European International Journal of Philological Sciences (ISSN: 2751-1715)

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Grammatical Categories of Verbs in German And Their Functional Characteristics

Safina Farida

Trainee lecturer at Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Abstract

The article examines the grammatical categories of the German verb and their functional characteristics in contemporary usage. The German verb is approached as a central organizing element of the clause, combining lexical meaning with a set of grammatical oppositions that encode temporal reference, modality, voice, agreement, and the internal structure of events. Particular attention is paid to the functional distribution of the tense system (Präsens, Präteritum, Perfekt, Plusquamperfekt, Futur I/II), to mood as a grammatical interface between speaker stance and propositional content (Indikativ, Imperativ, Konjunktiv I/II), and to voice alternations (Vorgangspassiv, Zustandspassiv and related constructions) as mechanisms of perspectivization. The analysis demonstrates that grammatical categories in German are not merely paradigmatic forms but pragmatic instruments that structure information flow, encode evidential and evaluative meanings, and support genre-specific conventions. The findings highlight a functional hierarchy: while agreement categories anchor predication to participants, tense and mood contribute most strongly to discourse organization, and voice provides a resource for foregrounding, backgrounding, and institutional styles. The article concludes that the functional potential of German verb categories is best described through their interaction with clause structure, aspectual interpretations, and communicative settings rather than through isolated form inventories.

K E Y W O R D S

German verb, grammatical categories, tense, mood, voice, person and number, Konjunktiv, Perfekt, passive, functional grammar, discourse functions.

INTRODUCTION

The verb occupies a privileged position in German grammar because it combines lexical semantics with morphosyntactic properties that determine clause structure and the communicative interpretation of utterances. In German, finite verb forms integrate agreement features, temporal reference, and mood, while the verb's placement in the clause organizes the syntactic skeleton of the sentence and constrains the distribution of arguments and adjuncts. These properties make the verb the main carrier of grammatical meaning in many communicative situations, especially in written discourse where tense choice, Konjunktiv selection, and passive constructions signal genre, stance, and the relationship between reported information and the speaker's commitment.

Grammatical categories of the verb are traditionally described as systematic oppositions realized by inflectional morphology and periphrastic constructions. Yet the functional dimension of these categories is equally decisive. In actual language use,

the same form may serve multiple discourse purposes, and different forms may converge on a similar interpretation depending on context. For example, the German Präsens can express present time, general truth, scheduled future, narrative vividness, or instruction-like immediacy; the Perfekt may indicate past reference in many registers, but it may also carry relevance-to-now or conversational anchoring; Konjunktiv forms may express quotation, distance, politeness, or counterfactuality. Therefore, a functional description must explain not only what forms exist but also why speakers choose a particular form in a particular setting.

The aim of this article is to provide a coherent account of the central grammatical categories of German verbs and to describe their functional characteristics from a usage-based perspective. The objectives are to identify the core categories and their formal expression, to demonstrate how these categories interact with syntax and discourse, and to clarify the pragmatic motivations behind frequent alternations such as Perfekt versus Präteritum, Konjunktiv I versus Indikativ in reported speech, and active versus passive in informational and institutional styles.

The study is based on descriptive and functional analysis of German verb morphology and syntax as presented in authoritative grammar descriptions and on illustrative examples typical of contemporary standard German. The methodological approach combines structural grammar with functional interpretation. First, the relevant categories are defined in terms of their paradigmatic oppositions and formal realizations, including synthetic inflection and analytic constructions with auxiliaries. Second, functional characteristics are described through semantic and pragmatic parameters, such as temporal anchoring, speaker attitude, evidential distance, and perspectivization. Third, the interaction between categories is discussed with reference to clause structure, especially verb placement, the distribution of finite and non-finite forms, and the relationship between grammatical form and information structure.

The analysis does not attempt to provide a quantitative corpus study; rather, it offers a systematizing account that is compatible with corpus findings widely acknowledged in the literature. The emphasis is placed on categories that are most productive and communicatively salient in present-day German: person and number agreement, tense, mood, voice, and the system of non-finite forms (infinitives and participles) as resources for clause combining and aspectual

interpretation.

German finite verbs mark person and number in agreement with the subject, thereby anchoring the predication to discourse participants and structuring the communicative roles in interaction. Although German is less morphologically rich than some languages, agreement endings in the present tense and in parts of the past system remain a stable resource for subject identification and for the organization of deictic relations. The functional value of person is most visible in the opposition between first and second person, where the verb form contributes to the interpersonal orientation of utterances. In instructions and directives, second-person forms often co-occur with imperative or with modal constructions that soften or strengthen the directive force. In narratives, third-person forms support referential continuity and facilitate topic maintenance.

Number agreement is functionally connected to quantification and distributive interpretations. Plural verb forms signal plurality of subjects, but the pragmatic relevance becomes clear in coordinated subjects, collective nouns, and cases of conceptual versus grammatical number. In institutional registers and scientific writing, the first-person plural often functions as an authorial strategy to create inclusive stance or to represent a research collective, even when a single author is implied. Thus, agreement categories provide more than grammatical consistency; they participate in the construction of speaker roles and the management of interpersonal distance.

The German tense system is traditionally described through six forms: Präsens, Präteritum, Perfekt, Plusquamperfekt, Futur I, and Futur II. A functional analysis, however, shows that tense choice in German often reflects discourse conventions and register differences as much as purely temporal relations.

Präsens is the most versatile tense form. Its basic function is to locate situations in present time, but its functional spectrum extends to generic statements, habitual readings, instructions, and scheduled future reference. In public communication, Präsens is frequently used for planned events because the calendar-like certainty supports a present-tense presentation. In narratives, Präsens can serve as historical present, creating immediacy and vividness by presenting past events as if unfolding now. This usage is especially common in oral storytelling, journalism headlines, and certain literary styles, where present tense supports a dynamic perspective.

Präteritum is the canonical narrative past in written German, particularly in literature, historical exposition, and formal reporting. Its functional strength lies in its compatibility with detached narration and with textual cohesion in continuous narratives. In spoken German and in many informal written contexts, however, Präteritum competes with Perfekt, and the distribution depends on region, register, and verb type. High-frequency verbs such as sein, haben, and modal verbs often appear in Präteritum even in spoken usage, which suggests that functional economy and entrenchment play a role: short, frequent past forms are readily available and stylistically neutral.

Perfekt is widely used as a past reference form in spoken discourse and in many written genres approximating spoken style. Functionally, Perfekt is often associated with relevance to the present, but in modern German it frequently functions as a general past, especially in conversation, interviews, and informal narratives. Its analytic structure with auxiliaries haben or sein and a past participle also supports complex clause combining and facilitates the integration of temporal and aspectual nuances through adverbials and context.

Plusquamperfekt functions as a relative past, marking anteriority with respect to another past reference point. Its main discourse role is to organize narrative time and to signal backgrounded prior events that explain the current narrative situation. It supports temporal layering: events in the Plusquamperfekt often provide reasons, preconditions, or earlier developments, while the main storyline continues in Präteritum or Perfekt.

Futur I and Futur II have distinctive functional profiles. Futur I can express future reference, but in many contexts it competes with Präsens plus temporal adverbials. Its communicative significance often lies in modality rather than time: Futur I may signal assumption, prediction, or intention-like projection, thereby marking epistemic stance. Futur II, though less frequent, expresses future perfect meaning and also serves as a marker of inference about a completed event, especially in contexts of conjecture about the past. The functional lesson is that German "future" forms frequently encode epistemic evaluation and evidential distance rather than purely chronological futurity.

German mood categories include Indikativ, Imperativ, and the two Konjunktiv paradigms. Their functional importance lies in the encoding of speaker commitment, directive force, and reportedness.

Indikativ is the default mood for factual assertions, but its "default" status does not mean neutrality in all contexts. It signals that the speaker presents the proposition without explicit grammatical distancing, which becomes salient when contrasted with Konjunktiv in reporting. Indikativ therefore functions as a marker of unmarked commitment in declarative contexts.

Imperativ realizes directive meaning and is central in instructions, requests, warnings, and procedural texts. Its functional force can be modulated through particles, intonation, and surrounding constructions. In written guidelines, imperative forms often create a direct and efficient style; in interpersonal communication, they may be softened by politeness strategies or replaced by modal constructions, which indicates that directive meaning in German is distributed across grammatical and pragmatic resources.

Konjunktiv I is canonically associated with indirect speech and reporting. Its functional contribution is evidential: it signals that the information is attributed to another source and that the speaker's commitment is mediated. This makes Konjunktiv I a key instrument in journalism, academic summaries, and legal-administrative reporting, where careful attribution is essential. When Konjunktiv I forms coincide with Indikativ forms, speakers often choose periphrastic alternatives or switch to Konjunktiv II or to reporting verbs plus infinitive constructions to maintain the distinction.

Konjunktiv II is associated with irrealis meanings such as counterfactuality, hypothetical reasoning, politeness, and softening. Functionally, it allows speakers to represent alternative worlds, unreal conditions, or socially mitigated requests. In discourse, Konjunktiv II often structures argumentation by separating actual facts from imagined scenarios, and it enables a polite interpersonal stance by reducing the directness of the speaker's demand. The same form may encode both counterfactuality and politeness depending on context, which underlines the pragmatic flexibility of mood.

Voice in German is not limited to an active-passive opposition; it includes multiple constructions that redistribute attention and reorganize argument structure. The core passive system comprises Vorgangspassiv with werden and Zustandspassiv with sein, each with distinct functional characteristics.

Vorgangspassiv presents an event as a process affecting a patient while backgrounding or omitting the agent. Its

functional value is perspectivization: it allows the speaker to focus on results, procedures, and institutional actions without emphasizing who performs them. This makes it highly frequent in scientific writing, technical descriptions, administrative language, and news reports where agents are irrelevant, unknown, or intentionally de-emphasized. It also supports thematic continuity by keeping the patient as topic across sentences.

Zustandspassiv with sein presents a resulting state rather than an ongoing process. Its function is to describe the status of an entity as a consequence of a prior event, often aligning with descriptive or evaluative discourse. The distinction between process and state is crucial for interpretation: while Vorgangspassiv highlights the occurrence, Zustandspassiv highlights the achieved condition.

Beyond canonical passives, German uses alternative constructions for agent defocusing, such as man-constructions, reflexive passives, and nominalizations, each with its own stylistic and functional niche. These strategies show that voice-related meanings extend into a broader functional domain of information management and institutional style.

German makes extensive use of non-finite forms, especially infinitives and participles, to build complex predicates and to combine clauses. The infinitive supports modal constructions, control structures, and purpose clauses; it allows compact expression of intentions, obligations, or plans. Participles enable periphrastic tenses, passive constructions, and attributive modifiers, thereby linking verbal semantics to nominal domains.

The past participle is central in the Perfekt and passive, and its functional contribution depends on the auxiliary choice. The haben/sein alternation is not merely formal; it reflects semantic classifications related to transitivity and change-of-state or motion predicates. The present participle, while less central to tense formation, contributes to adjectival and participial constructions that condense information and create stylistic density in written texts.

The interaction between finite and non-finite forms also shapes information structure. In German clause architecture, the finite verb occupies a prominent position, while non-finite elements accumulate in the right bracket, enabling hierarchical organization of modality, aspectual interpretation, and argument structure. This bracket structure provides

German with a robust mechanism for expressing complex meanings while maintaining syntactic predictability.

A functional description of German verb categories must account for the fact that German speakers routinely select among forms based on discourse type, communicative goals, and conventional genre patterns. The tense system illustrates this clearly: the choice between Perfekt and Präteritum is not reducible to a simple temporal distinction; it reflects register and the speaker's relationship to the narrated events. Perfekt aligns with conversational narration and present relevance, while Präteritum supports detached storytelling and formal narrative flow. Similarly, Futur forms are often driven by epistemic considerations; their usage frequently marks inference, prediction, or subjective assessment rather than mere future time.

Mood categories further demonstrate that grammatical form is tightly connected to social and evidential meaning. Konjunktiv I functions as a grammatical tool of source attribution and institutional caution, while Konjunktiv II provides a flexible means to encode counterfactuality, hypotheticals, and politeness. These functions are not accidental; they reflect communicative needs in German-speaking cultures where textual responsibility, reportedness, and interpersonal mitigation are salient.

Voice constructions provide a third domain where form and function converge. Passive does not simply "change active to passive"; it reorganizes attention and supports thematic continuity. In many institutional settings, passive is a stylistic choice that foregrounds processes, results, and objects while keeping agents in the background. This aligns with scientific and administrative norms that privilege procedures and outcomes over personal agency.

Finally, non-finite forms show how grammatical categories extend beyond paradigms into syntactic architecture. German's verbal bracket structure allows the stacking of modality, temporality, and voice, and it enables dense information packaging. As a result, the functional profile of verb categories is best understood as an interactional network: agreement anchors predication; tense and mood structure discourse and stance; voice manages perspective; non-finite forms provide syntactic flexibility and support aspectual readings.

The grammatical categories of verbs in German form an interconnected system that serves not only morphological

classification but also communicative organization. Person and number agreement anchor statements to discourse participants and contribute to role construction. Tense forms, especially the opposition between Perfekt and Präteritum and the multifunctionality of Präsens, are key instruments for discourse structuring and register differentiation. Mood categories encode speaker stance, reportedness, directive force, and irrealis meanings, making them central to journalism, academic reporting, and interpersonal interaction. Voice constructions, particularly Vorgangspassiv and Zustandspassiv, function as mechanisms of perspectivization and genre-appropriate information management. Non-finite forms support complex predicates and clause integration, reinforcing German's capacity for dense and structured expression. Overall, the functional characteristics of German verb categories emerge most clearly when categories are analyzed as resources for discourse, stance, and perspective rather than as isolated sets of forms.

REFERENCES

1. Duden. Die Grammatik: Unentbehrlich für richtiges Deutsch. 9., vollständig überarb. u. aktualisierte Aufl. Berlin: Dudenverlag, 2016. 1344 S.

2. Helbig G., Buscha J. Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht. Leipzig: Langenscheidt Verlag Enzyklopädie, 2001. 654 S.

3. Eisenberg P. Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik. Band 2: Der Satz. 4., aktualisierte Aufl. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2013. 470 S.

4. Engel U. Deutsche Grammatik. 3., überarb. Aufl. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag, 2004. 896 S.

5. Zifonun G., Hoffmann L., Strecker B. Grammatik der deutschen Sprache. 3 Bde. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997. 2560 S.

6. Hentschel E., Weydt H. Handbuch der deutschen Grammatik. 4., völlig neu bearb. Aufl. Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2013. 576 S.

7. Welke K. Deutsche Syntax funktional: Perspektivierung, Argumentstruktur, Informationsstruktur. Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2019. 448 S.

8. Fabricius-Hansen C. Tempus. In: Hentschel E. (Hrsg.) Deutsche Grammatik. Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2013. S. 273–322.

9. Thieroff R. Das Tempussystem des Deutschen. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1992. 286 S.

10. Leiss E. Der Konjunktiv im Deutschen: Formen und Funktionen. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1992. 268 S.

11. Askedal J. O. Konjunktiv und indirekte Rede im Deutschen: Funktionale Aspekte. Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik, 1998, Bd. 26, H. 2, S. 161–189.

12. Helbig G. Vorgangspassiv und Zustandspassiv im Deutschen: Funktion und Gebrauch. Deutsch als Fremdsprache, 1987, H. 1, S. 3–12.