 2003

## Plan

1. Grammatical categories of Old English and Middle English
2. The category of perfect in Middle English
3. The history of verb forms of the Uzbek language
4. Bibliography

# 1. Grammatical categories of Old English and Middle English

The passive voice was very widely developed in Middle English. As the verb *weorpan* disappeared the only auxiliary for the passive was the verb *ben*.

The phrase “*ben* + second participle” could express both a state and an action. Only the context would show which of the two was meant in each particular case.

Let us consider from this point of view some examples from Chaucer’s works. The castle-yate on my right hond, which that so wel corven was that never swich another was ‘the castle gate on my right hand, which was so well carved that there never was such another’. The context clearly shows that what is meant is the result of an action. Of Grekes, by oon general assent, than semed me ther was a parlement at Athenes, up-on certeyn points and cas; among the whiche points y-spoken was to have with certeyn contrees alliaunce ‘with the Greeks, by general assent, it seemed to me, there was a gathering in Athens, on certain points and questions, among which points there was said to conclude in alliance with some countries’. It is clear here that the action itself, not its result, is meant. Compare also: O Satan, envious sin thilke day that thou were chased from our heritogel ‘O Satan, envious since the very day thou wast chased of our heritage!’ where the time of the action

is expressed; this shows that the action itself is meant. The following example is of some interest from this point of view: These wordes al with gold y-writen were. Whan this was rad, than sude this olde man ‘These words were written in gold. When this was read, the old man said’.

In Middle English the sphere of the passive voice grew as compared with Old English. The subject of a passive construction could a word which in a corresponding active construction would have been an indirect object. For instance, we find in Chaucer’s works examples like the following: I may you devyse how that I may holpe ‘I can show you how I can be helped’; he hadde he ben holpen by the stede of bras ‘and he had not been helped by the teed of brass’; the ambassadours ben answered for final ‘the ambassadors receive a final answer’. These were beginnings of a construction which was widely developed in Modern English. Occasionally a direct object was found with a passive verb predicate: he tolde Felyce all his wylle and lyfe, and how he was bedyn riche wife ‘he told Felyce all his will and life, and now he was offered rich wives’. Such constructions were also developed more fully in Modern English.

The verb be did not change much since the Middle English period. The main change was the penetration of the Northern form are into the present plural indicative instead of be. In Shakespeare, forms derived from the be-root are still found in the present indicative,

e.g. there be that can rule Naples as well as he: if thou beest not an ass, I am a youth of fourteen. For the 2nd person singular past indicative we find both in Shakespeare and in contemporary English a vacillation between the variants wert and wast. The former was derived on the analogy of art, shalt, wilt, by adding the -t-ending to the Middle English form were; the latter was derived by adding the same ending to the form was. In Shakespeare: thou wert born a fool; I think thou never wast where grace was said. In the past tense, the distinction between the indicative (I) was, (he) was and the subjunctive (I) were, (he) were has been preserved; however, in colloquial style there is a tendency to use (I) was, (he) was instead of (I) were, (he) were.

The verb be is the only English verb to have retained the difference between past singular and past plural. Such forms as (we) was, (you) was, (they) was are felt as vulgarisms and are not admitted into literary and colloquial style.

The verb do has undergone changes common to weak verbs; besides, in the forms dost, does, doth, done the vowel has been shortened: the ME [o:] developed into [u: > u > ^]. The form did no longer divides into two morphemes in MnE.

In the verb go the past form went has been preserved, while the form yede disappeared.

The verb will, would has preserved its forms in MnE mostly - as an auxiliary. The form will is used as an auxiliary of the future tense,

and would as an auxiliary of the future in the past and the conditional mood. In MnE would, in some cases of its use, can no longer be considered a form of will, but has become a separate verb.

The system of perfect forms, which had arisen in OE and developed in ME, goes on unfolding in the modern period. In Shakespeare's text there is a fully developed system of perfect forms, e.g.: if I have too austerely punished you, your compensation makes amends; nay 'twill be this hour ere I have done weeping; ears have not yet drunk a hundred words of that tongue's utterance; ere I could make a prologue to my brains they had begun to play; in my schooldays, when I had lost one shaft, I shot his fellow of the self-same flight the self-same way.

Occasionally we find in Shakespeare perfect forms of intransitive verbs of motion derived by means of the verb be, e. g. the deep of night is crept upon our talk; whither are they vanished? this gentleman is happily arrived. Eventually such forms came out of use.

The category of aspect seems to have arisen only in the MnE period. In OE, as we saw differences in the way an action proceeds in time were expressed by the prefix *3e-* in an unsystematic way, and in any case they did not amount to a grammatical category of aspect. In ME even this distinction was lost.

In MnE a continuous aspect was gradually formed, expressed by a very obvious morphological pattern (be + first participle).

Verbal forms lacking this pattern became a system of common aspect. It is hard to state a definite point at which the category of aspect came into being, as the process developed slowly, and even as late as the 19th century it was still, possible to use forms of the common aspect to denote an action unfolding at a definite moment.

Continuous forms are found in Shakespeare somewhat more frequently than in Chaucer, but on the whole they are not numerous. The present continuous is used, for example in this sentence in *The Merchant of Venice*: your mind is tossing on the ocean. Here Salarino, trying to explain why his friend Antonio is sad, supposes that Antonio is worried by the fate of his ships, which are on the open seas. The past continuous is used in a sentence in *Hamlet*: my lord, as I was sewing in my closet, lord Hamlet ... he comes before me.

A continuous infinitive is found in *Much Ado about Nothing*: I wonder that you will still be talking. Beatrice is teasing Benedict: he is always talking, though nobody cares to listen to him. The phrase “will + infinitive” does not make a future tense, as is clear from the context.

However, in most cases where an action occurring at a given moment in the present or in the past is meant, the non-continuous form is used. E. g.:

OLIVER: Now, sir, what make you here?

ORLANDO: Nothing; I am not taught to make anything.

OLIVER: What mar you then, sir?

ORLANDO: Marry, sir, I am helping you to mar that which God made, a poor unworthy brother of yours, with idleness.

In present-day English Oliver's first question would have been: What are you doing here? It is curious that Orlando uses the present continuous in his second reply.

Use of continuous forms is still rather limited in the 17th and 18th centuries. In a comedy by Congreve we find such examples of the use of continuous as the following:

BLUFFE: This sword, I think, I was telling you of, Mr. Sharper, — this sword I'd maintain to be the best divine, anatomist, lawyer, or casuist in Europe.

Sometimes a continuous form is used with the adverb always to denote a repeated action, with an emotional colouring.

BRISK: Careless, this is your trick; you're always spoiling company by leaving it.

CARELESS: And thou art always spoiling company .by coming into't.

Sometimes the present and the past perfect continuous are used:

BELLMOUR: How now, George, where hast thou been snarling odious truths, and entertaining company like a physician, with discourse of their diseases and infirmities? What fine lady

hast thou been putting out of conceit with herself, and persuading that the face she had been making all the morning was none of her own? for I know thou art as unmannerly and as unwelcome to a woman as a looking-glass after the small-pox.

HEARTWELL: I confess I have not been sneering fulsome lies and nauseous flattery, fawning upon a little tawdry whore that will fawn upon me again, and entertain any puppy that comes, like a tumbler, with the same tricks over and over.

In the 19th century continuous forms are used more widely. But in the early 19th century they were considered a feature of colloquial style and were not admitted in to poetry. William Wordsworth (1770—1850) was the first to use continuous forms in poetry in his poem *Written in March* (1802), which contains a concrete description, expressed by a series of sentences with a continuous verb form as predicate.

The cock is crowing,

The stream is flowing

The cattle are grazing,

Their heads never raising

Small clouds are sailing,

Blue sky prevailing;

The rain is over and gone!

At the time this use of continuous forms in poetry seemed very bold and almost vulgar. Eventually, however, continuous forms penetrated far deeper into all styles of the language.

In the 19th century passive continuous forms appear. They express an action taking place at a given time in the present or past more clearly, distinguishing it from the result of an action. But the system of passive continuous forms has been limited to the present and the past; neither a future continuous passive nor any perfect continuous passive forms have been developed so far.

Henry Sweet gives a full system of verb forms, including such forms as he has been being seen and he will have been being seen.

He adds the remark: "Some of the longer forms are seldom or never used." From the point of view of modern linguistics this means that Sweet has pointed out structural possibilities which may be developed in the future.

Here are two examples of passive continuous forms used in the 19th century:

We are always being complained of and guarded against (Dickens).

Twelve months ago the effects of the coal strike were still being felt (newspaper).

## **2. The category of Perfect in Middle English**

The mood system developed in MnE mainly towards creating more precise means of expressing modal meanings and, in this connection, towards growth of analytical verb forms.

Thus, in the sphere of the subjunctive, use of the pattern “should/would + infinitive” gradually grew in main clauses of a conditional sentence.

In Shakespeare’s time both the synthetic subjunctive, inherited from OE, and analytical forms were used in such cases.

The synthetic subjunctive in the main clause is found, for example, in the following sentence: but if my father had not. scanted me... yourself, renowned prince, then stood as fair as any comer; a moiety competent was gaged by our king, which had returned to the inheritance of Fortinbras, had he been vanquisher; ‘twere as easy for you to laugh and leap, and say you are merry, because you are not sad.

But Shakespeare also used analytical conditional forms, e. g.: Had I such venture forth, the better part of my affections would be with my hopes abroad; I should be still plucking the grass to know where sits the wind; peering in maps for ports, and piers, and roads, and every object that might make me fear misfortune to my ventures, out of doubt would make me sad.

Syntactical subjunctive forms of the 1st and 3rd were also used to express appeal or wish, as in: sit we down; judge me the world; the worm of conscience still begnaw thy soul.

Sometimes the pattern “let + infinitive” was used with the same meaning: let us once again assail your ears, that are so fortified against our story, what we two nights have seen.

In the 17th century synthetical present subjunctive forms were still sometimes found, as in the following sentence from a comedy by Congreve: I'll tell you, I would have mirth continued this day at any rate; though patience purchase folly, and attention be paid with noise.

In the main clause of a conditional sentence analytical conditional forms gradually superseded the synthetic ones, as in the sentence; Hannibal was a very pretty fellow in these days, it must be granted, but alas, sir, were he alive, now, he would be nothing, nothing in the earth. Occasionally, however, synthetic conditional forms were still found in this function, as in the following examples from a comedy by William Wycherley: To look upon 'em, when I cannot help 'em, were cruelty; no, I must not give him that; so I had been served if I had given him this; sister, we had been gone, if it had not been for you.

Elsewhere analytical conditional forms were used: If I did, nobody would believe me; and if we should meet with Horner, he would be sure to take acquaintance with us.

In Early MnE the verb do was widely used as an auxiliary. Owing to its lexical meaning, which corresponds to the grammatical meaning of any verb as a part of speech, it easily lends itself to auxiliary use.

In the 16th and 17th centuries forms of the present and past are often derived by means of the auxiliary do. Thus, in Shakespeare we can find the following examples of this use in affirmative sentences devoid of any emphatic character: Sometimes from her eye-s I did receive fair speechless messages; if you do meet Horatio and Marcellus, the rivals of my watch, bid them make haste. Such forms are also found in interrogative and negative sentences, e.g. Why do you not perceive the jest? However, forms without do are also used in such sentences; Now, sir! what make you here? but what said Jaques? in sooth I know not why I am so sad; call you this gamut? tut, I like it not.

Thus, in Shakespeare's time the use of the auxiliary do both in affirmative and in interrogative and negative sentences was optional.

In the 17th century there was considerable hesitation in this sphere. Thus, in John Milton's prose works (for instance, in his *Areopagitica*, 1644) do is hardly ever used at all, while in Samuel

Pepys's Diary (1660—1669) it is used very widely, and in John Evelyn's Diary (the diary covers the years 1642—1706) no do is found in affirmative sentences. In John Dryden's works (he lived 1631 — 1700) do in affirmative sentences is not used at all.

In negative sentences the use of do gradually grew during the 17th century. In Shakespeare's works do is found in approximately 30% of all negative sentences, whereas in John Farquhar's works no interrogative or negative sentences without do are ever used.

In philosophic and scientific prose hesitations in this sphere last for a much longer time. Thus, in David Hume's (1711 — 1776) *Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (1748) do is only found in 2% of all negative sentences.

The verb shall has been preserved in MnE mainly as an auxiliary of the future tense. The form should has preserved its meaning of past tense only in the "future in the past"; in all other uses it has acquired a modal meaning instead of a temporal and has become an auxiliary of the conditional mood; besides, it has acquired a meaning close to that of ought. What was said about the form ought applies here too: the change of a past meaning into a present took place here twice. In most cases should no longer is a past tense of the verb shall, but a separate verb.

The ME verb man has disappeared. The verb may (past tense might) has been preserved in MnE. The form might is hardly used as a past tense (except indirect speech). Owing to the modal

meaning of the verb, the form acquired a meaning of present conditional; thus, in this verb, too, the change of a past meaning into present took place twice. The absence of an –s -ending in the 3rd person singular present indicative characterizes the verb as preterite-present.

The ME verb *mot*, *moste*. The form *mote* is still sometimes found in Early MnE as an archaism, thus in Spencer: *as fair as fair mote be*. The form *moste* had sometimes been used in a present meaning in ME already. This use and the concomitant change of the meaning ‘can’ into ‘must’ started from a use of the conditional form: ME *pou moste* ‘you might’ came to mean ‘you must’. In MnE *must* is used as a present tense; only in indirect speech has it the meaning the past. Thus, this verb, too, underwent the change of present into past twice during its history.

### 3. The historical development of the Perfect forms

The Uzbek language is rich in past tense forms and some of them express perfectness of the action too. In order to have more complete impression on the scope of meanings of the past forms we will analyze the meanings, expressed by the past forms of Uzbek.

1. Past definite tense. It is formed by means of adding the ending –ди to the stem of the word. For instance:  
Бордим, келди, бордик, курдик, келдилар, бормадик, курмадингиз and etc.

Отабек Рахматнинг сузини ихлос билан эшитди.

(А. Кодирий)

Бир оздан кейин дахлиз эшиги очилди.

(М. Исмоилий)

Каердандир шу тобда кора этик кийиб ок ятакларни устидан кук кийик боглаб олган йигитлар келиб колишди.

(У. Умарбеков)

2. Historical past tense. This tense form is formed by means of the ending –ган: укиганман, укигансан, билганмиз, олганмиз. For example:

Мени деб дадамлар бир канча этакларни ёдлаганлар.

(У. Умарбеков)

Хабиб бечора куп хам хуноб булгандир.

(У. Назаров)

Совук котгандирсиз?

(У. Назаров)

3. Distant past tense. This tense form is formed by means of adding the auxiliary verb “эмок” to the stem of the ending –ган: борган эдим, курган эдим, айтган эдим, берган эдик. For instance:

У Кудратнинг юзида бир ниманинг ташвиши борлигини курган эди.

(М. Исмоилий)

Хомиднинг халиги сузидан кейин орадаги бахс кесилган эди.

(А. Кодирий)

Мен бу кинони курган эканман.

(М. Исмоилий)

4. Narrative past tense. It is formed by means of ending the verb «эмок» to the stem with –иб: бориб эдим, куриб эдим, айтиб эдик. For example:

Болалар «кайна хумча» деб бакиришиб эди, хумчадан тилла кайнаб чикди.

Нима булиб иноклашиб колдилар, шу сирни билай деб етиб келдим.

5. Reported past tense. Борибсан, курибман, айтибди, олмабмиз:

Юрган йулида хам узига иш топиб юрадиган хотин узига карайди-ю гапира олмайди, ховликиб колибди.

(И. Рахим)

Расиникига кандай килиб етиб келганимизни билмай колибман.

6. Imperfect past tense.

Олар эдим, борар эдик, курар эдинг, билмас эдилар, айтар эди, таркатмас эдингиз:

Атрофимда яшовчи кишиларнинг хаммаси кучманчилик килар эди.

(Жамбул)

If we analyze the historical development of the perfect forms of Uzbek verbs we can see that the Uzbek system of the words had a long and complicated structure:

Айтган эдим – айтгандик

Айтар эдик – айтардик

Among those forms of the imperfect past tense олар эдим is also widely used in old Uzbek of the XIV-XV centuries. One of the endings is –иб эди. This imperfect form was widely used in Uzbek before a month.

In XX and XXI centuries other tense forms began to be used. Now the form –иб эди is used in written form and it is not used in oral speech.

Мирзам! Бу кун ёмон туш куриб, Хожа Бахоуддин хазратларига етти танга атаган эдим. Акчангиз булса шу гадога етти танга инъом этинг. ( the language of the XIII century).

- Хуш нима килиб юрибсан?

- Сизга ош килиб берайми, деб сурагани чиккан эдим.

(The language of the XVIII century)

Абдулла жавоб бермади, лекин у хавас билан Сайёрага тикилиб колган эди.

(The language of the XX century)

Further detailed analysis of the historical development of the analytical forms of the perfective aspect of Uzbek will truly give much material to understand the nature of the functional-semantic relations in the structure of the forms existing in the language in its development.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Бархударов Л.С. Очерки по морфологии английского языка. М. 1976
2. Бархударов Л.К. и Штепин Д.А. Грамматика английского языка. М-1981
3. Блох М.Л. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. М. 1983
4. Большой Англо-Русский словарь. М-1981.
5. Воронцова Г.В. Очерки по грамматике английского языка. М. 1966
6. Гинзбург Р.С. Лексикология английского языка. М-1983
7. Иванова И.П. Погенцов Г.Г. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. М.1973
8. Ильиш Б.А. Строй английского языка. М-1972
9. Каушанская В.Л и др "Грамматика английского языка" М-1973
10. Качалова Е.Б. Грамматика английского языка. М-1996
11. Смирницкий А.И. Морфология английского языка. М.1956
12. Смирницкий А.И. Синтаксис английского языка. М. 1967
13. Хаймович. Б.А. Роговская Б.С. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка, Москва, ВШ. 1966.

14. Хлебникова Б.С. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. М-1981
15. Аскарлова М.А. Узбек тили грамматикаси практикуми. Т.1983
16. Бурунов Д.Б. Инглиз тили грамматикасидан справочник. М-1976
17. Бурунов Ж.Б. Инглиз ва Узбек тилларининг кийсий грамматикаси. Т.1973
18. Бурунов Ж.Б., Хошимов У.Х. Инглиз тили грамматикаси. Т.1975
19. Махмудов Н. Нурматов А. Узбек тилининг назарий грамматикаси. Т.1994
20. Расулов М., Усмонов С. Узбек тили. Т. 1972
21. Узбек тили грамматикаси морфология. Т. 1973
22. Узбек тили грамматикаси. Синтаксис. Т. 1974