

Germaniei postbelice, începând cu Habermas și terminând cu toți colegii săi, le este, și va continua să le fie, profund îndatorată.

Inspirându-se din metodele critice aplicate de Marx și Freud, pentru a „elibera indivizii” de sub „jugul” ordinii patriarhale „represive”, structurate în jurul valorilor care întruchipau autoritatea (familia tradițională, religia creștină, patria), neomarxiștii, reprezentanți ai Școlii de la Frankfurt, elaborează un instrument ideologic prin care să poată critica aceste valori, să le reinterpreteze, pentru a le „deconstrui”. Inițial, totul în cel mai democratic ambient cultural. Acest mecanism ideologic, specific celor care, polemic, se numesc „intelectuali” de la Revoluția Franceză încoace, a fost numit foarte sugestiv: *Teoria Critică*. Ca instrument ideal al Revoluției totale, al disoluției tuturor instituțiilor fundamentale ale societății umane, aceasta a fost aplicată și în domeniul lingvistic.

Bibliografie

1. Adorno, W. Theodor, Erziehung nach Auschwitz, in: Erziehung zur Mündigkeit. Suhrkamp Verlag Frankfurt, 1971, p. 90.
2. Dobrescu, Paul, Bârgăoanu, Alina, Corbu, Nicoleta, Istoria comunicării, Editura Comunicare.ro, București, 2007.
3. Tischer, Michael, Veraltet die Halbbildung? Überlegungen beim Versuch, die Theorie der Halbbildung zu aktualisieren, in: Pädagogische Korrespondenz, Heft 6/1990, pp. 5-21.

PERFECT – THE CATEGORY OF TENSE, ASPECT OR OF ORDER?

Tatiana GUZUN, university lecturer

Summary

Articolul este dedicat unei teme gramaticale actuale, cu importanță practică în studierea limbii engleze. Studiul prezintă argumentele savanților lingviști referitor la categoria gramaticală, în care se încadrează formele de perfect ale verbului în limba engleză.

The problem concerning the perfect verbal form has caused ambiguities on a large scale. Linguists offer diverse explanations in order to support one point of view in the detriment of others and this is rather confusing for learners of English as far as the verb sphere is regarded. Therefore, the points of view of different scholars are presented and the most appropriate variant is analyzed, so as to clarify which of the above-mentioned terms are to be used.

The first comprehensively represented grammatical exposition of the perfect verbal form was **the tense view**. M. L. Bloch mentions that ‘by this view the perfect is approached as a peculiar tense form’ [1, p. 166].

The author suggests the names of the foreign followers of this idea. ‘The tense interpretation was also endorsed by the well-known course of English Grammar by M. A. Ganshina and N. M. Vasilevkaya. V. V. Burlakova sustains the same idea regarding the Perfect Form as Tense’ [Ibidem, p. 166].

V. V. Burlakova adds that there are ‘lexical time (Tense) and object time (Time)’ [2, p. 48].

She also sustains that while ‘the object time separates into present, past and future, the lexical time can be expressed in different forms’ [2, p. 48].

In addition to this, she clarifies: ‘In English the three main times can be expressed by different forms of the verb Indefinite (Present, Past, Future), Continuous (Present, Past, Future), Perfect (Present, Past, Future), Perfect Continuous (Present, Past, Future)’ [Ibidem, p. 48].

M. L. Bloch explains the difference between the perfect and non-perfect forms of the verb, according to the tense interpretation of the perfect, which ‘consists in the fact that the perfect denotes a secondary temporal characteristic of the action. Namely, it shows that the denoted action precedes some other action or situation in the present, past, or future. The perfective priority can be clearly

conveyed even in its future translations, extended by the exposition of the corresponding connotations' [1, p. 166-167].

The author considers that 'laying emphasize on the temporal function of the perfect, the *tense view* fails to expose with the necessary distinctness its inspective function, by which the action is shown as successively or *transmissively* connected with a certain time limit. Besides, the purely oppositional nature of the form is not disclosed by this approach either, thus leaving the categorical status of the perfect undefined' [Ibidem, p. 167].

The second grammatical interpretation of the perfect was **the aspect view**: according to this interpretation, the perfect is approached as an aspective form of the verb.

M. L. Bloch admits the great merit of G. N. Vorontsova's explanation of the aspect nature of the perfect, which 'lies in the fact that the resultative meaning ascribed by some scholars to the perfect ... is understood in her conception ... as a particular manifestation of its transmissive functional semantics' [Ibidem, p. 168].

Sidney Greenbaum sustains, referring to the aspect as a category of verb, that 'the aspect of the verb refers primarily to the way that the time of the situation is regarded rather than its location in time. In absolute terms English has two aspects: the perfect aspect and the progressive aspect' [3, p. 253].

He explains that 'aspect is indicated by a combination of an auxiliary and a following verb form. The perfect aspect requires the perfect auxiliary *have* and a following – *ed* participle' [Ibidem, p. 81].

The grammarian shows that the aspect is always combined with tense. 'So, *has left* and *have left* are present perfect (because *has* and *have* are present tense) whereas *had left* is past perfect (because *had* is past)' [Ibidem, p. 253].

M. L. Block clarifies that the aspective interpretation of the Perfect forms has two drawbacks: '...it underestimates its temporal side,...' and the second drawback is that '...it fails to strictly

formulate its oppositional nature, the categorical status of the perfect being left undefined' [1, p. 168].

B. S. Haimovich and B. I. Rogovskaya contradict those who take the perfect for part of the aspect system because '...it is difficult to explain the nature of the *perfect continuous*, where two aspects (*resultative*, *perfective* or *transmissive*, on the one hand, and *continuous* or *imperfective* on the other) seem to have merged into one, which is hardly possible' [4, p. 131].

The third interpretation of the perfect was **the tense-aspect view**. In accord to this interpretation, the perfect is recognized as a form of double temporal aspective character. The tense-aspect interpretation of the perfect was developed in the works of I. P. Ivanova. According to I. P. Ivanova 'a more important factor is that in English there is no Aspect without the meaning of the Tense' [6, p. 62].

The Russian grammarian connects the Tense-Aspect and the forms of Time Correlation. 'Time correlation is indispensable to each Tense-Aspect form, the difference lying in time correlation background. Hence, all the Tense-Aspect forms can be considered as Time Correlation forms' [Ibidem, p. 62].

Other scholars support the same idea are M. C. Murcia and D. L. Freeman which present William Bull's framework about the Tense-Aspect system. 'William Bull sustains the existence of a tense-aspect system, including the Perfect Forms' [7, pp. 162-164].

The fourth idea about the perfect forms is represented within the term **category of time relation**, thought by A. I. Smirnitsky. B. A. Ilyish mentions that 'A. Axiutina proposed to replace his term of *time relation* by that of *correlation*, which has the advantage of eliminating the undesirable term *time*' [5, p. 99].

It was later changed into **category of order**. 'The category of order is a system of two-member opposemes, showing whether the action is viewed as prior to, or irrespective of other actions or situations' [4, p. 130].

‘A. I. Smirnitsky was the first to draw attention to the fact that opposemes like *writes – has written, wrote – had written* or *to write – to have written* represent a grammatical category different from that of tense, though closely allied to it’ [Ibidem, p. 131].

M. L. Bloch mentions: ‘Still, the *time correlation* view is not devoid of certain limitations. First, it somehow underestimates the aspective plane of the categorial semantics of the perfect’ [1, pp. 170-171].

Judging by the above presented arguments, there is tendency of considering that the perfect forms belong to the tense-aspect blend category. Indefinite, Continuous and Perfect show the way the action is viewed by the speaker, which defines the aspect. In the Perfect form, the action is viewed back, as a prior action to another one in present, past or future, just like it is viewed from the moment of speaking when using Continuous forms or as a general, narrative action expressed by Indefinite. Since a tense cannot be used without specifying its aspect, it is clear that the system of tense-aspect is a trustworthy theory. Bull’ Framework suggests that the tenses are to be studied on an axis, so as to clearly present the relation of the tenses to the time, the latter being expressed by three notions: Present, Past and Future. Due to the fact that there would be no sense in saying that the verb is written at present, past or future time, the tense accompanied by its aspect comes to clarify the exact context of the action.

In conclusion, all the ideas of the scholars mentioned above highlight an element of the Perfect forms, describing them from one point of view, leaving other sides undefined. Perfect forms express both the Tense and the Aspect, which already exist as categories. Therefore, the Perfect forms build the Tense-Aspect set. That is why the Perfect forms are considered Tense-Aspect forms.

Bibliography

- 1) Bloch, M. L., *The Theoretical Grammar of English*, Vissaya Skola, Moscow, 1983.
- 2) Burlakova, V. V., *The Theoretical Grammar of English*, A. A. Zhdanova Publishers, Leningrad, 1983.
- 3) Greenbaum, Sidney, *The Oxford English Grammar*, Oxford University Press, Great Britain, 1996.
- 4) Haimovich, B. S., Rogovskaya, B. I., *The Theoretical Grammar of English*, Vissaya Skola, Moscow, 1967.
- 5) Ilyish, B. A., *The Structure of Modern English Language*, Prosvesenie, Leningrad, 1965, 378 p.;
- 6) Ivanova, I. P., Burlakova V. V., Pocheptsov, G. G., *The Theoretical Grammar of English*, Vissaya Skola, Moscow, 1981.
- 7) Murcia, Marianne Celce, Freeman, Diane Larsen, *The Grammar Book. An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course*, Heinle & Heinle Publishers, United States of America, 1999.

PASSIVUMSCHREIBUNG „sein + Adjektiv auf –bar“ ALS KONSTRUKTION

Victor CHISELIOV, dr., conf. univ.

Rezumat

În acest articol, autorul examinează structura sintactică „sein+ Adjektiv auf – bar“, care este de fapt o formă descriptivă a pasivului, tipică limbii germane, din perspectiva gramaticii constructive. Gramatica constructivă, ca o tendință relativ nouă în lingvistică, își propune să descrie fenomenele lingvistice sub formă de construcții. Construcțiile sunt unitățile lingvistice de bază la nivel lexical, sintactic și semantic, reprezintă o unitate de formă și conținut și formează un inventar structurat, numit constructicon. Sarcina cercetătorilor este de a descrie constructiconul, începând cu o descriere a structurilor individuale. Structurile analizate în articol au toate caracteristicile construcției și pot fi identificate ca atare.

Passivumschreibungen als Ersatzformen für das Passiv im Deutschen wurden bereits vielfach zum Untersuchungsgegenstand