CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter the writer discusses the main theoretical framework of the study in order to answer the research questions. Some relevant previous studies are also reviewed to give a better picture of the topic of the study.

2.1 Verbs and Verb Phrases

According to Graeme Kennedy in *Structure and Meaning in English* (2003:177), "Verbs typically describe states, actions or events, verbs have sometimes been characterised as 'doing words' or 'words of action' in some grammars. However, because many verb occurrences do not involve action, it is probably better to recognize verbs on the basis of their form."

There are three main classes of verbs: **lexical verbs** (e.g. *think*, *find*, *replace*), **Primary verbs** (*be*, *have*, *do*) and **Modal verbs** (e.g. *will*, *can*, *might*).They have different functions and grammatical characteristics.

The vast majority of the different verbs in English are lexical verbs. Lexical verbs, like other word classes, have a small number of very frequent items and huge numbers of rare items. In a corpus analysis of about 150,000 words of US English texts taken from unrehearsed radio interviews, TV plays and academic writing, Ota (1963) found that 12 lexical verbs accounted for 23.8 per cent of the 17,166 occurrences of verbs in his corpus.

Regular lexical verbs have four forms: stem (or base), stem+s, stem+ed and stem+*ing* (e.g. want, wants, wanted, wanting).

Irregular verbs typically have a different past tense or -ed participle thanregular verbs (e.g. make, made, have made, not make,*maked, *have maked). Because some of these irregular verbs are among the most frequent lexical verbs in English, they can be a major source of errors for second language learners.

There are about 200 irregular lexical verbs in English. Some have a vowel change for the past tense or -ed participle (e.g. feed, fed, fed), or different past tense and -ed participle forms, e.g. rang, rung. About 80 of these 200 irregular verbs are rare and probably not worth teaching, e.g. beseech, smite).

Grabowski and Mindt (1995) analysed the use of the 160 differentirregular verbs which occur in the Brown and LOB corpora. If we include the very frequent primary verbs be, have, do, which are also irregular and which account for 60 per cent of the irregular verb tokens, then the 20 most frequent irregular verbs account for 84 per cent of all irregular verb

tokens in these written corpora. The rank order of the 20 most frequent irregular verbs in the corpora is: *be, have, do, say, make, go, take, come, see, know, get, give, find, think, tell, become, show, leave, feel, put*. It is worth noting that in the two corpora, in addition to the 160 irregular verbs, 4,240 different regular lexical verb types occur (96 per cent of the lexical

verb types). These regular verbs, however, account for only 42 per cent of the verb tokens, while 58 per cent of verb tokens in the corpus come from irregular

verbs. Thus, learning the small number of high frequency irregular verbs is very cost-effective for learners of English. Language change can be observed in the use of some irregular verbs. For example, some native speakers of English say *I rung him, We swum about 500 metres, The boat sunk, She sung it very well,* using the -ed participle form instead of the past tense (*I rang him, We swam about 500 metres*, etc.).

Verbs are one of the most fundamental elements in language vocabulary. In the *Brown Corpus* of 1 million words of written American English, Francis & Kuʒera (1982) state that "verbs make up over 17 per cent of the words in 'informational' (non-fiction) writing, about 22 per cent of the words in texts of 'imaginative writing' (fiction), and over 18 per cent of the words overall." From these statistics, aabout 10 per cent of words in a corpus are typically lexical verbs, about 7 per cent are primary verbs, and about 1.5 per cent is modal verbs.

Verbs can be identified from their basic semantic and structural properties or characteristics. At the general level, Rodney Huddleston (1988) states,

> "Verb is applied to a gramatically distinct word class in a language having the following properties: (a) It contains amongst its most central members the morphologically simplest words denoting actions, processes or events; in predications of these types at least, the word functioning as head of the predicate expression will normally belong to the class we call verb. (b) Members of the class carry inflections of tense, aspect and mood if the language has these as inflectional categories" (1988: 37).

Furthermore, Huddleston (1984:124) states about the most central members of the world-class verbs that have the following two properties, i.e. inflectional and functional:

"(a) Inflection. They are tensed: they have one or other of the inflectional properties 'past tense' and 'present tense'. Thus in *He lived in Sydney* and *He lives in Sydney* the words *lived* and *lives* are prototypical verbs. In the present tense the verb-again prototypically-agrres with the subject as third person singular vs general (i.e. not third person singular): *He lives in Sydney* vs *I/you/we/they live in Sydney*. (b) Functional potential. They function as the ultimate head of the clause (with the EVP and VP as intervening caegories)" (1984:124)

In clauses and sentences, verbs commonly become the head of verb phrases which in turn fill the position of predicates of the clauses or sentences. A verb phrase is structured with a verb as the head and other elements as dependents. According to Huddleston (1984:128), "The verb phrase consist 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 in a verb phrase may be filled by two elements:

(a) **Auxilary verbs,** like the *may* and *have* of this example. Auxilary verbs ar precisely those verbs which do function as dependent in VP structure and are contraster with **main verbs,** which function as head.

(b) *to-infinitive,* as in *to resign* [*now would be a mistake*]. Although it has certain affinities with an inflectional affix, *to* quite clearly satisfies the criteria for separate word status, and is accordingly regarded here as entering into the syntactic structure of the VP, not the morphological structure of the verb.

The present study of "verbs of survival" anayzes those verbs and verb phrases that are found in the novel that show some types of semantic relations with the meaning of the word *survival*. Since *survival* involves actions, it is then

possible to analyze the verbs and verb phrases found in the novel that will show what actions are taken to show the main theme of the novel, that is, survival. Since the study examines the meanings of verbs and verb phrases, the appropriate theoretical framework to do the analysis is lexical field approach. This point is discussed in the following section.

2.2 Lexical Field

Lexical field is an attempt to classify lexemes according to shared and differentiating features. It means that when the words that are used in the same sentence are similar to each other or are somewhat recurring, this means that there are just similar things. Lexical field (also known as semantic field) involves identifying and classifying words from the same area of meaning, for example, the words *sad, mournfully, lament ,tragic, despair* all belong to the (rather broad) field of negative human emotion, feelings produced by loss or defeat (Language Terminology Checklist Article).

Lexical field analysis describes the types of relations that exist among lexical items or words. According to Kreidler (1996:87), Some lexical sets involve part-whole relationships, for example, *arm* includes *hand,* which then include *finger* and *thumb*. On the other hand, the set *second-minute-hour-day* is also a part-whole relationship that is also hierarchical. And some sets are sequential, such as numbers (*one, two, three,* etc.) or cyclical as in months (*January, February,* etc.), days (*Sunday, Monday*, etc.) and seasons (*spring, summer, autumn, winter*).

Lexical field theory generally identified a number of lexical relations, including hyponymy, synonymy, antonymy, and collocation (Kreidler, 1996: 87). Each of the relation types is discussed separately in the following subsections.

2.2.1   Hyponymy

Hyponymy is the relationship between some words to other words, that is, these words are analogues. To support this, Saeed (2003: 68) states, "Hyponymy is a relation of inclusion. A hyponym includes the meaning of a more general word." The more general word is called the *superordinate* and *hypernym*. Much of the vocabulary is linked by such system of inclusion. According to Graeme Kennedy (2003: 69),

> "Many words can be described as being semantically subordinate or superordinate to other words. Thus, *dog* is subordinate to *mammal*, which in turn is subordinate to *animal*, which in turn is subordinate to *creature*. A word that is subordinate to another in this way is called a **hyponym**" (2003:69).

In the above quotation, *dog* is also superordinate to words such as *terrier* or *spaniel*, etc. Another illustration is the word *apple* is a hyponym of *fruit* which in turn is a hyponym of *food*, and so on.

Language learners can get good value from learning superordinate words. These words help them identify the general and specific words and various relations between words. The words *thing* and *stuff*, for example, are extremely useful because most common nouns are hyponyms of them.

2.2.2 Synonymy

Synonyms are two or more words of the same meaning. Synonymy relations means that the words belong to the same part of speech. These words posses one or more identical meaning, interchangeable at least in some contexts without any considerable alteration in denotational meaning, but they may differ in morphemic composition, phonemic shape, shades of meaning, connotation, affective value, style, emotional coloring and valence peculiar to one of the elements in a synonymic group. (*Synonymy In English.pdf*, December, 28, 2013)

Kennedy (2003:68) said that words that show similar meanings are known as **synonyms**. Kennedy further states that there can never be synonyms, because "words never have exactly the same context of use, differing for example in levels of formality" (*Ibid.*). However, he continued that for general language teaching purposes, it is often convenient to recognise approximate similarity of meaning, and to accept, for example, that *enough*, *sufficient* and *adequate* mean roughly the same, as do *say again* and *repeat*, or *pull towards* and *drag*. Also, in translation between languages, loose synonymy between word forms is possible. Another function of synonyms is for avoiding repetition, and thus contributes to cohesion in texts (Kennedy, 2003:68). In the present study, synonymy analysis is used to reveal how the keyword of the main theme of the novel, *survival*, is expressed in various verbs and verb phrases throughout the novel.

2.2.3 Antonymy

If the synonyms are two or more words of the same meaning, the antonyms are opposite in meaning, and when they occur as predicates of the same subject the predications are contradictory. In terminology, antonyms are words which are opposite in meaning. It is useful, however, to identify several different types of relationship under a more general label of opposition such as *wet—dry, late—on time, same—different, more—less, kind—unkind* and *direct—indirect*. Also, antonyms that are generated by prefixes such as *un-*, *in-*, *im-*, *il-*, *ir-* are a rich source of vocabulary in English (Kennedy, 2003: 69).

When discussing antonymy, the principal distinction we have to make is between gradable and non-gradable antonyms. Non-gradable antonyms are antonyms which do not admit a midpoint, such as *male-female* or *pass-fail*. Gradable antonyms, however, like hot-cold or good-bad, seem to be more common than nongradable ones. A gradable pair of antonyms names points on a scale which contains a midpoint: thus, *hot* and *cold* are two points towards different ends of a scale which has a midpoint, lexicalized by adjectives like *tepid*, which is used to refer to the temperature of liquids which are neither hotnor cold, but somewhere in between. A consequence of the fact that gradable antonyms occur on a scale is the fact that they are open to comparison. Thus, we may say that one drink is hotter than another, or that some water is less cold than another (Riemer, 2010:137).

2.2.4 Collocation

Lexical cohesion is also achieved through the selection of vocabulary. According to Kennedy (2003: 322), "Particular words can become associated with or regularly found in the company of certain other words. Cohesion that is achieved through the association of lexical items regularly occurring together is called collocation."

Collocates can be words that belong to the same area of meaning, or words that are frequently used in the same contexts, e.g. *weather forecast*, *full moon*, *heavy rain*. In a *trial*, if the *jury* cannot agree on a *verdict* then we say there is a *hung jury* and the *judge* may order a *retrial*. There has been an increasing tendency for such outcomes in *criminal cases* (Kennedy, 2003: 322).

Collocations are usually described as "sequences of lexical items which habitually co-occur [i.e. occur together]" (Cruse 1986:40). The term collocation was first introduced by Firth, who considered that meaning by collocation is lexical meaning "at the syntagmatic level" (Firth 1957:196). The syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations of lexical items can be schematically represented by two axes: a horizontal and a vertical one. The paradigmatic axis is the vertical axis and comprises sets of words that belong to the same class and can be substituted for one another in a specific grammatical and lexical context. The horizontal axis of language is the syntagmatic axis and refers to a word's ability to combine with other words. The collocation analysis is important in identifying how the main concept is expanded and elaborated by combining the main keyword, *survival*, with other words that are commonly used together with the keyword.