



Finite and non-finite verbs in political news: Israeli and Palestinians issues

Yoshua Hardjoni Gani¹, Beny Alam¹, Winda Lutifyanti¹

¹STIBA JIA, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Background: For centuries, newspapers have delivered news to the reading public informing important events of a day. Specifically, the political news nowadays is more relaxed and popular than other sections, not to mention that it is also presented in an interesting and serious manner.

Purpose: This research aims to classify and determine the verbs whether they are finite or non-finite.

Design and methods: The subjects of the research are political news of “The Jakarta Post” newspaper which have taken and collected from two articles published on Monday, January 27th, 2020 and Tuesday, January 28th, 2020, with the focus on news related to “Donald Trump’s issues between Israeli and Palestinians”. The method used in the research is descriptive qualitative methodology. The main theory of this research are Greenbaum and Nelson (2009), Burton-Roberts (2011), and Lobeck and Denham (2014). The steps in analyzing the data include: (1) collecting the data, (2) categorizing the collected data into their own classifications, (3) analyzing the data, (4) determining the data whether they are finite or non-finite verbs, and finally (5) concluding the data.

Results: The results of the research shows that from the total of two hundred and seventy-two findings, there are one hundred and twenty-eight data of finite verbs (47%) and one hundred and forty-four data of non-finite verbs which then are divided into thirty-one –to infinitives (12%), twenty-six bare infinitives (10%), twenty-three passive participles (8%), thirty –ing participles (11%), twelve passive participle forms of be (4%), nine progressive participle forms of be (3%), and thirteen perfect participle forms of have (5%)..

Keywords: syntax; finite verbs; non-finite verbs; political news; newspaper

Introduction

In forming a sentence, a verb becomes the main focus. Not only becoming main focus, it also has a vital role in English sentences. A verb is the central component of a sentence since it determines the other components in sentences. It defines the relationship among those components as well. The verb can tell us whether certain phrases functions as subjects, objects, or complements. In other words, verbs are very important in every sentence since they provide the explanations of what is done by the subject and show the events or situations. Therefore, the existence of a verb is very important or fundamental in making sentences.

Traditionally, there are two kinds of verb in English and they were divided into lexical and auxiliary. Lexical verbs are the ones that belong to the indefinitely large general vocabulary of the language (e.g. run, eat, seem, explain, recycle, shatter, prepare, depend), and they typically express action, state, or other predicate meaning. The auxiliary by contrast, are a special and very restricted set of verbs. They are used together with a main verb to show the verb’s tense or to form a question or negative and they typically express grammatical meaning. Auxiliary verbs or also called helping verbs, can be distinguished among other auxiliaries including have and be, and the class of modals, such as may, might, can, could, or will.

CONTACT Yoshua Hardjoni Gani ✉ yoshua.harjonigani@gmail.com

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by CV. Mitra Palupi. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Verbs then can be divided again into finite and non-finite. Finite verbs are verbs that have subjects and indicate tenses (present and past), person, and number (singular and plural). In the structure of a clause, finite verbs are functioning as the main verb of a clause since they can stand alone by themselves. In finite clauses, the first or only verb in a clause is finite, and the other verbs (if any) are non-finite.

On the other hand, non-finite verbs are verbs that do not have tenses or subjects that they correspond to. It implies that the non-finite clauses cannot stand alone and occur as the main clauses. In other words, they are always embedded to the main clauses as subordinate clauses since they lack subjects to be attached to. In its form, non-finite verbs are traditionally divided into bare infinitive, to-infinitive, passive participle, and -ing participle.

For instance, an example is given by the writer in order to give a brief insight of this research: Those calls have come from climate scientists, international groups such as the United Nations - and kids and teens.

The above sentence shows two kinds of verb that can be divided into finite and non-finite clauses, they are the auxiliary verb “have” and the verb “come”. The verb “have” in the sentence above is considered as an auxiliary which also described as the “perfect” auxiliary. In the sentence, the auxiliary “have” is positioning as the very first verb in the sentence and showing the tense of present time which refers to an overt and plural subject “those calls”. On the other hand, the verb “come” in the sentence is non-finite because the verb “come” does not determine the time or tenses of the sentence, the verb “come” is only the perfect participle form from the perfect “have” which follows after the lexical verb. Therefore, from the above explanations, it can be concluded that from the above sentence, the auxiliary verb “have” is the finite verb while the verb “come” is the non-finite verb of the sentence.

A kind of literature where we can classify, analyze, and determine whether the verbs are finite or non-finite is newspaper. For centuries, newspapers have delivered news to the reading public informing them of important events of a day. Using newspaper can provide useful source of information, serving as primary source of information about historical and current events. Newspaper also serves a valuable and factual record of the past and information source for the present. According to Prahanan (2017), the survey which was done by Nielsen Indonesia in 2017 informed that there were 4.5 million printed media readers and 83 percent of them are newspaper readers. This survey was made through 11 big cities in the inside and outside Java with the total of 17,000 respondents. Through Nurcahyo (2018), Nielsen Indonesia also added that the main reason why Indonesian people love reading newspaper was because newspapers are more credible and reliable in delivering the news. The previous survey showed that there were many readers which still read and have interests in newspaper.

The newspaper which was chosen and used by the writer in this research is “The Jakarta Post” newspaper. “The Jakarta Post” is an English-language daily newspaper in Indonesia. This daily newspaper is owned by Bina Media Tenggara Company which headquartered in Jakarta. It was first published on April 25, 1983. “The Jakarta Post” is also an English-language Indonesian newspaper that has a circulation of 40,000 copies. “The Jakarta Post” also has an online edition that contains news from newspapers and other news. The target audience of “The Jakarta Post” is foreigners and educated Indonesians as well. According to Pakpahan (2009), “The Jakarta Post” has won a number of awards, one of them was Adam Malik Awards which “The Jakarta Post” received in 2009 from Hassan Wirajuda, The Ministry of Foreign Affairs Indonesia for giving and providing “The Best Foreign Political News”.

Due to its title as “The Best Foreign Political News”, the news’ section of “The Jakarta Post” newspaper which was used by the writer as the main source of data for this research is the section of political news. According to Hair (2018), people love political news. The first reason behind it was because political news is the mean or place for people to express and

assert their political identities and views towards others. Secondly, Indonesian people like anything that related to competition which does exist in political news (i.e. presidential election). Lastly, political news nowadays is more relaxed and popular than other sections, not to mention that it is also presented in an interesting and serious manner.

Therefore, this research is to know the classification of verbs that make them considered as finite and non-finite verbs. Next, this research is to know the amount of finite and non-finite verbs which were appeared on sentences in political news of “The Jakarta Post” newspaper published on Monday, January 27th, 2020 and Tuesday, January 28th, 2020. Last, this research is to know which form of non-finite verbs that mostly existed on sentences in political news of “The Jakarta Post” newspaper published on Monday, January 27th, 2020 and Tuesday, January 28th, 2020.

Method

The method used in the research was qualitative methodology with the content analyzing technique to the kinds or forms finite and non-finite verbs found in political news of “*The Jakarta Post*” newspaper. The data were collected by observing thoroughly of each sentence in political news of “*The Jakarta Post*” newspaper.

The first step was reading the newspaper closely and thoroughly, so that the verbs which are lexical verbs, auxiliary verbs and modals were gained. The data were collected from the sentences in political news of the newspaper. After that, the writer classified the data. This classification was done by splitting the verbs whether the verbs are finite or non-finite. In the non-finite section, the verbs were classified again into *bare infinitive*, *-to infinitive*, *passive participle*, and *-ing participle*. The third step was analyzing the verbs found on sentences in the newspaper. The verbs were classified according to their classifications, positions, and tenses that a verb shows and carries in a sentence by the supports of the theories from several experts which have been chosen and used in this research. At the end, the writer determined the verbs whether the verbs are finite or non-finite. Therefore, the amount of finite and non-finite verbs used in political topic of “*The Jakarta Post*” newspaper can be shown and the main verb with its subordinate verb of a clause can be detected as well.

Finding & Discussion

Finding

According to the data which were analyzed from the political news of “*The Jakarta Post*” newspaper, the writer has found 272 findings of finite and non-finite verbs from 56 sentences existing on two articles of the newspaper. The details and the interpretations of the data were formed and shown on the below table as follows:

Table 1 Findings

Category	Verbs	Frequency	Percentage
Finite Verbs	Finite Verbs	128	47%
Non-finite Verbs	-To Infinitive	31	12%
	Bare Infinitive	26	10%
	Passive Participle	23	8%
	-Ing Participle	30	11%
	Passive Participle Form of <i>be</i>	12	4%
	Progressive Participle Form of <i>be</i>	9	3%
	Perfect Participle Form of <i>have</i>	13	5%
	Total	272	100%

Based on the table 1, it can be seen that there are 128 data of finite verbs and 144 data of non-finite verbs found from political news of “*The Jakarta Post*” newspaper. The data of non-finite verbs themselves are divided into 31 *-to* infinitives, 26 bare infinitives, 23 passive participles, 30 *-ing* participles, 12 passive participle forms of *be*, 9 progressive participle forms of *be*, and 13 perfect participle forms of *have*.

On the other hand, for the percentages, it can be seen that finite verbs have the highest percentage with the total of 47%. It is also followed by *-to* infinitive with 12%, *-ing* participle with 11%, bare infinitive with 10%, passive participle with 8%, perfect participle form of *have* with 5% , passive participle form of *be* with 4%, and progressive participle form of *be* with 3%.

Discussion

In determining verbs whether the verbs are finite or non-finite, the one that is needed to be concerned is *tenses*. Tense is one of the most fundamental aspects to be focused since by spotting it, the verbs whether they are functioning as finite or non-finite can be revealed as well. Etymologically speaking, Brown and Miller (2016) revealed that the word *tense* derived from Latin “*tempus*” which means time (p. 225).

Based on its meaning, Greenbaum and Nelson (2009) said that *tense* is a grammatical category referring to the time of the situation; the tense is indicated by the form of the verb (p. 73). In line with them, Richards and Schmidt (2010) reported that tenses are the relationship between the form of the verb and the time of the action or state it describes (p. 590). Radford (2009) in his book also revealed that tense is finite auxiliary and main verbs in English show a binary (two-way) tense contrast, traditionally said to be between present (Pres/Pr) tense forms and past tense forms (p. 405). Correlating with them, Delahunty and Garvey (2010) also wrote that tense is the set of grammatical categories that languages use to relate the time of the situation denoted by the clause to the time at which the clause is said or written (p. 338). Grammatical categories are represented by elements of the grammar of a language rather than by its words. Therefore, from the above explanations, tenses can be concluded as a form of verb (lexical or auxiliary) which shows the time of an action indicated in a clause and sentence.

In its form, Burton-Roberts (2011) wrote that English has just two tenses, *present* and *past* (p. 114). Richards and Schmidt (2010) in their book also agreed and said that in English, verbs may be in the past or present tense (p. 590). Additionally, Lobeck and Denham (2014) further elaborated that present tense shows up morphologically in English when the verb is affixed with the third person singular inflectional affix *-s* (p. 72).

Furthermore, Greenbaum and Nelson (2009) explained that the two tenses are related to distinctions in time, but they do not correspond precisely to the difference between present and past in the real world (p. 74). Radford (2009) in his book also agreed and stated that present/past tense distinction correlates (to some extent) with time-reference, so that (e.g.) past tense verbs typically describe an event taking place in the past, whereas present-tense verbs typically describe an event taking place in the present (or future) (p. 406).

Finite Clauses

Finite clauses are clauses which contain finite verb phrases as the elements of the verbs. According to Hudson (2010), the term *finite* has the meaning of *limited*, which means that in its usage, finite clauses are limited in the terms of their subject and their tense (p. 257). In addition, Burton-Roberts (2011) also wrote that every sentence must contain a finite verb (p. 112). Having at least a finite verb in a sequence of sentence means that finite verb is very

essential or fundamental in making sentences. Based on its form, Aarts (2001) said that a verb which carries a tense is called *finite verb* (p. 35).

Furthermore, Greenbaum and Nelson (2009) informed that a finite verb phrase is one that carries a contrast in tense between present and past, and may also be marked for person and number (p. 79). Correlating with them, Richards and Schmidt (2010) in their book wrote that finite verb is a form of a verb which is marked to show that it is related to a subject in person and/or number, and which shows tense as well (p. 220). Delahunty and Garvey (2010) also reported that finite clauses are clauses that are marked for either present or past tense (p. 412). Moreover, Radford (2009) in his book said that finite clause is a clause containing a present or past tense auxiliary or verb (p. 6). Therefore, in conclusion, finite clause can be stated as a clause which contains finite verb, that is, a verb referred to the subject (either person or number) which shows tense (present or past) in a sequence of clause.

In the terms of characteristics, Greenbaum and Quirk (1990) said that finite verb phrases can be distinguished into four categories (p. 41). They are as follows:

- a) Finite verb phrases can occur as the verb phrase of independent clause.
- b) Finite verb phrases have tense contrast, the distinction between present and past tenses.
- c) There is a person concord and number concord between the subject of a clause and the finite verb phrase.
- d) Finite verb phrases have mood, which indicates the factual, non-factual, or counterfactual status of the predication.

In the absence of any auxiliary, it is the lexical verb that is tensed (finite) in a sequence of a clause or sentence. Delahunty and Garvey (2010) also mentioned that an easy way to spot a finite clause is to look at its first verb; if it is in the present or past tense, then the clause is finite, otherwise it is non-finite (p. 429). In other words, in a finite clause, the first or only verb is finite, and the other verbs (if any) in a clause are non-finite. In a non-finite verb phrase all the verbs are non-finite.

Non-finite Clauses

In contrast with finite clauses, non-finite clauses are described as clauses with non-finite verb phrases as the elements of the verbs. As previously stated by Hudson (2010), the term *finite* has the meaning of *limited*, as these forms are limited in the terms of their subject and their tense (p. 257). In other words, since the word *finite* means *limited*, therefore, the word *non-finite* can be stated as *infinite* or *limitless*, which is exactly in the opposite of finite terms. Based on the previous theory, it can also mean that in its appearance, they are not related to the subject and tense existing in the sequence of sentence.

Based on its definition, Burton-Roberts (2011) explained that a non-finite clause is a clause in which there is no tensed verb and they are considered as *tenseless clause* (p. 224). In line with him, Richards and Schmidt (2010) wrote that non-finite clause is not marked according to differences in the person or number of the subject, and has no tense (p. 221). Moreover, Delahunty and Garvey (2010) reported that non-finite clause is a clause which is not marked for tense nor includes a modal (p. 319). Correlating with them, Greenbaum and Nelson (2009) also informed that non-finite clauses are generally subordinate clauses and they have a non-finite verb (tenseless) (p. 111).

Therefore, in conclusion, non-finite clause can be stated as a clause which contains non-finite verb, that is, a verb which is tenseless (have no tense) and functioning as subordinate clause since it cannot appear as a main verb of a clause in a sequence of sentence.

Furthermore, Greenbaum and Quirk (1990) said that any phrases in which one of these verb forms is the first or the only verb, is a non-finite verb phrase, and such phrases do not normally occur as the verb phrase of an independent clause (p. 41). Miller (2002) in his book

also shared his thought of non-finite verb phrase and stated that non-finite constructions are limited in their grammar (p. 82). Not only excluding tense and modal verbs such as *can*, *may*, and *must*, they also excluding interrogative and imperative constructions and do not allow prepositional phrase. Those limitation imply that non-finite verb phrases have no tense or mood, and it is impossible for them to occur with the subject of a main clause. In other words, they are always embedded to the main clauses. Therefore, the non-finite clauses are different from the finite clauses because the non-finite clauses always function as subordinate clauses while the finite clauses can occur both in main clauses and subordinate clauses.

Based on the previous statement, it can be inferred that main clauses are always finite clauses, but subordinate clauses can be either finite clauses or non-finite clauses. Therefore, the three types of subordinate clauses; namely *adjective clauses*, *adverbial clauses*, and *noun clauses* can occur either in finite clauses or non-finite clauses.

According to Burton-Roberts (2011), there is in fact more to the difference between finite and non-finite clauses than just the presence vs. absence of tense (p. 224). In addition to lacking tense, *non-finite clauses may lack one or more major overt NPs (Noun Phrases)*. They frequently lack an overt subject. In a finite clause, the finite verb must have an overt subject to agree with. Non-finite verbs are not subject to this constraint. When this is so, it can be considered that the relevant NP is *covert* or in other words, invisible.

We need a short-hand term for this contrast between NPs that are covert because general and nonspecific (a) and those that are covert because understood as identical to a constituent in a higher clause (b) *When a covert NP is understood as identical to an overt element in a higher clause, the higher overt element is said to control the covert NP*. So the subject of the subordinate clause in (2) is controlled by the main clause subject (*Hedda*). By contrast, neither of the covert subjects in (1) has a controller in the main clause. That is why they have such a nonspecific, general interpretation.

Moreover, Greenbaum and Nelson (2009) also mentioned that non-finite clauses can be regarded as *reduced clauses*, reduced in comparison with finite clauses since they often lack a subject (p. 111). For instances: Dressed in street clothes. (V+A); They were dressed in street clothes. (S+V+A). Based on its form, Greenbaum and Nelson (2009) revealed that there are three types of non-finite clauses, depending on the form of the first verb in the verb phrase (p. 111), they are *infinitives*, *passive participles*, and *-ing participles*. Those types are further elaborated as follows.

Infinitives

The most basic form of the verb is called *infinitive*. Based on its etymology, Lobeck and Denham (2014) reported the word *infinitive* comes from the Latin root with the meaning “in perpetuity, without end,” which in terms of verb tense, means “without time.”, that is, the infinitival form of the verb has no inflection at all, and expresses no tense (nor any agreement inflection) (p. 71).

Based on its definition, Richards and Schmidt (2010) defined that infinitives are the base form of a verb (i.e. go, come) (p. 280). In line similarly with the previous experts, Greenbaum and Nelson (2009) wrote that infinitive has the base form, and it can appear after the modals and after the dummy operator *do* (p. 79). Hudson (2010) in his book also mentioned that infinitive is a bare form without suffixes but dependent on some other verb, such as *will*, *or*, and on *to* (p. 271). Correlating with them, Radford (2009) mentioned that infinitives or infinitival form of a verb is the (uninflected) form which is used when the verb is the complement of a modal auxiliary like *can* (i.e. he can *speak* French), or of the infinitive particle *to* (i.e. he is trying *to speak* French) (p. 389).

Moreover, Delahunty and Garvey (2010) also informed that infinitive is a form of a verb without any inflection; the form that one would look up in a dictionary, e.g., *eat*, abbreviated as V, and the same form of a verb when preceded by *to*, e.g., *to eat* (p. 186). Therefore, in conclusion, infinitives can be stated as an uninflected and tenseless form of a verb which can also be used with and without particle *-to*. Furthermore, in its form, Burton-Roberts (2011) said that *infinitives* can be further divided and explained into *bare infinitives*, and *-to infinitives* (p. 225).

Bare Infinitives

In the study, the use of bare infinitive to introduce the non-finite clauses is excluded since it is rarely used in the sentences. It is because in English, as stated by Richards and Schmidt (2010), infinitives usually occur with the infinitive marker *-to* (p. 280). Therefore, in its usage, they are rarely found in a sequence of sentence. But, under certain circumstances, Lobeck and Denham (2014) mentioned that infinitival verbs can show up as single words without particle *-to* called *bare infinitives* (p. 71).

Based on its definition, Burton-Roberts (2011) explained that bare infinitives are just consist of the (untensed) stem of a lexical verb (p. 226). In other words, the lexical verb is not preceded by any auxiliary verb. It is also called 'bare' because it lacks the infinitive particle *-to*. In a bare infinitive, the verb also appears in its *uninflected form*. According to Lobeck and Denham (2014), bare infinitives can show up for several circumstances

Furthermore, bare infinitives also show up in other contexts as well. Lobeck and Denham (2014) further revealed that another circumstance is when certain verbs of perception, like *see, feel, sense, hear, or watch*, are followed by another verb in the next clause, that verb is a bare infinitive (p. 71).

Not only modals and perceptions, Lobeck and Denham (2014) also elaborated that another circumstance is when a verb follows one of several verbs of causation or permission, such as *make, let, or have* (p. 71). As stated by Lobeck and Denham (2014), bare infinitives are sometimes hard to identify because the bare infinitival form of the verb is often indistinguishable from the present tense form of the verb (p. 72).

One way to figure out whether a verb is a bare infinitive or not is to simply remember that as stated by Lobeck and Denham (2014), a modal is always followed by a bare infinitive, no matter how many verbs are in the verb string (p. 72). Another way to tell whether you have a bare infinitive or not is to replace the verb with another verb whose infinitival form is different from its present tense form. For example, the bare infinitival form of *be*. The present tense forms of *be* are completely different (in many English dialects): *is, am, are*. So, if it can be replaced by a verb (such as *remain, grow, appear, or become* in the following example) with *be*, that means that those verbs, like *be*, are bare infinitives.

Another way to tell whether a verb is a bare infinitive or not is to take a look at the subject it occurs with to check for subject-verb agreement. As it can be seen, in the sentence *I saw Leo dance the flamenco*, the bare infinitival form of *dance* is identical to the present tense form of *dance* in *I dance the flamenco*. But consider the following contrast, where the subject is third person singular (*he, she, it, Leo*).

-To Infinitives

Another infinitive is *-to* infinitive. As stated by its name, *-to* infinitive is introduced by particle *-to*. According to Delahunty and Garvey (2010), in a *-to* infinitive, the verb appears in its uninflected form after *to* (which is simply a marker of the infinitive, not a preposition) (p. 431). Burton-Roberts (2011) explained that when the infinitive particle *to* is present, auxiliary possibilities can also make an appearance (p. 226). Furthermore, Burton-Roberts

(2011) also said that the verb following the infinitive particle *to* must have the basic stem form (p. 226).

Passive Participle

According to Richards and Schmidt (2010), participle is a non-finite verb form which functions as an adjective, and is used in passive sentences to form perfect and progressive aspects (p. 422). In its form, Greenbaum and Nelson (2009) mentioned that in English, there are two participles in non-finite clauses, they are the *-ing* participle and the *-ed* participle (p. 263). Generally, the *-ed* participle is used in the passive voice. Therefore, it is also known as passive participle.

Based on its definition, Close (1975) defined that *-ed* participle clause is normally a contraction of a clause in which the verbs is in the passive voice (p. 94). Close (1975) also further elaborated that an *-ed* participle used as an adjective (p. 96). In line with the previous expert, Burton-Roberts (2011) reported that *passive participles* are like bare infinitives in consisting of just a lexical verb, but in the passive participle form with a passive meaning (p. 227). Correlating with them, Radford (2009) said that passive participle used in conjunction with the passive auxiliary *be* (p. 397). Delahunty and Garvey (2010) in their book also informed that *-ed* participle is a type of non-finite clause whose first verb is in its past participle form functioning as modifier, typically in a NP (Noun Phrase) (p. 444). Therefore, in conclusion, *-ed* participle or passive participle can be stated as a non-finite participle formed in its past participle and used in a passive voice.

Furthermore, Radford (2009) revealed that passive participles are generally ended with in *-d* or *-n* (p. 397). Moreover, in determining whether the participle is a passive one, Lobeck and Denham (2014) explained that it is less easy than present participle since it can overlap with past tense form (i.e. saw (past tense) and seen (past participle) (p. 77). Therefore, in differentiating the participles between past tense and past participle, it is needed to be remembered that in the *-ed* participle, the only verbs taking objects in the active can be passive, since passive entails promoting an object to the subject, leaving a gap in object position. Lobeck and Denham (2014) in their book also further stated that past tense always exists as the only verb in the clause (p. 77).

-Ing Participle

Another participle included as non-finite clauses is *-ing* participle. As previously stated by Hudson (2010), in participles, there are only two inflections included in it, they are present participles (i.e. *taking*) and passive participles (i.e. *taken*) (p. 258). Generally, the *-ing* participle is used by adding *-ing* to a verb base.

Based on its definition, Richards and Schmidt (2010) quoted that *-ing* participle is formed by adding *-ing* to a verb base, functioning as an adjective (e.g. a *smiling* girl, a *self-winding* watch), and is used with *be* to form the progressive (e.g. *It is raining*) (p. 422). In line with the previous expert, Greenbaum and Nelson (2009) reported that *-ing* participle always ends in *-ing* (p. 263). Correlating with them, Brown and Miller (2016) explained that *-ing* participle or *free* participle is a type of non-finite clause which contains verbs with the suffix *-ing* and unlike gerunds, they modify whole clauses (p. 131). Delahunty and Garvey (2010) in their book also informed that *-ing* participle is a type of non-finite clause whose first verb is in its V-*ing* (present participle) form and has the function as a modifier, typically in a NP (Noun Phrase) (p. 444). Therefore, in conclusion, *-ing* participle can be stated as a non-finite participle which always ends with *-ing* to its verb base and has the function as modifier in a sequence of a clause.

According to Burton-Roberts (2011), auxiliaries can figure in *-ing* participle clauses as *-ing participles* with *to*-infinitive clauses (p. 228). Instead of the verb being preceded by *to*, it takes the *-ing* affix. Furthermore, Close (1975) wrote that when *-ing* participle is used as an adjective, it usually refers to a characteristic feature of the thing referred to by the noun and not to any specific act (p. 80). Additionally, Burton-Roberts (2011) also explained that progressive *be* cannot precede perfect *have* (p. 229). It means that perfect *have* cannot assume the progressive participle *-ing* form demanded by a preceding progressive auxiliary.

Finite & Non-finite Clauses on Political Newspaper

Below is a data example found in the article.

*First of all, **said** Miller, who **is** now with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Kushner team **wants to** “finally, basically **demonstrate** that they **have** a plan” – and **to do** so ahead of the US presidential election in November, which **could result** in the plan **being** permanently **shelved**. (Fontemaggi, 2020)*

According to its classification, the first word **said** is a finite verb. It is a finite verb because the word **said** above shows and has the tense of past time, or in other words, past tense. Not only that, the word **said** above also refers to an overt subject of “Miller”. The reason why the word **said** refers to the noun “Miller” and not to the phrase “First of all” is because the phrase “First of all” is a reported speech, or direct speech to be more precise, that is a style used to report what a speaker actually said, without introducing any grammatical changes, therefore, it is correct for the word **said** to refer to the noun “Miller” instead of the phrase “First of all”. Moreover, in this finding, it is pretty complicated to determine whether the word **said** is finite or non-finite verb because the word “said” itself is an irregular verb, which means that in its past tense or V2 form and past participle or V3 form, the word “say” has the same form which is “said”. But, since the word **said** previously has an active meaning, therefore the word **said** here is a finite verb which is written in its V2 or past tense form. Since the word **said** carries the notion of past tense, has the form of past tense or V2, and refers to an overt subject, therefore it is correct to categorize it as a finite verb.

On the other hand, the word **is** existing in the sentence mentioned before is also appeared as a finite verb. The word **is** is a finite verb because based on the relative clause “*who is now with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*”, the word **is**, which usually functioning as auxiliary *be*, is positioning as the very first verb in the clause. Positioning as the very first verb means that the word **is** is functioning as the main verb, or in other words, finite verb. Not only that, the word **is** in the clause above is also showing and expressing the tense of present time. It can be stated as present tense because the word **is** is written in its V1 or present tense form. Moreover, the word **is** above is referring to an overt subject of a third person singular “Miller”. Referring to an overt subject means that the word **is** is a finite verb. Since the word **is** carries the notion of present tense, has the function of a main verb, and refers to an overt subject, therefore it is correct to categorize it as a finite verb.

Furthermore, the word **wants** showed in the sentence above is a finite verb as well. It is a finite verb because the word **wants** shows and has the tense of present time, or in other words, present tense. It can also be stated as present tense because the word **wants** is clearly written with suffix *-s* which is attached to its verb base, “want”. A verb being attached to suffix *-s* means that verb agrees with a third person singular or a singular subject of a noun phrase (either person or number). Moreover, the word **wants** above is referring to an overt subject of a singular collective noun “Kushner team”. Referring to an overt subject means that the word **is** is a finite verb. Since the word **wants** carries the notion of present tense,

attached to suffix *-s*, and refers to a third person singular, therefore it is correct to categorize it as a finite verb.

In contrast, the word **to demonstrate** in the sentence mentioned before appeared as a non-finite verb. In this complex sentence, the word **to demonstrate** is a non-finite verb because the word **demonstrate** following after particle *-to* is in its basic stem form and not being attached to any inflection at all. In other words, the particle *-to* existing in the clause above is functioning as an infinitive particle or a *-to* infinitive, not a preposition. Moreover, the word **to demonstrate** does not show or express any tense. The reason behind it is because *-to* infinitive is always tenseless. Not only that, the word **to demonstrate** above also does not refer to any overt subject. Referring to the clause in the sentence above, it can be clearly seen that the word **to demonstrate** is functioning as subordinate verb, not a main verb since it is written in the clause after the word **wants** existed. The word **wants** itself does clearly express tense and refers to an overt subject. Since the word **to demonstrate** is a *-to* infinitive, tenseless, functioning as a subordinate or dependent verb, and not referring to any overt subject, therefore it is correct to categorize it as a non-finite verb.

On the other hand, the word **have** appearing in the sentence above is a finite verb. It is a finite verb because the word **have** shows and has the tense of present time, or in other words, present tense. Not only that, the word **have** above is also referring to an overt subject of third person plural "*they*". The subject "*they*" itself refers to a singular collective noun "*Kushner team*". Referring to an overt subject means that it is a finite verb. Moreover, even though that the word **have** is not written with suffix *-s* attaching to its verb base, which is one of major characteristics of a finite verb, the word **have** is still stated as present tense since it refers to a third person plural. Referring to a third person plural means that the verb has to be in its V1 or basic stem form without any inflections attached to it. Correlating with the theory of Lobeck and Denham (2014), the first and second person singular and plural forms of English present tense verbs have no inflectional morphology at all, though they used to in earlier varieties of English (p. 73). In addition, being written in its V1 or basic stem form does not mean that the word **have** is a bare infinitive because the word **have** above is not written and followed after a modal or causative verb. Since the word **have** carries the notion of present tense, refers to a plural noun, and appears in its V1 or basic stem form, therefore it is correct to categorize it as a finite verb.

In contrast, the word **to do** in the sentence above appeared as a non-finite verb. In this complex sentence, the word **to do** is a non-finite verb because the word **do** following after particle *-to* is in its basic stem form and not being attached to any inflection at all. In other words, the particle *-to* existing in the clause above is functioning as an infinitive particle or a *-to* infinitive, not a preposition. Moreover, the word **to do** does not show or express any tense. The reason behind it is because *-to* infinitive is always tenseless. Not only that, the word **to do** above also does not refer to any overt subject. Referring to the clause in the sentence above, it can be clearly seen that the word **to do** is functioning as subordinate verb, not a main verb since it is written in the clause after the word **have** existed. The word **have** itself does clearly express tense and refers to an overt subject. Since the word **to do** is a *-to* infinitive, tenseless, functioning as a subordinate or dependent verb, and not referring to any overt subject, therefore it is correct to categorize it as a non-finite verb.

Additionally, the word **could** existing in the sentence above appeared as nothing but a finite verb as well. It is a finite verb because the word **could** is a modal. According to its classification, modals are always appearing as a main verb, not a subordinate verb, or in other words, finite verb, as same as the word **could** in the previous sentence. Not only that, the word **could** in the clause above also refers to the previous clause of "*to do so ahead of the US presidential election in November*". Moreover, even though that the word **could**

appeared in its past tense form or V2 of the V1 “can” which can be indicated that the clause is in the past time, it turns out that the word **could** does not literally mean that way. In other words, it really focuses on the context of the clause. So, the word **could** in the clause above does not mean that it is in past time or past tense, but it actually expresses the modality of possibility. Based on the previous sentence, the word **could** means that for Kushner team wanting to “finally, basically demonstrate that they have a plan” ahead at the US presidential election in November has the possibility in resulting that the plan being permanently shelved. Therefore, the word **could** in the clause above is stated as showing present tense which also has a future-time meaning because it expresses the modality of possibility which may happen in the future. Since the word **could** is a modal, has the tense of present time, and functioning as a main verb, therefore it is correct to categorize it as a finite verb.

Furthermore, the word **result** appeared as a non-finite verb. It is a non-finite verb because the word **result** above is appeared after the modal **could** existed, or in other words, a bare infinitive. A word appearing after modals is always a bare infinitive. Not only that, the word **result** itself is a bare infinitive because it appears in its basic stem form without any inflections attached to it. Moreover, the word **result** does not show or express any tense. The reason behind it is because bare infinitive is always tenseless. The word **result** above also does not refer to any overt subject. Based on the clause in the sentence above, it can be clearly seen that the word **result** is functioning as subordinate verb, not a main verb since it is written in the clause after the word **could** existed. The word **could** itself does clearly express tense because it is a modal and refers to an overt subject. Since the word **result** is a bare infinitive, tenseless, functioning as a subordinate or dependent clause, and not referring to any overt subject, therefore it is correct to categorize it as a non-finite verb.

On the other hand, the word **being** in the sentence above appeared as also a non-finite verb. It is a non-finite verb because the word **being** is written with the suffix *-ing* which can be indicated as a *-ing* participle. Not only that, based on the clause “*which could result in the plan being permanently shelved*”, the word **being** is functioning as an adjective which modifies the noun phrase “*the plan*”, not as a verb because it does not show the action of subject. Having modified the noun phrase and functioned as adjective means that the word **being** is a *-ing* participle. Moreover, the word **being** in the clause above is not functioning as a progressive participle form of auxiliary *be* even though that the suffix *-ing* attaching to it because there is no auxiliary *be* existed earlier. In addition, the word **being** also does not show or express any tense. The reason behind it is because *-ing* participle is a type of non-finite clauses which always appears without tense (tenseless) and also because of its function as adjective earlier. Since the word **being** written with the suffix *-ing*, has the function as adjective or modifier, and tenseless therefore it is correct to categorize it as a non-finite verb.

Lastly, the word **shelved** in the sentence above appeared as a non-finite verb. It is a non-finite verb because the clause where the word **shelved** existed has a passive meaning, not an active even though that the word **shelved** is written with the suffix *-ed* which usually indicates the tense of past time or in other words, finite verb. In this finding, it is pretty complicated to determine whether the word **shelved** is finite or non-finite verb because the word “shelve” itself is a regular verb, which means that in its past tense or V2 form and past participle or V3 form, the word “shelve” has the same form which is “shelved” unlike irregular verbs. But, since the word **shelved** above has a passive meaning, therefore the word **shelved** here is a passive participle which is written in its V3 or past participle form. Not only that, the word **shelved** above is functioning as an adjective, not a verb because it does not show the action of subject. Based on the clause “*which could result in the plan being permanently shelved*”, it can be seen that the word **shelved** is just modifying the noun phrase “*the plan*”, and not showing any actions. Moreover, the word **shelved** above also does not

show or express any tense. The reason behind it is because passive participle is a type of non-finite clauses which always appears without tense (tenseless) and also because of its function earlier as adjective. Since the word **shelved** has a passive meaning, written in its V3 or past participle form, has the function as adjective, and tenseless therefore it is correct to categorize it as a non-finite verb.

In conclusion, from the analysis above, it can be concluded that the words **said, is, wants, have, and could** in the sentence above are finite verbs while the words **to demonstrate, to do, result, being, and shelved** are non-finite verbs.

Conclusion

After analyzing finite and non-finite verbs in political news of “*The Jakarta Post*” newspaper, the writer has summarized some conclusions based on the data study as follows. There are various finite and non-finite verbs found in political news of “*The Jakarta Post*” newspaper which were taken and collected from two articles published on Monday, January 27th, 2020 and Tuesday, January 28th, 2020, with the focus on news related to “Donald Trump’s issues between Israeli and Palestinians”, they are 128 data of finite verbs and 144 data of non-finite verbs. The data of non-finite verbs themselves are divided into 31 *-to* infinitives, 26 bare infinitives, 23 passive participles, 30 *-ing* participles, 12 passive participle forms of *be*, 9 progressive participle forms of *be*, and 13 perfect participle forms of *have*. In the same articles of political news found in “*The Jakarta Post*” newspaper, the form of non-finite verbs which mostly exist is *-to* infinitive. From total of 20 data, there are 3 simple sentences, 13 complex sentences, and 4 compound-complex sentences found in the articles.

Reference

- Aarts, B. (2001). *English Syntax and Argumentation* (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave.
- Brown, K. & Miller, J. (2016). *A Critical Account of English Syntax: Grammar, Meaning, Text*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Burton-Roberts, N. (2011). *Analysing Sentence: An Introduction to English Syntax* (3rd ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Creswell, J. W. 2014. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches* (4th ed.). California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Close, R. A. (1975). *A Reference Grammar for Students of English*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Delahunty, G. P., & Garvey, J. J. (2010). *The English Language from Sound to Sense*. Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse.
- Fontemaggi, F. (2020) Trump’s anticipated Middle-East peace plan may be shot on peace. *The Jakarta Post* Vol 37 No 225 accessed January 27th 2020.
- Greenbaum, S., & Nelson, G. (2009). *An Introduction to English Grammar* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Greenbaum, S., & Quirk, R. (1990). *A Student’s Grammar of The English Language*. Harlow: Longman Group Ltd.
- Hair, A. (2018). Mengapa Masyarakat (Masih) Suka Berita Politik?. *Geotimes*. August 6, 2020. <https://geotimes.co.id/kolom/media/mengapa-masyarakat-masih-suka-berita-politik/>
- Hudson, R. (2010). *An Introduction to Word Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press Ltd.
- Lobeck, A., & Denham, K. (2014). *Navigating English Grammar: A Guide to Analyzing Real Language*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Miller, J. (2002). *An Introduction to English Syntax*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Nurchahyo, N. (2018). Survei Nielsen: Pembaca Koran Didominasi Kaum Kerah Putih. *Jogjapolitan*. August 6, 2020. <https://jogjapolitan.harianjogja.com/read/2018/04/10/512/909378/survei-nielsen-pembaca-koran-didominasi-kaum-kerah-putih>
- Pakpahan, D. (2009). The Jakarta Post Raih Adam Malik Award. *Tempo*. August 6, 2020. <https://nasional.tempo.co/read/153958/the-jakarta-post-raih-adam-malik-award/full&view=ok>
- Prahanan, R. 2017. Survei Nielsen: Kini Pembaca Media Cetak 4,5 Juta. *Indopos*. August 6, 2020. <https://indopos.co.id/read/2017/12/06/119180/survei-nielsen-kini-pembaca-media-cetak-45-juta/>
- Radford, A. 2009. *An Introduction to English Sentence Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press Ltd.
- Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. 2010. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.