2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Huddleston (1985:128) says, “The verb phrase consists of a head element, obligatory except in cases of ellipsis, and optionally one or more dependents. In [He] may have seen [her], for example, we take may and have as dependents. The dependent positions may be filled by.’

According to the quotation above that it can be understood that may and have as the auxiliary verbs are precisely those verbs which function as dependent in verb structure, and are contrasted with main verbs, which function as head. Most verbs belong exclusively to one or other of these sub-classes, but a few, most clearly forms of be, have, and do, belong to both. For examples: He is sleeping. We have an auxiliary use of is or and hence, derivatively, of be, in He is said a main verb use. The precise delimitation of the auxiliary class raises a number of problems.

The rules given to determine the inflectional form of each verb in the verb phrase other than the first. In verb phrase has functioning as head of kernel (and many classes of non-kernel) clauses, the first verb carries one of the tense inflections.

Perrin (1985:305) says, "A verb formed by an auxiliary and an infinitive or post participle is called a phrasal verb: will go, must go, has gone, had gone, should have gone.”

It is very clearly seen that in the tenses which have simple forms (goes, went), we get different shades of meaning by using phrasal forms (went, did, go, was going, etc.) Phrasal verbs are also called periphrastic verbs.
A phrase is a group of two or more grammatically related words without a subject and finite verb that functions as a unit in a clause or sentence. Phrases are conventionally classified in terms of their elements.

Prepositional: in the room, before the war, because of that
Participial: coming into the room, pasted on the wall
Gerund: learning English
Infinitive: to live peacefully, to have seen him

Though the elements in a phrase usually stand together, they need not do so. For example in He puts it off, we have a verb phrase, puts off, interrupted by its object it.

Other word groups that function as syntactical units are also referred to as phrases (have gone, a large house). Other examples:

Prepositions: Because of John we were late.
Adjectives: a heart of gold
    Crossing the street, he nearly was hit by a car.
Adverbs: beyond the town
    in the morning

He did it in the Chinese manner. We use the term “grammar” with a systematic ambiguity. On the one hand, the term refers to the explicit theory constructed by the linguist and proposed as a description of the speaker’s competence. On the other hand, [it refers] to this competence itself.

The sounds and sound patterns, the basic units of meaning, such as words, and the rules to combine them to form new sentences constitute the grammar of a
language. The grammar, then, is what we know; it represents our linguistic competence. To understand the nature of language we must understand the nature of this internalized, unconscious set of rules, which is part of every grammar of every language.

Every human being who speaks a language knows its grammar. When linguists wish to describe a language, they attempt to describe the grammar of the language that exists in the minds of its speakers. There may be some differences among speakers’ knowledge, but there must be shared knowledge, because it is this grammar that makes it possible to communicate through language. To the extent that the linguist’s description is a true model of the speakers’ linguistic capacity, it will be a successful description of the grammar and of the language itself. Such a model is called a descriptive grammar. It does not tell you how you should speak; it describes your basic linguistic knowledge. It explains how it is possible for you to speak and understand, and it tells what you know about the sounds, words, phrases, and sentences of your language.

We have used the word grammar in two ways: the first in reference to the grammar speakers have in their brains; the second as the model or description of this internalized grammar. Almost 2000 years ago the Greek grammarian Dionysius Thrax defined grammar as that which permits us either to speak a language or to speak about a language. From now on we will not differentiate these two meanings, because the linguist’s descriptive grammar is an attempt at a formal statement (or theory) of the speakers’ grammar.
When we say that there is a rule in the grammar—such as “Every sentence has a noun phrase subject and a verb phrase predicate”—we posit the rule in both the “mental” grammar and the model of ii, the linguist’s grammar.

When we say that a sentence is grammatical, we mean that it conforms to the rules of both grammars; conversely, an ungrammatical (starred) sentence deviates in some way from these rules. If, however, we posit a rule for English that does not agree with your intuitions as a speaker, then the grammar we are describing is in some way different from the grammar that represents your linguistic competence; that is, your language is not the one we are describing. No language or variety of a language (called a dialect) is superior to any other in a linguistic sense. Every grammar is equally complex and logical and capable of producing an infinite set of sentences to express any thought. If something can be expressed in one language or one dialect, it can be expressed in any other language or dialect. It might involve different means and different words, but it can be expressed.

No grammar, therefore no language, is either superior or inferior to any other. Languages of technologically undeveloped cultures are not primitive or ill-formed in any way.