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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Role of Linguistics in the Development of the Audiolingual Method of Language Teaching

The harsh necessities of war brought about by the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and by the subsequent declaration of war by the Axis Powers in Europe brought a swift end to the linguistic isolationism of the United States which had prevailed since the early years of the twentieth century. The situation in the teaching of foreign languages in America during this period of isolationism in the 1920's and 1930's has been described in detail by Moulton who offers a three way characterization of the era. He states that few students studied a foreign language at all, and of those who did the overwhelming majority took only a two year sequence. He cites, further, the fact that the study of foreign languages in American high schools was, in general, limited to Latin, Spanish, and French (German was dropped from the curriculums of most

high schools which had previously offered it in 1917). Colleges usually added only German, Greek, and, occasionally, Italian to this list. The third feature he notes is, perhaps, even more interesting—for this is the now widely condemned grammar-translation method of teaching foreign languages, which had as its major, if not sole, objective the teaching of reading ability in the foreign language.

The grammar-translation method, with its primary objective of the teaching of reading ability, was characterized by detailed explanations of grammatical rules by the instructor, and tedious memorization of long lists of vocabulary items with their translational equivalents and of inflectional paradigms by the language learner. Exercise and text materials usually consisted of a short reading selection illustrating the new vocabulary and grammar. These were followed by a set of questions on the reading to be answered in written form. This section was usually followed by the vocabulary list, the explanation of the grammatical principles introduced in the unit accompanied by one or two example sentences. Practice on the material presented in the latter section was provided in the form of exercises of the "fill-in-the-blanks" type, or other
completion type of exercise which could be done only in written form and whose primary objective was the practice of inflectional forms. The culminating activity of the typical unit was the translation section featuring sentences to be translated from English into the foreign language and from the foreign language into English.

The establishment of the grammar-translation method with its basic reading objective on a large scale was due to the prevailing sentiment that the short period of contact with the foreign language that was available to most high school students made such instructional techniques necessary, since it was felt that a minimal reading knowledge was all that could be achieved within the brief span of a two year sequence.²

The entry of the United States into global conflict for the second time brought with it the need for fluent speakers of many different languages. To meet this desperate need, the Army looked to its scientists as it had for the solution to other challenging technical problems, and the linguists offered as their solution the Intensive

Language Program which had been developed in 1941 by the American Council of Learned Societies under the direction of Mortimer Graves. In 1942, Leonard Bloomfield published his *Outline Guide for the Practical Study of Foreign Languages*, and, finally, in 1943 the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) was born. From the beginning provided by the intensive language courses of the ASTP in the war years, the audiolingual texts of the late 1950's and early 1960's for high school students were developed.

The typical audiolingual course and materials claimed as their basis the findings of the linguistic scientists of what is now generally referred to as the structuralist period. In general, these linguists held the belief that language was primarily speech and were only secondarily interested in the writing systems of modern languages. They further held that the structure of language was learned as a set of habits through the constant repetition, correction, and reinforcement one receives as a


child. The attention which the linguists of this period placed on the spoken language formed the basis for the division of language ability into the now classic four skills of understanding (listening comprehension), speaking, reading and writing which were to be taught in the order mentioned. Materials to teach the foreign language were based on an analysis of the contrasts between the mother tongue and the language of study. These analyses consisted of a detailed comparison of the phonemic systems of the two languages to form the basis for teaching the skill of understanding the foreign language. To master the grammar, a contrastive analysis of the "grammatical patterns" of the two languages was made, and points of structural difficulty were presented for overlearning in culturally authentic dialog situations, and drilled in what are known as pattern practice exercises to establish control of the structures of the foreign language by the learner as a set of habits. However, the most striking innovation in the audiolingual method was, perhaps, not its theoretical foundation, but rather, the very practical and useful notion of ample drill on all aspects of the new language and insistence on the

use of the language as a means of oral communication.

The Problem

The current theoretical bases for the construction of materials to teach the syntax of modern foreign languages are the concepts of patterning which is defined by an immediate constituent analysis of a language, and the strict behavioristic psychological theory of language learning as defined by Skinner. The latter asserts that the structure of language is internalized as a set of habits by a process of conditioning of responses to stimuli in the environment. Thus, the current version of language teaching theory is that materials should emphasize structural differences between the native language of the student and the language of study. Such materials are presented orally for overlearning in a format designed to overcome interferences resulting from conflicting native language habits. Such materials consist typically of a basic sentence in which substitutions of lexical items are made within immediate

---


constituent boundaries. Substitutions may or may not entail some kind of a grammatical change within the remainder of the sentence. Furthermore, it is believed that the learner uses a process of analogy to produce new, and often novel utterances based on these overlearned structures. In summary then, the fundamental tenets of modern foreign language teaching are these:

1. Language learning is habit formation produced by conditioning responses to stimuli in the environment.

2. The structure of language is internalized through the overlearning of patterns which are reapplied to new situations by analogy.

3. The points of difficulty for the language learner are those where the patterning of the foreign language is different from that of the native language.

Within the last decade, however, serious objections to all of these points have arisen. As Chomsky has pointed out, an analysis of natural languages based on an immediate constituent analysis fails to meet simplicity criteria for a description of the Indo-European languages.

9 Nelson Brooks, op. cit.

at least. Postal\textsuperscript{11} later demonstrated in a formal proof that such a model of grammar fails completely to generate all possible strings in languages such as Mohawk. He demonstrated further that Mohawk is not an isolated case for human languages, and that the inadequacies of such grammars can, therefore, be generalized to generative grammars of any known language. Thus, the question of how to create an adequate pedagogical grammar based on a clearly inadequate scientific grammar becomes a matter of serious concern.

The fact that immediate constituent grammars are not adequate for a description of natural languages disproves, in addition, the notion that novel utterances are produced solely by a process of analogous creation.\textsuperscript{12} However, Braine attempted\textsuperscript{13} a minor modification of the principle of analogous creation in syntax by claiming that


the grammatical order of words in sentences is learned by a process of generalization from the syntactic environment in which they occur. This, too, was shown to be inadequate since such a formulation cannot account for the fact that certain verbs belong to syntactic classes whose members do not permit the operation of (for example) the passive transformation. Therefore, both the notion that the syntax of human language is composed of patterns, and the notion that new utterances are produced by analogy to those basic patterns cannot be considered as an acceptable theoretical base for the design of teaching materials.

Furthermore, Chomsky has shown that the view that language learning is primarily a process of habit formation in the strict behaviorist sense, which is based on the principle of structural patterning, cannot, in fact, account for the ability of native speakers of a language to understand and produce an unlimited number of novel utterances. The habit formation theory of language learning

---


also fails to account for the fact that children do not imitate adult speech when they are learning their native language, but rather select and innovate to develop both their own phonological system\textsuperscript{17} and their own system of concatenation.\textsuperscript{18} These latter studies lend strong support to Chomsky's claim that language is rule governed behavior demanding a mediation by an innate ability of the human organism to linguistic stimuli in order for language learning to take place.\textsuperscript{19}

Since the theory of interferences between surface structures of a language falls under the same theoretical objections as the above precepts of foreign language teaching, it, too, is open to controversy. Some evidence that the notion of interference fails to give an adequate explanation of the difficulties encountered by the student of


foreign languages was shown by Brown in two small, unpublished pilot studies. It was found that students tend to be unable to recognize ungrammatical sentences in the foreign languages in just those areas where structural grammars are inadequate, and where there may be no great difference in the surface structures of the native and the foreign languages.

Since the main tenets of current foreign language teaching are either inadequate or open to serious question on theoretical grounds, it is hoped that teaching materials which are based on a more adequate description of the foreign language may enable the learner to improve his ability to communicate effectively in the language.

Related Research

Due to the relatively recent date of the discovery of transformational grammars, and to the rapidly changing conceptions of the nature of human language systems in the period following this discovery, very little research on possible applications of the principles of generative grammars in the teaching of modern foreign languages has been

T. Grant Brown, French Writing Test, and Test of Grammatical Intuitions in German Passive Sentences, Columbus, Ohio, 1967 and 1968. (Dittoed.)
published. However, Jacobson reports that an experiment at the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan utilizing a transformational grammar based set of drill materials to teach the use of indirect object pronouns, bearing dative and benefactive relations to the verb, at an elementary level to foreign students of English reduced the time required to learn this distinction by over fifty percent with a corresponding increase in the frequency of correct responses. He presents, however, no information about experimental procedure, control of variables, or attempts to test for significance of differences in achievement. No conclusions regarding the effectiveness of such materials can be drawn from this experiment due to the lack of an adequate experimental design.

Ney reports that an experiment using materials based on a transformational model of English grammar to teach the language to Japanese secondary school students succeeded in reducing the number of malformed English sentences by ninety percent as compared with materials

---


based on a structural grammar. However, since he indicates no attempt to control variables, or to establish a satisfactory experimental design, it is impossible to generalize from this experiment.

The remaining literature on the application of transformational grammars to the design of pedagogical materials for foreign language instruction consists, in so far as it has been possible to determine, of opinions and guidelines for the use of generative grammars in contrastive analysis and in materials preparation.

The use of transformational grammars in the teaching of English in American schools has been investigated somewhat more carefully. Bateman reports that an experiment in the use of a generative grammar of English to teach the structure of the written language to ninth and tenth grade students increased significantly the proportion of well-formed sentences as compared with the sentences of the control group. However, he states that the small size of the sample makes generalization of the results of this experiment beyond the scope of this sample

purely speculative. In a further study of the application of generative grammars to the teaching of the written structures of the native language, Bateman and Zidonis[^24] report that the use of such grammars in teaching ninth and tenth grade students English sentence construction showed a highly significant difference between the experimental and control groups on the gain scores in the production of well-formed sentences, although there was no significant difference between the groups in the complexity of sentences produced.

Since the theoretical import of transformational grammars for the teaching of foreign languages is of large magnitude, which fact is supported by studies in the use of such grammars in instruction in the native language, and since the research into the potential contributions of such grammars in the design of teaching materials has, thus far, been of a rather general nature, it is felt that there is a distinct need for further, detailed investigation of the implications of grammatical theory in second language teaching and learning, and for the development and

implementation in some detail of a pedagogical model based on modern grammatical theory.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are both theoretical and practical. It is felt that the rather large volume of recent research in both linguistics and psychology of language learning should be examined in sufficient detail to determine to what extent they may affect current theories of second language instruction. Furthermore it is felt that there is a need to develop an outline of French grammar based on the theories proposed by Chomsky for English, and the revisions suggested by Fillmore. Such a grammar should specify what information native speakers have in their command regarding membership in syntactic classes for various verbs, what kinds of noun phrases occur as subject or object of verbs or adjectives, and any other relevant information as membership in conjugational class, government of certain prepositions, required presuppositions, etc. Such a grammar should also treat clause

---


relations and embedding in French sentences. In short, there is a need for a grammar of French which incorporates both an analysis of the propositional core of French sentences, and the more widely known models of generative grammars consisting of a system of phrase structure rules containing recursive devices and a system of transformation rules which map the structures generated by the phrase structure component of the grammar into the utterances of the language. Such a grammar should be sufficiently complex to handle the majority of the structures found in the first two levels of an audiolingual French course.

The practical objectives of this study are to suggest a general pedagogical approach for the four skills which is consistent with the advances in linguistics and psychological theory, to suggest a sequence of syntactic topics for the elementary level French course, and to demonstrate how the first two of the objectives may be achieved by offering several sample lesson plans. The lesson plans will include visual aids, question-answer practices, structure drill, directed dialogue and grammatical generalizations designed to permit the learner to induce the syntactic properties of French and to reapply them in novel combinations with spontaneity.
Limitations of the Study

Since the purpose of the grammatical model to be developed in this study is purely illustrative, no attempt will be made to undertake an exhaustive study of French syntax, and the portion of French grammar investigated here, in general, will be restricted to the more interesting syntactic relationships normally taught in the first two levels of an audiolingual high school language program. Similarly, those verbs which will be examined in Chapter Four will, in general, be selected from the very common verbs normally taught in the first two levels of an audiolingual sequence. Similarly, this study will not deal with either the phonological or morphological segments of a generative grammar of French in any significant way, and reference to these components will be made only in the event that their avoidance would be awkward, or would obscure an interesting relationship between syntactic and morphological facts.

Furthermore, since the objective of the sample teaching and drill materials contained in Chapter Six is to demonstrate one instructional approach which can lead the learner of French to draw correct syntactic generalizations and provide him with sufficient, varied practice to
internalize and automatize the grammar, no attempt will be made to furnish a complete set of materials for the syntactic investigations of Chapters Three and Four. Sample materials will be presented only when these differ significantly from current audiolingual practice as defined by Lado.  However, sufficient exercises and examples to demonstrate the point of view to be developed in this study will be presented with a detailed explanation of their use.

Description of the Remaining Chapters

Chapter Two will sketch, in some detail, the significant developments in the theory of syntax from the publications of *Syntactic Structures* to the publication of *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* in 1965. The consequences of the separation of context sensitivity from the phrase structure component of the grammar and the elimination of meaning changing transformations will be discussed relevant to the effects that they have had on the nature of linguistic theory in the period since 1965. Certain limitations of phrase structure rules discovered in this

---

period will be discussed and their importance in the de-
velopment of the view that semantics, rather than syntax,
is generative\textsuperscript{30} will be outlined. The significance of
these developments for behavioristic theories of first
language acquisition will also be discussed, and the sig-
nificant revisions in psycholinguistic thought in the realm
of the child's acquisition of syntax will be discussed in
regard to their relevance for the acquisition of foreign
languages by adults. Finally, the impact of the research
in both linguistic theory and theories of first language
acquisition on developments in applied linguistics will be
reviewed.

Chapter Three will approach certain grammatical no-
tions associated with nouns and the noun phrase in French
from a transformational point of view. In particular, the
relevance of the notion of selectional features of nouns in

\textsuperscript{30}This use of the term generative is somewhat in-
accurate since lexical entries do not generate strings in
the strict sense of the term. The term Generative Semantics
should be understood to mean that a grammar maps se-
mantically described abstract objects into phonetic se-
quences. The main assumption held by proponents of this
view is that there is no separate structural level of the
type Chomsky called deep structure.
French, and the notion of nominal case\textsuperscript{31} will be investigated for the purpose of categorizing the kinds of information that a native speaker of French controls, and that a learner of French as a foreign language must be taught in order to speak the language fluently.

Chapter Four will investigate the French verb phrase, outlining in detail the auxiliary system and taking up the notion of semantic case relations within the predicate. Accordingly, several syntactic classes of French verbs will be examined and the question of surface "pattern" and the more generalizable considerations of semantic (deep) structure will be analyzed. Finally, the notion of presuppositional\textsuperscript{32} content of the lexical entry will be examined.

Chapter Five will review the description of French Syntax and Semantics sketched in Chapters Four and Five and discuss their implications for the teaching of foreign languages. In particular, the broad question of what it means to teach meaning will be discussed. Finally,


specific points of several methods of language teaching will be examined critically in the light of recent developments in linguistic and psycholinguistic theory.

Chapter Six will contain specifications of a general, methodological approach which is in accord with modern linguistic and psychological theories and with the modern pedagogical philosophy of teaching all four skills. In addition, a sequence of syntactic topics will be suggested for a complete first level course. This sequence will be designed to permit rapid development of syntactic generalizations in a manner calculated to permit efficient teaching of significant interrelationships in the grammatical structure of French. Finally, the general approach suggested in this chapter will be illustrated by several sample lessons plans which will be described in detail.
Developments in Syntactic Theory from 1957 to 1965

Prior to 1957, the description of a language by a linguist was, essentially, a strictly empirical process which consisted of three basic steps. The linguist began his analysis by eliciting a rather large number of utterances from native speakers. After he had recorded a sufficiently large corpus, the linguist began painstakingly to catalogue utterance types by subdividing sentences into successive layers of immediate constituents (essentially a form of labeled bracketing of surface structures which Postal¹ has shown to be equivalent to context free phrase structure). Finally, he described the kinds of relationships which exist between immediate constituents.²


The publication in 1957 of *Syntactic Structures*\(^3\) served to change both the philosophy of grammar and the techniques and apparatus of grammatical analysis outlined above. Rather than relying completely on description of a corpus of sentences uttered by a native speaker, Chomsky claimed that the ultimate goal of a grammar of a language should be to provide a theory of that language. That is, the grammar should produce, or generate, all and only the grammatical sentences of the language. Such grammars must meet certain external conditions of adequacy\(^4\) as producing sentences which are acceptable to a native speaker and explaining cases of constructional homonymity, or syntactic ambiguities.\(^5\) In addition to the development of a new philosophy of grammar, Chomsky demonstrated formally the deficiencies of the finite state or Markov process grammars\(^6\) for the description of English. Furthermore, he offered the claim that phrase structure grammar (immediate


\(^4\)Ibid., pp. 49, 50.  

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 86.

\(^6\)The model of grammar which Charles F. Hockett develops in *A Manual of Phonology* (Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics, 1955) is essentially a finite state grammar.
constituent grammar) is not adequate for the task of describing the syntax of English since there are constructions in English which can be, at best, described only clumsily by phrase structure. To overcome the shortcomings of phrase structure, Chomsky introduced a third type of rule called transformation rules.\(^7\)

Operating on an abstract deep structure defined by the phrase structure rules, the transformation rules served to produce the surface structure (after the application of morpho-phonological rules) by rearranging the elements specified by the phrase structure rules. The phrase structure rules of this early period were augmented by the use of context sensitivity and were applied in strict order. However, since the phrase structure contains no recursive devices, all deep structures generated by the phrase structure are those underlying simple or kernel sentences. The transformations operating on these underlying kernels (referred to as singulary transformations) were of two basic types: obligatory and optional. The obligatory

transformations served for affix attachment in the verb phrase, providing for number agreement, etc. The optional transformations served to produce passive sentences from underlying active structures and to introduce meaning changes as is the case with the interrogative and negative transformations. Transformations which operated on two kernel sentences for the purpose of conjoining them into a compound sentence, or for embedding one kernel within another (matrix) sentence were called generalized transformations.

Once the foundations of transformational grammar were well established by *Syntactic Structures*, rapidly progressing research produced numerous, significant revisions in syntactic theory. This attention to the syntax of English pointed up the need for a semantic theory which would be capable of interpreting the structures generated by the grammar. In 1963, Katz and Fodor published the first attempt at the characterization of a semantic theory of

---

English. Taking as a base the syntactic theories of *Syntactic Structures*, their theory utilized three types of information: (1) the semantic content of the lexical entry; (2) the grammatical category described by the phrase structure component (e.g., noun phrase, verb phrase, etc.); and (3) the transformational history of the sentence. The semantic component of a grammar under Katz and Fodor's interpretation makes use of rules of two distinct types to arrive at the meaning represented in the surface structure. The first of these (type one projection rules) utilizes the information given in the lexical entry (word meaning) and, beginning at the bottom of the grammatical tree, utilizes the notion of grammatical category assigned by the phrase structure to sum up the semantic content from node to node until the top of the kernel tree is reached. The type two projection rules utilize the information in the transformational history of the sentence in conjunction with the semantic information of the type one rules to arrive at the semantic reading of the sentence as a whole.

During this same period, the nature of the

---

transformational component of the grammar was much modified, affecting in turn the semantic component. Lees\(^{10}\) pointed out that the negative transformation\(^{11}\) should be reformulated as an obligatory transformation which would be triggered by the presence of an abstract negative morpheme introduced into the base by the phrase structure rules. Similarly, Klima\(^{12}\) found that the question transformation should be made obligatory on the presence of an abstract question morpheme in the deep structure and Katz and Postal\(^{13}\) noted that this should also be the case for the imperative transformation. Katz and Postal further concluded\(^{14}\) that all singulary transformations affecting meaning should be reformulated in similar fashion. In short, the meaning of a sentence was then defined in the phrase structure and the semantic component. Furthermore, the


\(^{11}\) Noam Chomsky, *op. cit.*, 1957.


\(^{14}\) Ibid.
function of type two projection rules as defined by Katz and Fodor\textsuperscript{15} was greatly simplified since they no longer needed to refer to singulary transformations.

The interest given to the nature of singulary, meaning changing transformations served to focus attention on the formulation of generalized transformations as well. Katz and Postal\textsuperscript{16} pointed out that the only function of the generalized transformation was to embed a kernel into a position in a matrix sentence which was already marked by the presence of a dummy symbol. About the same time, Fillmore\textsuperscript{17} found additional evidence that embedding should be viewed as a process of inserting a sentence transform in the place of a dummy symbol which is specified by the phrase structure component. The result of these developments was to permit the reintroduction of the symbol $S$ (in the place of dummy symbols) by the phrase structure rules. This, in turn, permitted the complete elimination of generalized transformations and the type two projection rules needed to interpret them. This led not only to a considerable

\textsuperscript{15}J. Katz and J. Fodor, \textit{op. cit.}, 1964.

\textsuperscript{16}J. J. Katz and P. Postal, \textit{op. cit.}, 1964.

simplification of the theory of language structure, it also permitted all the information necessary for semantic interpretation to be introduced by the base component since the remaining meaning changing transformations had been eliminated.

The rapid changes in the transformational component of a grammar were matched by equally rapid simplifications in the conceptualization of the base component. The phrase structure portion of early transformational grammars was characterized by the use of context sensitivity, linear ordering, and, lastly, its use for the introduction of lexical items. Almost immediately after the publication of the first transformational grammars, it was pointed out that the kind of cross-classifications required by lexical items was beyond the scope of phrase structure.\(^{18}\) Consequently, all rules which introduced lexical items were removed from the phrase structure component. This observation required that the theory of the base be extended to reflect the requirements for lexical cross-classification. Since this requirement (for syntactic information) can be met by a binary feature system and since the semantic

\(^{18}\) N. Chomsky, *op. cit.*, 1966, p. 43.
component in Katz and Fodor's conceptualization consists of a listing of lexical entries each of which is classified by the use of binary semantic features, the lexicon was developed to deal with both problems. As feature notation developed to treat the cross-classification of syntactic information, it was gradually extended in scope to include syntactic restrictions formerly handled by context-sensitivity in the phrase structure. Finally, the elimination of generalized transformations and the consequent inclusion of the recursive element in the phrase structure led to the elimination of linear ordering in the phrase structure (since each new introduction of the symbol $S$ would require reentering the phrase structure component at some higher point in the ordering).

In summary, the model of syntax which had been developed by the publication of *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*\(^1\) was composed of a set of context free phrase structure rules which contained the recursive elements of the grammar. The lexicon contained the relevant syntactic information regarding the insertion of individual lexical items into the structures generated by the base. Finally,

grammatical transformations, which were no longer permitted to change the meaning of underlying structures, changed the abstract deep structures representing the semantic relationships in the utterance to the surface forms of the language.

Developments in Syntactic Theory Since 1965

In the period since the publication of Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, the separation of the lexicon and context sensitivity from the phrase structure rules has served to focus considerable attention on the nature of the lexicon and, indeed, on the very nature of the base component of transformational grammars themselves. In 1966, McCawley found that it was not necessary for the phrase structure rules to apply in order, since there were no apparent effects on the surface by changing the order of the rules as is the case with transformation rules. In 1966, Lakoff found that it was necessary to distinguish between stative adjectives and change of state verbs in the constituent structure rules. He found that there are many cases in

---


English grammar where both the semantic and syntactic components can be simplified if both adjectives and verbs are subsumed under the single lexical category, verb. Necessary grammatical distinctions between the two surface manifestations of this category are marked by the presence or absence of a feature adjectival.

Following shortly after this development, Fillmore demonstrated that the purely relational nature of the notion subject and object lacks the power to express numerous, significant syntactic generalizations. His proposed revision to syntactic theory removes the distinction between the noun phrase and the prepositional phrase in the 'deep structure.' A more far-reaching consequence of this proposal was the fact that the motivation for phrase structure was seriously questioned. In 1967, Lakoff presented additional data concerning change of state verbs in English and adverbial instrumental phrases which raised rather serious questions about the existence of the single level of linguistic description known as deep

---

Lakoff's evidence indicated that a grammar which used phrase structure to define a level of deep structure where lexical insertion was to take place was not capable of treating certain kinds of synonymous relations involving statements of causality and instrumentality in a straightforward fashion.

Utilizing somewhat similar evidence concerning instrumental adverbial phrases in predicates employing change of state and surface contact verbs, Fillmore presented a model of grammar which offered a description of these data more in keeping with the principle of parsimony. Fillmore demonstrated that three separate lexical entries are required for each change of state verb, such as break, and two for each surface contact verb such as hit, if the base component of a transformational grammar is presumed to consist of phrase structure. Such a base component generates strings of category symbols (noun phrase, verb phrase, etc.) which serve to define such functional notions as subject-of-

---

23 George Lakoff, "Instrumental Adverbs and the Concept of Deep Structure," Harvard University, March 1967 (dittoed).

and object-of. Thus, the verb break must be listed three times in the lexicon: once in its intransitive form, once in the transitive form which occurs with animate subject and optional adverbial phrases of instrument, and once in the transitive form with inanimate subjects where instrumental adverbial phrases are not permitted. The model of grammar described by Fillmore in this treatise was a further development of the notions of grammatical case outlined in his 1966 article, and was presented in the form of a general grammatical theory in 1968. In brief, the theory outlined in the work maps semantically described abstract objects consisting of a predicate word and its attendant noun phrases directly into surface structures by means of transformations. This model of grammar eliminates the phrase structure component and, consequently, there is no level of deep structure in the sense defined by Chomsky.

Note that the phrase structure component does not define strings in terms of grammatical function. The grammatical functions subject-of and object-of are, however, related to the categories generated by the constituent structure. Cf. Chomsky, op. cit., 1965, chapter 2.


During the same period, the Lakoffs developed a different characterization of grammar to account for the properties of change of state verbs.\(^{28}\) In essence, the Lakoffs solved the problem of multiple entries in the lexicon for each verb postulating a single, basic entry: for change of state verbs, only the intransitive form is listed. The two transitive forms of verbs of this class are then accounted for by embedding sentences containing the intransitive form under abstract, causative verbs whose subject will become the subject in the eventual surface structure. Transformation rules delete the abstract, causative verb and move the deep structure subject of the change of state verb to the position following the verb where it becomes the surface structure direct object. Other classes of verbs are handled in similar fashion. Although this approach differs markedly from that suggested by Fillmore in that it retains phrase structure and utilizes abstract verbs which are obligatorily deleted, having no surface forms, it nevertheless recognizes the existence of classes of verbs which have certain semantic and syntactic properties in common.

While the main concern of linguistic analysis in the period 1965 to 1968 was directed to the nature of the base component, research indicated that the acceptability of sentences to native speakers depended not only on syntactic well formedness, but also on the beliefs of the speaker about the world. In his 1965 paper dealing with the use of even, Fillmore demonstrated that the appropriate use of this word in one grammatical structure requires that the speaker's beliefs be exactly opposite to those which would be required if he were to use appropriately the same construction without the word even. Somewhat later, Paul and Carol Kiparsky investigated in detail the effect of presuppositions of the truth of a complement on the ways the complement may appear in surface structures. Their investigation of sentence complements demonstrated that it is necessary to distinguish between what a speaker believes to be true, what he asserts to be true, and what he presupposes to be true since


presuppositions of the truth of a complement determine its acceptability with factive predicates.

In the period since 1968, several important changes have been made in the nature of lexical entries. Added to the listing of predicate words with their case relations are notations of the kinds of presuppositions associated with the entry, whether a predicate projects certain information on one of its attendant noun phrases, and other information concerning idiosyncracies of the entry. In short, the lexicalist concept of what it means to know a language may probably be characterized by some general properties of human language, some general statements about English, and knowledge of the ways in which whole classes of verbs behave.

31Langendoen has pointed out that verbs such as drink require that the inanimate noun phrase associated with it be understood as a liquid. That is, in "Did you really drink that stuff?" stuff is required to be understood to be liquid. Cf. D. Terence Langendoen, "On Selection, Projection, Meaning, and Semantic Content," Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, December 1967).

Changing views of the nature of human language have had, as might be expected, a profound influence on the speculations of psychologists on the acquisition of language by children. Chomsky's refutation of structuralist theories of grammatical description for natural language did considerable damage to a theory of language acquisition which depended heavily upon such notions as conditional probabilities of word sequences and substitutability within slots in a frame of immediate constituents. However, perhaps even more important to recent developments in psycholinguistics is the sheer weight of attention which has been given to the study of syntax in particular and language in general. With the development of a precise system of notation in the years following 1957, it has become possible to describe more accurately the structure of human language; and this attention to the precise definition has been carried over, inevitably, into the realm of the description of verbal behavior. Rigid examination of the stimulus-response-reinforcement terminology of the operant conditioning laboratory showed it to be both inadequate and
unrevealing with respect to first language learning. The inadequacies lie in the fact that anything can function as a stimulus to produce an infinite number of totally unpredictable responses which are either self reinforcing or reinforced by any element in the world which is, again, nameable only after the event.

The obvious consequence of the above was the abandonment of theories of language acquisition which depended on strict adherence to behaviorism. In this scheme, the adult utterance or inner drive (hunger, thirst, etc.) functions as the stimulus; the child's attempt at imitation as the response; and the adult expression of approval or the satisfaction of the drive as the reinforcing agency for the shaping of verbal behavior. The speech "habits" thus acquired are then generalized by the child to new situations. This in turn is reinforced by the satisfaction of the need in the new situation which served as the stimulus.

Some notice was made in the literature of child language learning as early as 1941 that children not only


34Roman Jakobson, "Kindersprache, Aphasie und
imitate in the acquisition of the phonological system of the adult language, but also innovate so that the child's speech always has the characteristics of an orderly system even though that system may be markedly different from the adult system. For example, the child may be able to produce the "phonemes" of the adult speech community but distribute them differently in his own speech. However, little attention was paid to such problems in the domain of syntax prior to the discovery of generative grammar. Thus, until the early 1960's, it was generally felt that the child's syntax was essentially the same as the syntax of the adult with the condition that the child's utterances contained only the stressed words of the adult's speech, omitting such unstressed portions as prepositions, articles, auxiliaries and the like. As the child matured and practiced (in the strict sense of that word) language, his utterances became, by a process of successive approximation, more and more like the speech of adults.

A further influence on the development of current theories of child language acquisition is the notion that the capacity to learn language is a biologically determined

ability, and is, therefore, innate in and specific to man. The major difference of this view with that of the behaviorist is that, while the behaviorist would agree that there exist biological differences in man and the lower animals which determine language learning ability, he would insist that these consist only of things like the memory capacity, and the amount of brain tissue given to the control of the human tongue. The position of Lenneberg is that biological determiners of language capacity consist of a cognitive structure such that the child already possesses grammatical distinctions of the kind found in human languages as part of his genetic heritage. Such distinctions have been claimed to exist in the part of speech classifications (i.e., the ability to make distinctions of part of speech is innate, although the English parts of speech do not exist in all or even most languages), in the domain of selectional restrictions, in the kind of transformational


processes a language uses,\textsuperscript{37} and, more generally, in that area referred to as linguistic universals.

One of the early studies to reflect these revisions in linguistic theory was the article by Brown and Bellugi\textsuperscript{38} whose description of the acquisition of syntax in children takes up in some detail the role and importance of imitation in child language learning. They studied two children, a boy and a girl, for a period of thirty-eight weeks. During this period they isolated a considerable corpus of utterances and noted three factors that they felt were important for the production of those utterances, e.g.: (1) imitation with reduction, (2) imitation with expansion, and (3) the induction of latent structure. The first two of these three factors are the classics of stimulus-response-reinforcement theories of child language acquisition. Brown and Bellugi noted that children repeat adult utterances by reducing the number of morphemes, i.e., by making a


so-called telegraphic repetition. They noted, too, that the mother of the two subjects often repeated something the child had said, but expanded it to the full adult form of speech. The third factor is, however, an addition of considerable import to the behavioristic theories of language acquisition. They found that children did not acquire the syntax of their native tongue by the sole process of successive approximation through continued repetition by reduction which gradually improved through parental expansion of the child's utterances, but rather through the perception of structural relationships in the syntax of the adult language which the child internalized and reapplied to his grammar as a whole.

The problem of explaining the manner in which the child learns the structure of his mother tongue had been handled in the theory of the behaviorist school of psychology by the hypothesis that the child acquires habits through the above mentioned process of repetition and successive approximation to the adult model which he generalizes, by a process of analogy, to new utterance types. The discovery by Brown and Bellugi\textsuperscript{39} of the fact that the child

\textsuperscript{39}Ibid.
does, on the contrary, induce structural relationships from the corpus of adult speech he hears stimulated much interest in the psycholinguistic world. One of the products of this interest is the study by Susan Ervin of the role of imitation and induction in the language learning process. In her study of the syntactic structures used by five children, she concludes:

If we can rely at all on this sample of five children, there is an inescapable conclusion. Imitations under the optimal conditions (for operant conditioning, TGB), those of immediate recall, are not grammatically progressive. We cannot look to overt imitation as a source for the rapid progress children make in grammatical skill in these early years (p. 172).

Moreover, she found that the process of the child's acquisition of the variants of the English plural morpheme is impossible to explain by any theory of simple habit formation since the children tended to replace the already learned [-s] and [-z] variants of the plural with the [-iz] form which occurs after sibilants. This overgeneralization of a just-learned rule to forms which have existed (and have been practiced) in the child's speech for many weeks is very hard to explain in any known sense of the

---

word "habit." She found essentially the same sort of process at work with the past tense inflections of English verbs (which is highly analogous to plural formation). That is, "habits" conditioned by weeks of repetition and reinforcement were suddenly replaced by the overgeneralization of a newly acquired rule of grammar.

In the realm of syntax, she found that the child produced many more strings than he could be reasonably expected to if his only language capacity were based on a set of conditioned verbal sequences stored in his memory. Moreover, she found, as had Brown and Bellugi, that many of the utterances the children produced could not be explained away as reductions of adult language.

Many of the children's sentences are such imitations, but some have a word order that cannot be explained by simple imitation. Children talk a great deal. It is improbable that they could produce the great variety of sentences they do produce from memorized strings of words (p. 180).

She found that, when the child was introduced to a nonsense word, he would re-employ it in an appropriate manner. She offers the solution which has been offered by other researchers⁴¹ that this process is the result of the

child's sorting and classifying new lexical items by syntactic class as noun, verb, adjective, etc. Ervin cites further the bedtime monologues reported by Weir\(^{42}\) wherein the child under observation repeated sentences with one word changed in each; i.e., a kind of first language "substitution drill" similar to one of the techniques employed in second language instruction (although the child appears to be practicing "part of speech" or something of the sort rather than "patterns" of grammar that are drilled by substitution in second language classes). Moreover, she found that, in the acquisition of the particle do, the process by which the child learns the syntactic structure cannot be based solely on an analysis of the structure of the adult language in any straightforward fashion. Thus, she postulates that the child's acquisition of his mother tongue is due to a process of "building by analogy of classes and rule . . . (p. 188)," and not to imitation of direct analysis.

The notion of classification of linguistic structure


by the child is reviewed by McNeill,\(^43\) who suggests that the process of language learning by the child can best be described by the child's following a strategy of progressive differentiation which has the peculiar property of being made up of a generic class at each point. McNeill claims that the child's learning of language proceeds as if the child possessed as part of his innate endowment a set of "templates" (i.e., the psychological correlates of linguistic universals) which he uses to analyze the corpus of language he encounters. Thus, McNeill offers a classificatory schema of the ways in which the classes of words which occur in prenominal position are progressively differentiated by the child. He offers as additional justification the hypothesis that such a strategy of successive differentiation based on linguistic universals simplifies the task of acquisition since the child need not make exceedingly fine distinctions in several classes simultaneously, but rather, he can differentiate the class of, say, pre­nominals into articles, demonstrative words, and others (a tripartite distinction). Then, somewhat later, he may

differentiate the remainder into adjectives, possessives, etc. Thus, the eventual learning of a linguistic system can be reduced to a much simpler decision and rule concept, much of which is biologically innate.

In summary, recent research in the child's acquisition of syntax has, in effect, destroyed the earlier, simplistic notions of the formation of verbal habits analogous to the ratbox behavior of lever pushing and the like. Imitation and practice were found to play a much less important role than was formerly thought to be the case, and analysis was found to be highly significant in child language learning. Finally, McNeill postulates a process of classification and differentiation based on universals of language which are innate in the human organism. Thus, the pendulum of psycholinguistic theory has swung from the empiricist position of the first half of the twentieth century toward an enlightened awakening of the rationalism of earlier scientific enquiry.

Effects of Developments in Linguistics and Psychology on Foreign Language Pedagogy

Inevitably, changes in man's views of language and language learning have had, in recent years, a profound influence on second language pedagogy. However, these
effects have been as varied as they have been profound. Many researchers, apparently convinced that the superiority of generative grammars for description would automatically ensure better second language learning, plunged headlong into the type of "experimentation" described in Chapter One. Others, having espoused structural linguistics and behavioral psychology and their implications for language teaching, have refused adamantly to consider any new developments in the theoretical foundations for their teaching methodology, apparently fearing a return to grammar-translation. 44 Between these extremes fall the works of many writers in second language teaching who have chosen either to adopt a wait-and-see attitude, or to investigate in careful detail the effects of changes in allied disciplines on foreign language teaching.

In 1964, one of the earliest mentions of the possible theoretical benefits of generative grammar to language pedagogy, Politzer speculates cautiously that the notions of ordering in transformations could lead to clearer ideas about the order of presentation of

grammatical topics, particularly in programmed teaching materials. In the same year, a book appeared which examined the impact of revised versions of psychological theory and linguistic structure on the theoretical foundations of audiolingual methodology. By its attack on selected aspects of the theoretical foundations of the audiolingual method, Dr. Rivers' book stirred the smoldering disagreement between the traditional and audiolingual schools into the controversy which rages to this date between the so-called cognitivists and proponents of established audiolingual techniques.

The theoretical foundations of the audiolingual method were again attacked in 1966, when Chomsky claimed


47 The term cognitivist was first used, to the best of my knowledge, by John B. Carroll, in his article entitled, "Research in Foreign Language Teaching: The Last Five Years," in Language Teaching: Broader Contexts, Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages; Reports of the Working Committees, R. G. Mead, ed. (New York: MLA Materials Center, 1966). The term was used by Carroll apparently to replace the term traditionalist due to the fact that even in classrooms where considerable emphasis is placed on grammar and translation, it is often the case that much more oral language is used than in the so-called traditional method.
that neither linguistics nor psychology had progressed far enough to be able to provide a basis for a theory of language pedagogy. Others have carried the attack on audio-lingual theory even further; Jakobovits has claimed that the technique of pattern practice is unjustifiable since all three of the theoretical postulates underlying it are untenable. In the place of pattern practice, he suggests that grammatical drill be based upon transformational grammars of the target language and that it consist of performing transforms on underlying structures. Lakoff, however, accepts the usefulness of pattern practice for teaching purely structural concepts. However, she offers evidence for the need for differing kinds of language


50 While the shortcomings in audio-lingual theory that Jakobovits cites are uncontestable, his criticism of pattern practice and his suggestions for pedagogical innovations are often inconsistent and occasionally incorrect. For a detailed critique of his argument, see: T. Grant Brown, "In Defense of Pattern Practice," Language Learning, Vol. XIX, Nos. 3 and 4, December, 1969.

practice for teaching other elements of language structure such as presuppositional content.

Acting in defense of established audiolingual practice, many applied linguists were quick to point out what they felt were pedagogical fallacies. Barrutia reacted in 1966 against taking the more formally described rules of transformational grammars so seriously that they be presented in lieu of devices which would permit the development of new language habits. 52 Albert Valdman offered the opinion that

... a pedagogical grammar will use whatever grammatical theory proves most useful for a specific aspect of the structure of the language. Thus, the transformational item-and-process style would be used to relate the masculine and feminine forms of French adjectives occurring following the head noun. ... But the item-and-arrangement model is more suitable to account for the small set of adjectives preceding head nouns. ... 53


Although the correctness of the application of the term item-and-process with the modifier transformational is highly questionable and although the suitability of any grammatical model to pedagogical application is yet to be demonstrated, the general point of view expressed in this passage has been relatively influential in pedagogical circles and has been included herein for that reason.
A somewhat similar point of view was expressed by Saporta who claims that improvements in pedagogical grammars can come about through improvements either in linguistic description or by improvements in teaching techniques. This is the position which has been refined by other supporters of audiolingual techniques to the point where it has achieved the status of official doctrine within the language teaching profession. In short, the effect of transformational grammar upon this school of language pedagogy has been to loosen the ties between language teaching and the related disciplines of psychology and linguistics.

Perhaps the major consequences of the development of these two conflicting schools has been the rejection of the results of earlier experimental comparisons of audiolingual and traditional classrooms in favor of engaging in experiments to compare cognitive classes and audiolingual classes. Thus, there have been a number of recent


doctoral dissertations comparing such methodological differences at various grade levels. In addition, the results of the Pennsylvania Project have become a central issue in the methodological controversy since its results show no marked superiority for any of the three methods employed. Nevertheless, the impact of this study has been such that the October, 1969 issue of the *Modern Language Journal* has been devoted to a number of articles in critique of the procedures involved in the project.

---


57 Two separate documents are involved in this project; they are:


In conclusion, the rapid and significant changes in linguistic and psychological theory have, in effect, removed much of the "scientific foundation" of the audio-lingual method which was laid by the linguists of the nineteen forties. Furthermore, in removing the bases of structural linguistics and operant conditioning, generative linguistics and cognitive psychology have offered nothing very concrete (except slightly more accurate grammars) to replace their predecessors. The most significant result of the theoretical revision has been the bringing about of a rebirth of the methodological controversy, which remains unresolved, of the nineteen fifties cloaked in somewhat newer terminology. In short, the effects of developments in linguistics on language teaching are, at best, somewhat difficult to pin down except for any additional grammatical generalizations that may be captured. It is to this end that the remainder of this volume is aimed.

CHAPTER THREE: THE FRENCH NOUN PHRASE

Case and Noun Phrases

The status of the noun phrase in the sentence and the general properties of nouns represent two of the more crucial problems in syntactic theory. Until recently, it had been assumed that the notions of subject and object of a sentence were basic in the description of at least the Indo-European languages. This linguistic tradition was carried on in the earlier works in transformational grammar which defined, in effect, these functional notions in the terms of the phrase structure rules of the form:

\[
S \rightarrow NP + VP \\
VP \rightarrow V (NP)
\]

Since, however, there are many other syntactic relations involved in the sentences of natural languages which involve noun phrases, it was necessary to include many additional terms in the rewrite rules to account for them. Such terms included the indirect object, prepositional phrases, and adverbial phrases containing nouns.
Ultimately, research on the syntactic and semantic relations involved in constituents of this kind (as was described in detail in Chapter Two) led to a version of syntactic theory which highly resembled the predicate calculus. That is, verbs, adjectives, and predicate nouns began to be described in the literature as predicates which may make an assertion about the arguments (noun phrases) associated with it.\(^1\) The particular version developed by Fillmore differs in one important respect from the predicate calculus: the arguments bear labels to account for their semantic function in the proposition and to account for the selectional requirements of different classes of verbs.\(^2\) In addition, and as in the predicate calculus, predicates are listed according to the number of noun phrases which must be associated with them to fulfill the requirements of well-formedness. A predicate such as break is a one-place predicate since it occurs in well-formed sentences with only one noun phrase, as in:

1. The window broke.

Hit, however, is a two-place predicate since it must have


\(^2\)Ibid.
at least two noun phrases associated with it. For example:

2. John hit the table.

but not,


In general, the advantages of a grammar of this form lie in the fact that it removes the need to distinguish between the notions of noun phrase, prepositional phrase, and some types of adverbial phrase since these can be accounted for in the labeling of the arguments. Furthermore, as was pointed out in Chapter Two, it removes the need for phrase structure since the functional relations of subject and object were shown to be surface structure phenomena derived by transformation rules which are triggered by the kinds of labeled arguments present in the predicate. In addition, the form of lexical entries is considerably simplified.

Since the labels for arguments that Fillmore suggests are highly important to the discussion of French grammar which follows, they are repeated below:

---

Agent (A), the case of the typically animate perceived instigator of the action identified by the verb.

Instrumental (I), the case of the inanimate force or object causally involved in the action or state identified by the verb.

Dative (D), the case of the animate being affected by the state or action identified by the verb.

Factitive (F), the case of the object or being resulting from the action or state identified by the verb, or understood as a part of the meaning of the verb.

Locative (L), the case which identifies the location or spatial orientation of the state or action identified by the verb.

Objective (O), the semantically most neutral case, the case of anything representable by a noun whose role in the action or state identified by the verb is identified by the semantic interpretation of the verb itself; conceivably the concept should be limited to things which are affected by the action or state identified by the verb. The term is not to be confused with the notion of direct object, nor with the name of the surface case synonymous with accusative.4

The semantic roles of the cases as defined by Fillmore are illustrated in the following French sentences:

4. Jean a coupé le pain avec un couteau.  
(A)  (O)  (I)

5. Le pain a été coupé par Jean.  
(O)  (A)

6. Le sel a abîmé la table.  
(I)  (O)

4Ibid., pp. 24, 25.

8. Jean a été tué.

9. Le poison a tué Jean.

10. Jean est mort.

11. Jean a dit qu'il est malade.

12. Jean a bâti la maison.

13. Marie a créé un objet d'art.

14. Jean a frappé à la porte.

15. Marie a frappé Jean au visage.

The significant points to note in these examples are the fact that selectional requirements and strict subcategorization of the predicates are handled by the type and number of cases, respectively, which are associated with each verb, and that the semantic role of the noun phrase, as defined by its case mark is in no way connected with the notions subject and object. That is, each verb consists of a lexical entry listing the possible cases, and their number.
The choice of subject is defined by a limited number of transformation rules.\(^5\)

Also associated with the labeled arguments (noun phrases) in the deep structure is a case marker. In French, as in English,\(^6\) these case markers consist of a preposition which is generally deleted when a noun phrase becomes the subject or the direct object. From sentence (4), it can be seen that the instrument preposition is avec; from sentence (5), the agent preposition is par. The locative preposition, as in (14) and (15), is typically à, although this preposition may be replaced by dans, etc. to yield additional semantic information. The dative preposition is also à, as in:

\[
(A)\quad (O)\quad (D)
\]

16. Marie donne le livre à Jean.

At least one additional case needs to be added to this list, the benefactive (B) which is typically the animate being

\(^5\)Since the form of the lexical entry and the transformations which produce the subject, object, etc. are more important to the verb phrase than to the noun phrase, they are omitted from this discussion in favor of their presentation in Chapter Four.

who benefits from the action or state identified by the
verb. This case is illustrated in:

17. Henri a fait construire la maison
pour sa femme.

The preposition with this case is pour. The choice of
preposition with the objective and factitive is not so clear
cut. The preposition with the objective, from the few
examples I have found, would appear to be de, as in:

18. Leurs vêtements grouillent de petites
bêtes.

I have found no examples of prepositions with the factitive
in French. Therefore, since the example with the objective
occurs with a rather rare verb, and since no example has
been found for the factitive, the question of the marker is
left open for these cases, and is symbolized as Ø.

Each predicate in a case grammar consists of a
lexical entry which notes the number and types of cases
which must, or may be, associated with it. Each predicate,
or predicate type for verbs and adjectives which share
properties with other verbs or adjectives to form a class,
must also be listed in the lexicon according to whether it
accepts a direct object or a prepositional object. The
verbs assassiner and obéir have the same case choices, i.e.
but differ in that *assassiner* accepts a direct object by deletion of the dative preposition *à*, whereas *obéir* retains the dative marker and, thereby, accepts only a prepositional object.

The process of sentence generation in a case grammar begins with the specification of an abstract, semantic entity which consists of a predicate and its associated noun phrases. Using the verb *assassiner*, and choosing appropriate nouns to fill the case roles, this semantic entity is shown in the following diagram:

Diagram 3.1

[Diagram of a parse tree with the sentence: *assassiner* aux prés par le général à le président]
A subject is then selected. Most verbs in French active voice sentences select the agent as subject if this case is present; exceptions to this general rule are discussed in detail in Chapter Four. The structure in diagram 3.1 is modified as follows:

Diagram 3.2

The agent and dative case markers are then deleted, giving:

Diagram 3.3
An affix attachment rule of the familiar kind then applies, giving the surface form. Sentences containing verbs like *obéir* follow the same derivation, except that these verbs are marked to prohibit the erasure of the *dative* preposition.

**Recursive Processes**

Perhaps the greatest achievement in the early works in transformational grammar was the recognition and demonstration of the fact that the set of possible sentences in any human language is infinite. As was noted in Chapter Two, the first versions of generative grammar utilized so-called generalized transformations to embed kernel sentences under an *NP* node in another kernel sentence. Later research eliminated the need for generalized transformations by permitting the symbol $S$ to be reintroduced by the rewrite for *NP*. This process of recursion is essentially no different in case grammar.

The most elementary form of recursion in case grammar is illustrated by predicates which accept only sentential arguments, as in:

19. Il est certain que Paris est la capitale de la France.

20. Que Lee Oswald était l'assassin est un fait.
Predicates such as être certain and être un fait occur in the frame [__ 0], where 0 consists of S. The deep structure of sentences of this kind has the following form:

Diagram 3.4

pres être certain Paris est la capitale de la France

Notice that the recursive introduction of S can be carried on indefinitely as long as the predicate of the embedded sentence consists of words such as certain, sûr, probable, etc.

Secondly, as in models of grammar which utilize phrase structure rules to generate deep structures, case grammar contains a source of embedded sentences within the NP itself. That is, the rule for NP has the form:

\[ \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{N} \ (S) \]


8 Ibid., p. 49.
This rule is the source for the several types of relative clause structure in the following sentences:

21. Le garçon qui regarde la télé parle français.
22. Le garçon que j'ai vu hier regarde la télé.
23. Le garçon à qui je parle écoute la radio.
24. La fleur dont je parle est rouge.
25. Le fauteuil sur lequel mon père s'assied est confortable.

The deep structures for (21) to (25) are, respectively:

Diagram 3.5
Diagram 3.6

regarder par le garçon voir par je à le garçon & la télé

Diagram 3.7

écouter par le garçon parler par je à le garçon & la radio
Diagram 3.8

Diagram 3.9

être rouge de la fleur parler par je de la fleur

être confortable

Ø le fauteuil s'asseoir par mon père sur le fauteuil
One significant point that needs to be noted with respect to (21) to (25) is that the formation of the relative pronouns follows the transformations which create subjects and objects and delete case markers. If this were not the case, sentence (22) would contain à qui instead of the correct form que since both (22) and (23) contain the dative à + le + garçon. Following the creation of subjects and objects and the deletion of specified case markers, the relative reduction transformations derived by Langacker apply as he states them.9

The constructions ce qui, ce que and ce dont are also examples of this second type of recursion, for example:

26. Je vois ce qui reste sur la table.
27. Il sait ce qui vous gêne.

The structures for (26) and (27) are as follows:

---

Notice that the interpretation of this sentence implies that the O under the topmost S and the O in the embedded S
are both concrete, i.e., consist of a physical object of some sort. This is not true of (27), where the understood subject of the embedded S may be abstract.

Diagram 3.11

What is important to note is that ce qui, ce que and ce dont must refer to inanimate noun phrases in the embedded sentence. The ce is always the direct object of the matrix sentence; qui is the inanimate subject of the embedded sentence; que, the inanimate direct object of the embedded sentence; dont, the inanimate object of the preposition de
in the embedded sentence. Notice that (28) is not accepted:

28. *Je vois ce qui chante dans la rue.

If the subject of the embedded sentence is animate, the following must be used.

29. Je le vois qui chante dans la rue.

30. Je le vois chanter dans la rue.

There are, of course, many variations on these two basic forms of sentence embedding, such verbs which take infinitive clause complements as _aimer_, verbs which take infinitive clause complements with subject-verb inversion as _faire, laisser, voir, entendre_, etc., and verbs which take infinitive clauses preceded by a preposition. However, all of these forms can be described in terms of the two processes outlined above. The important point for the language teacher is that he understand these basic processes and their variations well enough to be able to furnish students with adequate material on which to base grammatical generalizations.

**Negatives, Interrogatives and Noun Phrases**

Both the description and the teaching of the basic negative (ne ... pas) in French sentences have generally
been treated as straightforward in the literature. As far as simple sentence negation (denial of the truth of a proposition) is concerned, this view is perfectly justified. However, there are certain interesting syntactic differences between French and English sentences containing the negative morpheme where negation of the proposition as a whole is not involved. The following English sentences illustrate different semantic interpretations of sentences with the same surface structure (different stress locations are indicated by underlining the point of primary stress where this differs from the stress location in simple sentence negation as in (31) below):

31. John didn't send the package to Mary.
32. John didn't send the package to Mary.
33. John didn't send the package to Mary.
34. John didn't send the package to Mary.
35. John didn't send the package to Mary.

Sentence (31) above (simple sentence negation) is paraphrased by:

36. It is not true that John sent the package to Mary.

Sentence (32), on the other hand, denies only the identity of the agent. Underlying this sentence is the presupposition that someone sent the package to Mary. What is denied
is simply the fact that John is the "someone." Sentences (33) and (34) are similar in that it is the identity of the dative and objective, respectively which are denied. Sentence (33) asserts that John sent the package to someone, but that "someone" is not Mary; (34) asserts that John sent something to Mary, but that "something" was not the package. Sentence (35) differs from (31) in that the stress location and negation amount to a comment on the inappropriateness of the predicate, send. That is, the use of send presupposes that, prior to the action, John was in possession of the package, and, after the completion of the action, Mary is in possession of the package. Furthermore, send presupposes that John does not relinquish possession of the package directly to Mary, but rather to an agent or instrumentality which is responsible for delivery. Thus, in the case where there is no intermediary, and John gives the package directly to Mary, the use of send is inappropriate. This is the case in (35), which might be explained in a conversation as follows:

37. John didn't send the package to Mary; he gave it to her in person.

The interesting point here is that the position of the negative morpheme is the same in (31) to (35) above, and
that the identity of the negated element is signaled by the use of stress.

The structure of French sentences carrying similar semantic interpretations differs from the English structure since French does not permit relocation of the stress from the simple sentence negation. The following French sentences are translations of (31) to (34) above:

38. Jean n'a pas envoyé le paquet à Marie.
39. Ce n'était pas Jean qui a envoyé le paquet à Marie.
40. Ce n'était pas Marie, à qui Jean a envoyé le paquet.
41. Ce n'était pas le paquet, que Jean a envoyé à Marie.\(^{10}\)

Apparently, sentence (35) is not directly translatable into French. Rather, such comments on the appropriateness of a predicate seem to require explanation of the kind in (37) above. Thus, the expression of the semantic facts in (35), requires the full context given in (37), e.g.:

Jean n'a pas envoyé le paquet à Marie; il le lui a donné, lui-même.

A similar contrast between stressed noun phrases in English and relative clause structure in French is found in

\(^{10}\)Note the ambiguity of (41).
interrogative sentences. In English, therefore, the difference in the semantic readings of (42) and (43) lies in

42. Did John send the package to Mary?

43. Did John send the package to Mary?

the fact that (42) asks the hearer for an assertion of truth or falsity of the proposition as a whole, whereas (43) presupposes that someone did, indeed, send the package to Mary, and demands of the hearer only whether John is the agent of the action. As was the case in negative sentences given above, the stress may be placed on any noun phrase in the interrogative sentence; such stress placement presupposes that the action or state identified did take place with respect to the unstressed noun phrases and, therefore, asks the hearer only if the stressed noun phrase has been correctly identified.

The French translational equivalents to English interrogative sentences of the above type are essentially analogous in structure to the French negative sentences discussed earlier in this section. Sentence (42) has as its French translational equivalent the following:

44. Est-ce que Jean a envoyé le paquet à Marie?

Sentence (43), however, may be rendered by either
45. Jean, a-t-il envoyé le paquet à Marie?

46. Est-ce que c'était Jean qui a envoyé le paquet à Marie?

The reduplicated structure of (45) is limited to interrogative structures which question the identity of the subject noun phrase. Thus, (47) which questions the identity of the transferred physical object can only have (48) as its translational equivalent.

(47) Did John send the package to Mary?

(48) Est-ce que c'était le paquet que Jean a envoyé à Marie?

The significance of these observations from a theoretical point of view is that the requirement for relative clause structure in French negative and interrogative sentences similar to (38) through (48) may furnish additional evidence for the derivation of all nouns from an underlying relative clause where the noun is used predicatively.\footnote{Cf. Emmon Bach, "Nouns and Noun Phrases," Universals in Linguistic Theory, ed. by E. Bach and R. T. Harms (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968).}

The pedagogical implications of negative sentences of these kinds are clear if the entire focus of teaching materials is on the form and placement of the negative and interrogatives. Since most text materials ignore sentences
containing noun phrase negation and interrogation, the learner has no sound basis for formulating such sentences when he wishes to produce his own utterances. Therefore, such materials regardless of methodology, tend to force students into applying the stress placement rules of English when they wish to express a "message" of the type illustrated in (38) to (48). This situation may be easily remedied, however, by providing the learner with drills and other activities which provide him with accurate and complete data upon which to base correct generalizations.

**Basic Phrase Structure**

Up to this point, this discussion of the French noun phrase has dealt with rather general properties of the noun phrase within the sentence. However, it is also necessary, for a comprehensive grammar, to discuss the internal structure of the noun phrase. Fortunately, this internal structure has already been worked out in considerable detail by Langacker, who gives the following rules:12

1. NP → DET + N (# S #)
2. DET → { (tout) ART } INDF

---

Most of the symbols in these rules require no further explanation; however, CL, NUM, WHQ, and qq do require definition since they are peculiar to French, thus:

CL represents the particles -ci and -là which are optionally suffixed to nouns preceded by ce. Ci is the surface form of the feature bundle [+ CL, + PROXIMATE]; là is the surface form of the bundle [+ CL, - PROXIMATE].

NUM represents the node from which the set of numerals is expanded. Langacker does not develop this expression beyond this point.

WHQ is the dummy symbol for which the "Wh" formatives are substituted when appended to a noun phrase.

qq represents quelque.

Since these rules, in themselves, are not sufficient to account for several significant surface structures, Langacker gives a number of transformations which take the input from rules 1 to 5 producing many of the structures not directly generated.¹³ Most of these rules and the structures which they produce will be omitted from this discussion since

¹³Langacker, *op. cit.*, Chpt. III.
their inclusion here would involve considerable duplication of arguments already present in the literature.

Nevertheless, there are certain points of Langacker's development of the noun phrase structure which are of sufficient interest for the remaining sections of this discussion to be included here. First, Langacker's rules provide no device for either possessives or the partitive. Second, the above rules provide no device for the generation of the surface form

49. Chaque chat

and so forth. In Langacker's version of French syntax, this form is derived by independently motivated transformations from an underlying structure of the form:

50. Chaque+un+de+ces+chats.

Informally, this derivation is motivated by the fact of the (near) paraphrase relation between (49) and (50). Although this portion of Langacker's grammar does not appear very interesting for the discussion in this chapter, there are certain similarities between the semantic notions member and set (exemplified above), and the partitive and some types of 'possessive' constructions to be discussed in the following section.
Possessives and the Partitive

One of the first problems in French syntax which faces the language learner is the mastery of a rather large number of surface structures which are commonly grouped together under the term possessives. Fillmore lists two basic types of possessive structures from which most of these surface structures can be developed.14 Among those structures which are commonly termed possessives are:

51. J'ai le stylo.
52. C'est mon stylo.
53. Ce stylo est le mien.
54. C'est mon stylo à moi.

It can be shown that the deep structure for all of these examples can be derived from a structure containing a dative and an objective case where the predicate is purely relational and, therefore, lexically empty.15 That is, the structure underlying (51) to (54) has the form:


Diagram 3.12

In (51) the dative is promoted to the subject position, requiring deletion of the case marker. The nominative form of the preposition is chosen, and avoir is inserted to fill the verb position, giving:

Diagram 3.13
The other forms are produced from the base structure by means of an ordered series of transformations, including transformations developed independently for relative clauses and adjective placement. Since Langacker has developed these transformations in considerable detail,\textsuperscript{16} they are omitted from this discussion.

The second type of possession mentioned above is found in expressions containing reference to body parts. In general, these forms are derived from a common deep structural relation produced by the rule:

\[ \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{N (D)} \]

Nouns referring to body parts (and certain other essentially relational terms) are marked in the lexicon as obligatorily taking a dative complement.\textsuperscript{17}

Thus, the sentence:

55. Marie se lave les mains.

has the deep structure:

\[ \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{N (D)} \]

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid.

The **dative** NP under the **objective** is then raised from the **objective** to the predicate (after the creation of the subject), and the **dative** case marker is deleted to form a direct object, giving:

**Diagram 3.15**
The second occurrence of Marie is then pronominalized as the reflexive direct object, and moved to its surface position in front of the verb. Other surface structures containing inalienably possessed noun phrases, as:

56. Il a les cheveux roux.
57. Elle est bien faite des jambes.
can also be derived from this type of deep structural relationship.\(^\text{18}\)

There are, however, certain other constructions in French which are commonly termed possessives, which the rules discussed above do not seem to cover. Among these are the examples which follow:

58. Ma promenade était intéressante.
59. On attend la fin de la guerre.
60. Le toit de la maison est vert.
61. La surface de la table est bien dommageée.

Sentences (58) and (59) do not seem to be derivable from the rules given above. However, both fin and promenade are nouns of the type called cognate objects (dummy factitives) by Fillmore.\(^\text{19}\) Under this interpretation, (59) would have a deep structure of the form:

\(^{18}\)Langacker, op. cit., 1967.

\(^{19}\)Fillmore, op. cit., pp. 85, 86.
Diagram 3.16

The noun representative of finir, fin, is then copied under the F, and the verb is replaced by the proverb, avoir, giving:

Diagram 3.17
Transformations of the form already discussed would then produce the surface structure shown in (59). Similar devices would generate (58) from a deep structure containing a dummy factitive.

Sentences of the form (60) and (61), however, may not be produced from this type of deep structure. Langacker has suggested that possessives of the type shown in (60) and (61) have many similarities to the inalienable possession of animate noun phrases. While this is true in so far as the notion "part of a whole" is concerned, it is nevertheless somewhat inconsistent with the theoretical dichotomy between animate and inanimate nouns in case grammar. Furthermore, sentences like

62. La moitié du riz reste sur son assiette.

exhibit the same surface structural relationship and the same "part of whole" notion, as do (49) and (50) from the preceding section. In general, the so-called partitive sentences with adverbs of quantity as peu, beaucoup, plusieurs, etc. exhibit this same structure. Notice that the following sentences differ in that (63) refers to the universal set of bread, while (64) refers to a specific,

---

non-universal quantity of bread which is assumed by the speaker to be recognized by his audience.

62. Henri a mangé un peu de pain.
63. Henri a mangé un peu du pain.

That this is true, can be shown by the fact that the relative clause, qui était sur la table, may be added to (63), but not to (62).

64. *Henri a mangé un peu de pain qui était sur la table.
65. Henri a mangé un peu du pain qui était sur la table.

Similarly, it is not unreasonable to propose that the partitive without an adverb of quantity might also be derived from the same structural relation since (66) is a paraphrase of (62) without the specification of quantity involved.


Although the data and arguments given here are not sufficient to furnish a proof of the relationship of partitive structures with the so-called possessives of (60) and (61), they are, nevertheless, highly suggestive on an intuitive level. Furthermore, the similarities of the surface structures involved would suggest that the transformations which produce (60) and (61) should also produce (62) to (66).
provided that an abstract "quantity" symbol be postulated in the deep structure for sentences like (66). Therefore, the following rule is proposed for structures of the type discussed above in (49), (50), and (60) to (66), pending verification by further, more detailed research:

\[ \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{N (LOC)} \]

Notice that this rule satisfies the suggestion by Langacker that possessives of the form found in (60) and (61) seem to bear structural similarities to inalienable possession by animates which are derived from the rule:

\[ \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{N (Dat)} \]

Furthermore, (49) and (50) are, intuitively at least, reasonably explained by this rule as member and set; the partitive, too, seems reasonably satisfied by this notion of member and set. In conclusion of this discussion, it must be reemphasized that the conclusions arrived at are merely suggestive and that their proof requires much more extensive analysis. This, however, is clearly outside the scope of this discussion.

Unfortunately, the pedagogical implications of parts of this section are not at all obvious. However, it is clear that the learner must generalize the differences between possession of an object by an animate, and
inalienable possession. This, however, is adequately done by some text materials which offer drill material of the forms:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{J’ai cassé} & \quad \text{mon stylo.} \\
& \quad \text{mon crayon.} \\
& \quad \text{mon assiette.} \\
& \quad \text{etc.}
\end{align*}
\]

and,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Je me suis cassé} & \quad \text{la jambe.} \\
& \quad \text{le bras.} \\
& \quad \text{le pied.} \\
& \quad \text{etc.}
\end{align*}
\]

The remaining two structural relations discussed in this section (dummy factitive "possessives," and "part-of-whole" possessives, including partitives) do not lend themselves to a clear pedagogical implication, however. Nevertheless, the generalizations implicit in these structures may be well served if the dummy factitive possessives are drilled by paired sentences of the forms:


68. La guerre finit. On attend cela. = On attend la fin de la guerre.

The "part-of-whole" possessive and the partitive are conceivably better taught if the "part-of-whole" possessive (la surface de la table) is first presented, followed by
the partitive with adverbs of quantity, followed finally by the pure partitive. This, however, is as purely speculative as the proposed grammatical analysis.

In conclusion of this chapter, it is clear that the structure of the French noun phrase is very similar to the structure of the English noun phrase. In general, most teaching materials do a reasonably adequate job of informing and drilling the learner on the use of these structures. However, current materials do not provide exercises in semantic case roles which, as will be shown in detail in Chapter Four, are essential for the correct internalization of the functions of the French verb. Furthermore, current texts typically offer little or no drill or generalization on negatives and interrogatives affecting the noun phrase, both of which have been shown herein to be of great importance to the learner. These points alone are sufficient to entail a change in scope in drill material and in point of interest from the form of structure to semantic content of utterances.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE FRENCH VERB PHRASE

The Auxiliary System

The complexity of French verb tenses has long been the plague of the language learner. In addition to the three major morphological classes, two of which are composed of two subclasses, there are numerous irregular verbs. Furthermore, French has a richness of tenses which is totally alien to the native speaker of English; each stem, unless it is in some way defective, yields a total of forty-five different forms. Fortunately, however, the situation is simplified considerably by the fact that relatively few of these tenses occur in simple sentences—at least where there are no presuppositions of fact or prior action or the like. Thus, the only tenses which occur in

---

1 The morphology of the French verb is discussed in considerable detail in: Sanford A. Schane, French Phonology and Morphology (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1968), Chapter Three.

2 It is true, of course, that tenses such as the subjunctive occur in surface structure simple sentences; for example, Vive le roi! However, it can be shown that sentences of this form should be derived from a deep structure including a hyper-sentence containing a verb of volition.
simple sentences thus restricted are: the présent, the passé composé, the futur, and the imparfait. The use of all other tenses in French is restricted to compound (or complex) sentences, or to situations governed by presuppositions of the kind mentioned above. Since this is the case, the auxiliary will be described herein in two parts: the first part will treat the four forms which occur in simple sentences; the second, the remaining forms. 3

In describing that portion of the auxiliary which occurs in simple sentences, only the third person singular of the verbs parler and entrer will be used in order to avoid the complexities of morphology. The forms for these two verbs are:

- il entre, il parle ........ present
- il est entré, il a parlé . . . . passé composé
- il entrait, il parlait . . . . imparfait
- il entrera, il parlera . . . . futur

3I know of no satisfactory treatment of the French auxiliary in the literature. Schane (op. cit.) does not develop the auxiliary. Langacker's treatment (Ronald W. Langacker, "A Transformational Syntax of French [unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Champaign, Ill.: The University of Illinois, 1966]) yields the rule: Aux ______ TNS (avoir + é); however, he leaves TNS unexpanded and notes further that his formula does not account for such tenses as le passé surcomposé, etc. Allen and Craig (Edward D. Allen and William Craig, "The Phrase Structure Rules of French," The Ohio State University, unpublished multilith, 1967) offer a more complete description, but they give no demonstration of the development of the rule.
A complete description of the tense system also requires a transformation which copies the significant features of the subject of the sentence into the tense (TNS) portion of the auxiliary before the affix attachment rule is applied in order to account for the concord system. In general, the subject pronoun or nouns can be distinguished by the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>je</th>
<th>tu</th>
<th>il</th>
<th>elle</th>
<th>on</th>
<th>nous</th>
<th>vous</th>
<th>ils</th>
<th>elles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hearer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masc</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subject-verb agreement rule, then, has the form:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc|ccc}
\alpha & \text{X} & \beta & \text{X} & \gamma & \text{X} \\
\text{speaker} & \text{X} & \text{hearer} & \text{X} & \text{plural} & \text{X} \\
\text{masc} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Verbs which are conjugated with être require a further rule which will transfer the features of [ + masculine] and [ + plural] onto the past participle in compound tenses.
As this rule is very similar to the rule shown above and as this is a matter more related to the morphology of the French verb, its formalization is omitted from this description.

Returning to the verb forms listed above, the first three can be described in a way similar to the English auxiliary with the addition of être + é, the second possible auxiliary verb in compound tenses, that is:

\[ \text{Aux} \rightarrow \text{TNS} \left( \{\text{avoir} + \text{é}\} \right) \]

where TNS is given the description:

\[ \text{TNS} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Prés} \\ \text{Imp} \end{array} \right\} \]

Note that this formulation will permit the formation of the pluperfect forms, as: il avait parlé in addition to the forms cited above. The future tense is, however, beyond the scope of this rule. While it would seem practical to rectify this shortcoming by the addition of future in the rewrite rule for tense, this will add complications to the auxiliary as other tenses are added. Thus, it would eventually be necessary to add the terms subjunctive and conditional under the TNS rewrite, leading, in effect, to the creation of a paradigm description. In order to avoid
this situation, Schane suggests that tense forms have as underlying forms both a tense mark and an aspect mark. The basis of his description consists of three aspects: the unmarked aspect, which underlies the present indicative, the imperfect indicative and the present subjunctive; the future aspect, which underlies the future and the conditional; and the past aspect, which underlies the preterite and the past subjunctive.

There remain, however, several problems of verb tenses which concern the aspect: the first of these is its position in the auxiliary; the second concerns the endings of the future tense; and the third concerns the formation of the present and passé composé of the subjunctive. The first of these problems requires an analysis of tenses which occur primarily in compound or complex sentences as well as the future and conditional, e.g.:

- il avait parlé; il était entré
- il aura parlé; il sera entré

---

4 Sanford A. Schane, op. cit., pp. 66 ff.

5 Since the preterite and past subjunctive are, with very rare exception, used exclusively in formal writing, they will be wholly excluded from consideration herein.

6 Note that this form can apparently occur only in the stative sense unlike the passé composé: il est entré which has both stative and active senses. Interestingly,
il aurait parlé; il serait entré
il parlera; il entrera
il parlerait; il entreait

These forms suggest that the aspect should follow the TNS
and before the form of avoir or être.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Aux} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{TNS} + \text{ASP} \left( \text{être} + \text{é} \right) \quad \text{where} \\
\text{ASP} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{Present} \} \\
& \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{Future} \}
\end{align*}
\]

The second problem, that of the future endings, can be
solved by using the formalism proposed by Allen and Craig\(^7\):
the avoir stem or AS.

Since this form is used only with the future aspect,
the change can be incorporated in ASP, viz.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ASP} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{Present} \} \\
& \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{AS + future} \}
\end{align*}
\]

It is interesting to note that the inclusion of the
term ASP in the auxiliary allows an important generalization
in certain kinds of French conditional sentences to be

it is possible to convey the active sense using the imperfect and entrer; however, the native speaker will use a
somewhat different construction: il était en train
d'entrer.


Note further that this formalism recapitulates, to some
degree, the historical development of tenses using the
future aspect (infinitive stem), as, historically, the
future tense consisted of the infinitive followed by the
present tense of avoir.
captured. That is; it has long been noted that in common usage, a present tense in the condition requires a future tense in the result, and an imperfect tense in the condition requires a conditional tense in the result, viz.:

1. Si j'ai assez d'argent, j'irai au cinéma.
2. Si j'avais assez d'argent, j'irais au cinéma.

It will be noted that in each of the sentences above, there is an identity of tense (TNS) in both clauses, and that in each of the sentences the si clause (condition) uses the present aspect; and the result, the future aspect.

Up to this point, the description of the auxiliary has dealt only with the forms used with verbal predicates. It can quite readily be extended for adjectival and nominal predicates, however, if these latter are formulated in the verb phrase expansion as follows:

\[
\text{VP} \rightarrow \begin{cases} V \ (NP) \\ \text{être} \ (\text{adj}) \\ (NP) \end{cases}
\]

However, the use of a rule of this form fails to capture a very important generalization concerning similarities between verbal and adjectival predicates. Noting the ambiguity which is present in sentences similar to:

3. La fenêtre est brisée,

it is clear that, as in English, the main difference
between adjectives and verbs lies in the stative versus non-stative senses in which such sentences may be interpreted. This would suggest that verbal and adjectival predicates may be distinguished by the presence or absence of the feature *adjectival*, and that the *être* in the expansion for VP be removed, yielding:

$$\text{VP} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{V (NP)} \\ \text{Adj} \\ \text{NP} \end{cases}$$

or, more simply:

$$\text{VP} \rightarrow \text{Predicate (NP)}.$$  

Changing the expansion for the verb phrase in this manner apparently requires that the configuration of the auxiliary be changed to cope with sentences such as:

4. Henri avait été fatigué.

This suggests that the Aux be changed to:

$$\text{Aux} \rightarrow \text{TNS + ASP (avoir + ë) (être + ë)}$$

However, such tenses as the passé surcomposé require a second (avoir + ë) in the rewrite for Aux. Hence,

5. Quand il a eu parlé, . . . .

requires the following description:

---

Clearly then, this generalization can be captured quite simply by adding a single \( \text{avoir} + \text{é} \) to the earlier formula for \( \text{Aux} \), e.g.

\[
\text{Aux} \rightarrow \text{TNS + ASP (avoir + é)} \cup \{\text{être + é}\}
\]

In this formula, the passé composé with verbs involves the choice of \( \text{avoir} + \text{é} \) or \( \text{être} + \text{é} \) from the last term of the rewrite. The passé composé with nominal and adjectival predicates selects the first \( \text{avoir} + \text{é} \) and \( \text{être} + \text{é} \) from the last term. The passé surcomposé involved the choice of both \( \text{avoir} + \text{é} \) terms. Note further, that this expansion for the \( \text{Aux} \) permits the direct formation of all passive voice tenses as well as active voice tenses.

The only remaining problem in this description of the French auxiliary system involves the formation of the
présent and passé composé of the subjunctive, as in:

6. Il faut qu'il parle.
7. Il fallait qu'il ait parlé.

Since this tense is formed from the same stem as the present and imperfect, it must be assigned to the present aspect. In general, the only problem presented with the formation of the subjunctive is that it does not occur with the future aspect. Therefore, it is necessary to add a specification to this form which restricts its occurrence to the present aspect. Given this restriction, the tense may be added under TNS in the auxiliary. Thus, the full expansion for the Aux is:

\[ \text{Aux} \rightarrow \text{TNS} + \text{ASP} \ (\text{avoir} + \text{é}) \ 
\begin{cases} 
\text{présent} \\
\text{Imperfect}
\end{cases} \ 
\begin{cases} 
\text{avoir} + \text{é} \\
\text{être} + \text{é}
\end{cases} \]

where TNS \[ \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\text{subjunctive} \\
\text{Imperfect}
\end{cases} \]

ASP \[ \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\text{present} \\
\text{future}
\end{cases} \]

At this point, there is only one rule needed to produce the surface form of the auxiliary; there needs to be an affixation transformation.
This rule is applied from left to right as many times as possible, renumbering after each application.

Case and Lexical Entries

In the discussion of French verb types which follows, it will be necessary to use a number of terms which have been developed in recent work in semantic and syntactic theory. The description of French grammar which follows makes use of the case notions which were discussed in

---

the preceding chapter. The formula for sentence, then, has the form:\(^{10}\):

\[
\text{Sentence} \rightarrow \text{Modality} + \text{Proposition}
\]

It is assumed, for this description, that the expansion for the auxiliary is contained in the term \textit{modality}. For the purposes of this treatment, features on the sentence such as + passive, etc. will also be shown in this position, although no attempt will be made to justify this procedure.

The term \textit{proposition} has the following expansion:

\[
\text{Proposition} \rightarrow \text{Predicate} + C_1 + C_2 + \ldots + C_n
\]

In this formulation, the term \textit{predicate} may consist of a verb, an adjective, or a noun phrase; and the terms \(C_1 + C_2 + \ldots + C_n\) refer to the case categories which may occur with it. Verbs (and other predicates) are inserted into the sentence frame from their lexical entries which list the predicate and number and kinds of case categories which occur with it. For example, the entry for \textit{casser} would have the following form:

\[
\text{Casser, } + [ \ldots \text{ Objective (Instrument) (Agent)} ]
\]

or more simply:

\[
\text{Casser, } + [ \ldots ]
\]

Casser, + [ ______ O (I) (A) ]

The notational system should be read to mean that *casser* occurs in sentences which contain obligatorily a noun phrase in the *objective* case. The parentheses around *instrument* and *agent* imply that either or both case relations may occur optionally; however, neither is required. The verb *casser*, then, is a *one-place* predicate, since only one noun phrase is required to be associated with it. Verbs like *frapper* require an understanding of a place which undergoes the surface contact and either an *agent* or an *instrument*. It is, therefore, a *two-place* predicate, and the form of its lexical entry is:

*frapper, + [ _____ L (A | I) ]*

where the interlocked parentheses indicate that both *agent* and *instrument* may occur, but that at least one of them must be present in addition to the *Locative*.

For the purposes of illustration, a semantic deep structure using the verb *casser* with the noun phrases *le garçon*, *la fenêtre* and *un bâton* would be diagrammed as follows:
Diagram 4.2

An ordered set of transformations acting on this structure would:

1. Move *par le garçon* to in front of the modality to create a subject.

2. Delete the preposition *par*.

3. Create a direct object by placing *la fenêtre* immediately after the verb.

4. Transfer the subject-verb agreement features to the TNS.
5. The affix attachment rule would apply (four times from left to right) to produce the surface form of the auxiliary.

The surface sentence produced by this structure and these transformations is, of course:

8. Le garçon a cassé la fenêtre avec un bâton.

The Common Reflexive Verbs

Perhaps the first major syntactic difficulty which presents itself to the student of French is the reflexive construction. In general, however, the student's first exposure to the reflexive construction is quite straightforward. Most text materials introduce a number of common verbs dealing with going to bed, getting up in the morning, and general grooming. Most of these common reflexive verbs also occur in non-reflexive forms in sentences which have a direct object which is not identical with the subject. The verb laver, which has syntactic properties similar in most respects to the other common reflexive verbs, occurs in sentences like:

9. Henri a lavé la voiture.
10. Henri a lavé le bébé.

where the object differs from the subject. In case terminology, la voiture in (9) is an objective, and le bébé in
(10) is a dative. The instrumental case may also be used optionally with laver, giving sentences like:

11. Henri a lavé la voiture avec du savon.11

Instrumental noun phrases may also occur as the subject of laver, as in:

12. Les grosses vagues lavaient les roches sur la côte.

The kinds of instrumental nouns which may occur as the subject of laver, as well as most other verbs in French where instrumental subjects are accepted, are apparently limited to those nouns denoting objects or forces which are either capable of effective action without human manipulation or, at least, which are not normally understood as needing to be manipulated by humans, as tools, etc. This, however, is related to facts about normal use of these types of nouns, and is not part of the syntactic properties of the verb.

Note that (13) is rejected.


11Many French speakers prefer: Henri a lavé la voiture au savon, although my informants all accept (11). Apparently, the difference in the two sentences is due to the notion that the voiture in the latter example is covered or immersed in le savon. This point is outside the scope of this investigation, however, and will be treated no further.
There is one further property of verbs like *laver* which must be noted before a generalization of their syntactic properties can be drawn. All of the above sentences contain a subject, either an agent or an instrument, and a direct object, either a dative or an objective. Sentences like the following are all rejected:

17. *La voiture lave.

Thus, it is clear that *laver* must be classified as a two-place predicate with the characteristics noted above.

These data permit the following generalizations:

\[ \text{laver}, + \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{A} \mid \text{I} \\
\{ \text{D} \}
\end{array} \right] \]

1. If there is an agent present in the deep structure, it becomes the subject in the active voice surface structure, and if there is also an instrument present, it occurs as the object of the preposition avec (except as noted in footnote 11) following the dative or objective which becomes the surface direct object.

2. If there is no agent present in the deep structure, there must be an instrument. In this case, the instrument becomes the surface structure subject.

Given these facts about common reflexive verbs, the following diagram accounts for the occurrence of the reflexive in:

18. Jean se lave.
The agent is raised as subject; and the dative becomes the direct object. Both prepositions are deleted.
The second occurrence of Jean (under the dative) becomes pronominalized as the third person reflexive and moved in front of the Modality. Affix attachment follows this, resulting in (18) above. Note that this generalization concerning verbs like laver serves to block the formation of sentences like:

19. *La voiture se lave.

since this sentence would require two occurrences of the case objective. Thus, it may be stated that verbs like laver occur in reflexive form only in the case that the person performing the action (agent) and the person affected by the action (dative) are identical.

There is one additional complication with verbs like laver in the active voice, which is exemplified in:

20. Jean s'est lavé la figure; and,
21. Marie s'est lavé les mains.

In these sentences, la figure and les mains form parts of the bodies of Jean and Marie, respectively. Furthermore, it should be noted that the past participle in (21) does not agree with the reflexive pronoun as is the case in:

22. Marie s'est lavée.

12 It is a general requirement of this form of grammar that each case be permitted to occur only once. Cf. Fillmore, op. cit., 1968.
The explanation provided in traditional grammar texts for the difference in agreement in (21) and (22) is that the past participle of reflexive verbs, like the past participles of verbs conjugated with avoir agree in gender and number with direct objects which precede the verb. Thus, the reflexive in (22) comes from a raised direct object; and that in (21), from an indirect object. This generalization with action affecting body parts is captured in the rule given by Fillmore where NP \( \rightarrow \) N (Dative), e.g.:\(^\text{13}\)

Diagram 4.5

---

\(^{13}\) Fillmore, op. cit., 1968.
Following the rules outlined above for verbs like *laver*, the agent is raised to subject and the objective to surface direct object, giving:

Diagram 4.6

Following this, the dative is raised to form a surface indirect object.

Diagram 4.7
The dative indirect object is then pronominalized to the reflexive and moved in front of the modality. After the affix attachment rule is applied, the surface structure of (21) is realized.

There is one further aspect of inalienable possession which is not treated here. Some verbs, of which *couper* is an example, may occur in two different surface structures which are, apparently, derived from the same deep structure, e.g.:

23. Marie s'est coupée au doigt, and
24. Marie s'est coupé le doigt.

My informants are divided on whether these are exact paraphrases. Three feel that they are, and two claim that the injury in (23) need not be so serious as that in (24), although (24) does not presuppose that the finger is severed. Whatever the case may be regarding paraphrasability, these examples suggest that there exists the possibility of an optional order for the transformations outlined above—at least with some surface contact verbs. In (24) the locative is raised to surface direct object; and the dative to surface indirect object. The remainder of the derivation is the same as that given for (21). In (23), the dative is separated from the locative first and raised to
surface direct object. In this case, the locative marker à is not erased, and the locative remains as a prepositional phrase in the surface structure. This allows the direct object (the dative) to pronominalize without the case marker, thus permitting the agreement between reflexive direct object and the past participle in compound tenses.

It should be noted that there are, in French, cases of possession where the dative and agent are identical which do not permit the use of the reflexive construction. Such cases refer to action affecting an object which is not inalienably possessed. For example, if Rodin had just finished a work of sculpture, and it were covered with dust and marble chips which he washed off the newly created head, the following sentence results:

25. Après avoir terminé la sculpture, Rodin a lavé sa tête.\textsuperscript{14}

Using only the main clause of (25), the following structural relation accounts for the difference between the possession of (25).

\textsuperscript{14}Given the circumstances outlined in the preceding sentence, all five of my informants accept this sentence.
The derivation of (25) from this deep structure would proceed from\textsuperscript{15}: 

1. The formation of the possessive adjective in front of \textit{la tête} in the embedded \textit{S}, deleting \textit{être} under predicate.

2. The \textit{sa tête} under objective is raised to form the surface direct object.

\textsuperscript{15}These rules are also required for sentences like the following: Henri a lavé sa voiture, etc.
3. The agent is moved to subject position and the marker par is deleted.

4. Affix attachment produces the surface passé composé.

The preceding description treats only the commonest of the reflexive verbs and their structural relations in the active voice. There are, however, many other facts related to the proposition core of French sentences which have not been discussed in this section since further information about other classes of verbs will be needed for their solution. The following section will outline the general characteristics of one such class and certain types of passive voice sentences.

Change of State Verbs and the Passive Voice

The syntax of change of state verbs in French exhibits some properties which are different enough from their English equivalents to warrant considerable attention in any study of French grammar. Some of the more important aspects—and those which create the greatest difficulties for English speaking students of French—manifest themselves in the semantic differences between active and passive voice sentences. Before proceeding to the relationships between the active and passive, it is first necessary to outline the general properties of change of state verbs.
The class of change of state verbs consists of two subclasses: those which take animate direct objects, and those which take inanimate direct objects. The first subgroup consists of verbs like blesser, tuer, etc. The following sentences illustrate the kinds of structural relationships which occur in active voice sentences with this group:

26. Jean a tué Paul avec un couteau.
27. Un couteau a tué Paul.
28. Paul s’est tué avec un couteau.
29. Jean a tué Paul.
30. Paul s’est tué.

Since these are the only possible active voice sentence types with this subgroup of change of state verbs, the following generalization may be stated:

1. tuer, blesser, + [ (A X I) D ]
   etc.

2. Since either the agent or the instrument must be present with the dative, these verbs are two-place predicates.

3. If there are both an agent and an instrument present, the agent becomes the subject, and the instrument remains as the object of the preposition avec. The dative follows the verb as the direct object.

4. If there is no agent, then the instrument becomes the subject. The dative follows the verb as the direct object.
With this class of verbs, the derivation of the reflexive is similar to that of verbs like laver. That is, when the agent and the dative are identical, there is obligatorily reflexivization of the dative as is seen in (28), (29), and (30).

The second sub-class of change of state verbs differs from the first sub-class in three important respects: first, they involve action affecting an objective rather than a dative; second, they are one-place predicates; third, the function of the reflexive pronoun is significantly different, as will be shown below. Verbs of this group occur in the following types of active voice sentences:

31. Henri a brisé la fenêtre avec une branche.
32. Henri a brisé la fenêtre.
33. Une branche a brisé la fenêtre.
34. La fenêtre s'est brisée.

Note that (34) differs from (30), which has an apparently identical surface structure (subject, reflexive pronoun, verb), in that (30) asserts that Paul performed an action which resulted in a change affecting a person, Paul, who happened to be identical to the subject. Sentence (34), however, simply asserts that some action occurred which affected a physical object. No mention is made concerning
the cause of the action. Thus, it must be concluded that, the reflexive pronoun in sentences like (34) serves as a dummy direct object to satisfy the surface structure constraint that change of state verbs must be transitive. Further evidence of this fact is provided by sentences like the following:

35. La France se compose de plusieurs régions historiques.
36. (?On compose la France de plusieurs régions historiques.
37. La Seine se jette dans la Manche.
38. (?On jette la Seine dans la Manche.

At this stage, it should be pointed out that many speakers of French reject sentences like (36) and (38). It is interesting to note, however, that these are not ungrammatical strings. If they are rejected, it is because it is recognized that the feats mentioned are beyond the powers of ordinary mortals, and their rejection is, therefore, merely a reflection of the speaker's knowledge of the physical world, and not a reflection of his knowledge of the grammar of his native language. Notice the complete acceptability of:

39. Charlemagne compose la France de plusieurs régions historiques.
40. Hercule jette la Seine dans la Manche.

Obviously, the difference between sentences (35) through
(40) lies in the fact that (36), (38), (39) and (40) contain a causative element (the personal agent) whereas no agency or causative factor is contained in (35) and (37).

Further evidence of the dummy nature of the reflexive in sentences is contained in the facts that there are verbs in French which require the reflexive pronoun, but which do not accept the agent case. For example:

41. Un grand problème se manifeste;

but not

42. *On manifeste un grand problème.\textsuperscript{16}

Given these facts, the lexical entry and syntactic properties of verbs of this group in active voice sentences may be summarized as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
casser, 
briser, + [ (A) (I) O ] 
fermer, etc.
\end{verbatim}

1. If there is an agent present, it becomes the subject. If there is also an instrument present, it follows the objective (which forms the surface direct object) as the object of the preposition avec.

\textsuperscript{16}This is ungrammatical in the sense that on is the agent, directing the action of the verb. However, this sentence is possible in case the speaker is referring to either the physical presence or emotional characteristics of a person whom he would rather not mention by name and whom he finds to be somewhat disturbing. This, however, is simply a special case of (41), and has no effect on the judgment of unacceptability for (42).
2. If there is no agent, but there is an instrument, the instrument becomes the subject. The objective becomes the direct object.

3. If there is neither an agent nor an instrument, the objective is copied in front of the verb as the subject. The original occurrence of the objective following the verb is reflexivized and moved in front of the verb to form the reflexive direct object.

4. Verbs of this group are one-place predicates.

While there is nothing particularly novel about the generalizations which have been presented in this chapter, they are, nevertheless, very significant for both an adequate description of French grammar, and for the student of French, and in much the same way. Notice that any grammar which rejects the semantic notions of agent, instrument, etc. and insists on adherence to the functional notions of subject and object must contain dual lexical entries (at least) for all the change of state verbs in French (which constitute a significant fraction of the total number of verbs). That is, for each verb, there must be one entry for the non-reflexive form and a second entry for the reflexive form, e.g.:

1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brisser ........................................</td>
<td>se briser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>casser .........................................</td>
<td>se casser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fermer .........................................</td>
<td>se fermer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and so forth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The problem faced by the second language learner is nearly identical. If he is not permitted these generalizations, then he is required to memorize (by whatever technique) exactly which verbs in French may occur in both the reflexive and the non-reflexive forms. This, in effect, doubles the vocabulary load that faces the student. If, on the other hand, he is permitted the generalizations stated above for verbs like *briser*, he need only learn one lexical item for each verb and one rule for the entire class which reduces the demand on his storage by a factor of two, and which will also lay the groundwork for additional, significant generalizations which will be discussed below.

Furthermore, many other, common verbs in French behave in similar manner to the change of state verbs.

Notice:

43. Ca ne se dit pas ici.
44. Le théâtre se trouve en face de l'église.
45. Le français se parle partout en Europe.
46. Ca ne se fait pas en Amérique.
47. Ca se voit souvent au Canada.
48. Ce livre se vend partout.

and many more. Traditional grammars, structural grammars, and transformational grammars based on the notions subject and object have all been forced to treat sentences like (43) to (48) as idiomatic and the language learner has
been forced, with no little difficulty, to memorize them as idiosyncracies of the French language. Under the system derived independently above, they are perfectly regular, following general, and quite pervasive, properties of French. Assuming that the learner has been allowed to draw the correct generalizations, both the vocabulary load, and the difficulties of semantic interpretation of structures of this kind should be dramatically reduced.

With these rather basic generalizations out of the way, it is possible to proceed to the analysis of passive voice sentences in French. One interesting aspect of the passive in French lies in the fact that it is widely claimed in traditional grammars that this structure is avoided by the French whenever possible by the use of the indefinite agent pronoun on or by the use of the reflexive form outlined above (known as the pronominal voice). While it is true that the pronoun on is widely used in French, where English might use the passive in similar circumstances, the second claim is false. The use of the pronominal voice in French is the same as the intransitive use of English verbs like break, and cannot be seriously claimed to be a substitute for the passive. It may be the case that the number of French verbs which occur in the "pronominal voice" may
be proportionately greater than the number of English verbs which may occur both transitively and intransitively, thus requiring wider use of the passive in English. However, this can only be determined by a comparative count of the relative frequencies of such verbs in both languages which takes into account the information discussed above. In any case, the result of the claims of traditional grammarians about the rarity of the passive has been to postpone the introduction of these forms until late in the language sequence with its importance, even then, de-emphasized.

In addition to the points discussed above, there are several other interesting aspects of grammatical structure which involve the passive voice in French. One of these, the adjectival use of the past participle in surface structures identical with the action use of the passive, was mentioned briefly in the description of the auxiliary system. Since this relationship is obviously significant in French grammar, it will be discussed at greater length below. Secondly, the choice of prepositions with the agent and instrument is highly important since this choice depends upon the semantic content of the deep structure of passive sentences. Lastly, the effect of the
number of noun phrases which need be associated with a
given predicate for it to be used appropriately will be
discussed in relation to the first two aspects mentioned
above.

Beginning with verbs like *briser*, the following
kinds of passive sentences are found:

49. La fenêtre a été brisée.
50. La fenêtre a été brisée par Henri.
51. La fenêtre a été brisée avec une branche.
52. La fenêtre a été brisée par Henri avec une branche.
53. La fenêtre a été brisée par une balle perdue.
54. La fenêtre a été brisée d'un coup de marteau.

The following constructions are rejected.

55. *La fenêtre a été brisée d'Henri.
56. *La fenêtre a été brisée avec Henri.

(Notice that this sentence becomes acceptable under the
interpretation that someone picked *Henri* up and threw him
through the window, thereby using his body to cause the
change of state. In this case, however, *Henri* is not
understood as the agent as in (50), but rather Henri's body
is the instrument as *une branche* in (51).

57. *La fenêtre a été brisée d'une branche.
58. *La fenêtre a été brisée par un coup de marteau.
59. *La fenêtre a été brisée avec un coup de marteau.

The information contained in (49) through (59) is suffi-
cient to form several generalizations concerning verbs like
*briser* in passive sentences. First, sentence (49) is the
only one of the acceptable sentences listed above which may be interpreted ambiguously, although the use of the passé composé causes, apparently, some speakers to reject the adjectival sense. Similarly, the use of the imperfect tense causes native speakers to reject the action sense, as in:

60. La fenêtre était brisée.

This is undoubtedly due to the fact that the passé composé is used to express action of relatively short duration in the past, whereas the imparfait is used to express states of being in the past. Apart from these examples, sentences similar to (49) are systematically ambiguous in all other tenses. At this point, it is necessary to mention the fact that many traditional grammars do not accept the possibility of ambiguity in the passive with some change of state verbs. For example, Mansion states that the sentence:

61. La porte est fermée.

may be interpreted only in the stative sense, and not in the passive sense. This observation, however, is contradicted by:

62. James Bond entre dans le salon et, tout à coup, la porte est fermée derrière lui.

in which *la porte est fermée* is open only to the passive action sense. In spite of the claim that sentences like (62) do not occur commonly in French (a claim that is based on frequency counts depending on completely inadequate notions of grammatical structure), it is nevertheless true that this systematic ambiguity is a general and significant semantic property of verbs like *briser*. Any grammar which fails to capture this property, whether the purpose of the grammar be descriptive or pedagogical, can only lead to inadequate and inaccurate generalizations about the structure of French.

Furthermore, the data listed above furnish the information necessary for a statement of the conditions under which the prepositions *par*, *avec*, and *de* are selected in sentences containing verbs like *briser*. Notice that the agent must select *par*. The instrument, on the other hand may select any one of the three. However, it is clear from the above examples that *de* may be selected only by abstract instruments as *un coup de quelque chose*. Concrete instruments, however, may select either *par* or *avec*, but under different semantic interpretations. Notice that (51) is a paraphrase of:

63. On a brisé la fenêtre avec une branche
but not of,

64. Une branche a brisé la fenêtre.

and that (53) is a paraphrase of

65. Une balle perdue a brisé la fenêtre.

but not of,

66. On a brisé la fenêtre avec une balle perdue.

From these examples, it is clear that the use of *avec* in passives like (51) implies the existence of an unspecified agent, and, thereby, purposiveness. The use of *par* in passives like (53) has no such implication; there is no agent responsible for the action and therefore no purposiveness. Sentences similar to this assert only that some physical object brought about a change of state in another physical object without animate manipulation. Additional evidence for this claim is found in the fact that, at first sight, native speakers reject sentences like:

67. La fenêtre a été brisée par le marteau.
68. Le marteau a brisé la fenêtre.

However, if these same speakers are first given a situational orientation which implies accidental action, they readily accept such sentences as perfectly acceptable, and even common in usage. For example, if speakers are told that a workman left a hammer on a scaffold and that it was
accidentally jarred, shaken, or otherwise dislodged to fall through the window, both (67) and (68) are accepted. The difference in semantic readings of (51) and (67) can be accounted for in formal terms by the following structural diagrams:

Diagram 4.9

Structures like those shown in Diagram 4.9 obligatorily delete the indefinite agent, on. The objective is then moved in front of the verb as the subject, and the instrument remains unchanged. Note that the deletion of on
has independent justification since it may only occur in French sentences as the subject and the agent may not become the subject in passive sentences. Structures like these shown in Diagram 4.10 move the objective in front of the verb to form the surface subject, and the instrument case marker avec is replaced by par, indicating that there was no agent present in the deep structure.

Diagram 4.10

```
S (+ passive)
  Prop
  M
  P
    I
      V
        K
          Det
            N
                K
                  Det
                    N

m briser avec le marteau \(\emptyset\) la fenêtre
```

The situation with the change of state verbs affecting datives is, unfortunately, not quite so clear-cut. With verbs of this group, sentences with de and concrete instruments in both active and passive voice are acceptable.
For example:

69. Paul a blessé Jean avec une flèche.
70. Paul a blessé Jean d'une flèche.
71. Jean a été blessé avec une flèche.
72. Jean a été blessé d'une flèche.
73. Jean a été blessé par une flèche.

Sentences (69), (71), and (73) exhibit the same general syntactic and semantic properties as verbs like briser. The difficulties arise in the semantic interpretation of sentences (70) and (72). Sentences (69) and (71) insist upon the purposiveness of the action; sentence (73), on the other hand, denies the existence of an agent in the deep structure, and thus there is no purpose implied. De, however, may occur with the instrument in deep structures which contain an agent, and which imply, therefore, purpose. The consensus of my informants regarding the semantic interpretation of sentences of this type is that the notion of intent is not so strong as it is in similar structures containing avec. That is, avec is used to emphasize purpose in (69), and the passive sentence (72) neither insists on purpose as does (71), nor denies it as does (73), but is more or less neutral between (71) and (73). This is admittedly rather weak evidence to support a definite conclusion, and the question must remain open pending the discovery of more conclusive examples.
A second, highly speculative, possibility for an explanation of the existence of such sentences lies in the fact that de was the more usual preposition with the instrument and agent in earlier stages of the language and, in modern French, has largely been replaced by par.¹⁸ It is within the realm of possibility that this conflict in prepositional choice indicates a syntactic change which is still in progress. The confirmation or rejection of this possibility would, however, require quite extensive, and very likely fruitless, field work in dialect variations and in differences in the usage of older and younger speakers.

Verbs of Emotion

Verbs of this class differ from the change of state verbs in several interesting and important ways. First, verbs like aimer, respecter, estimer, etc. do not occur with instruments. Secondly, all verbs of this class are two-place predicates; and, thirdly, the stative interpretation of passive sentences occur with either one or two noun phrases present in the surface structure, whereas the stative interpretation is possible with change of state

¹⁸Mansion, op. cit., p. 54.
verbs only if there is one noun phrase present in the surface structure. The following examples provide the data for a general statement of the properties of *aimer*, etc.:

74. Paul aime Marie.
75. Paul aime le vin.
76. Paul respecte la loi.
77. Paul s'aime.
78. *Paul aime.
79. *Le vin s'aime.
80. *Le vin aime.
81. *Paul respecte la loi avec any noun

Thus,

\[
\begin{array}{c}
aimer \\
\text{respecter} \\
estimer \\
terrifier \\
e\text{tc.}
\end{array}
\]

\[+ \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{A} \\
\text{D}
\end{array} \right] \]

1. In active voice sentences, the agent becomes the subject, and the remaining noun phrase (either the dative or the objective) becomes the direct object.

2. If the agent and dative are identical in the deep structure, the dative is obligatorily reflexivized, and the pronoun is moved in front of the verb.

3. All verbs of this class are two-place predicates.

The choice of prepositions with the agent in passive sentences is particularly interesting with verbs of this class. Either *de* or *par* may be selected; in cases of coordinate conjunction of two agent noun phrases, *de* may occur with one and *par* with the other. However, as is illustrated in the following examples, there is a difference in the
semantic interpretation which is marked by the choice of preposition:

82. Marie est aimée de Paul.
83. Marie est aimée par Paul.
84. Jean est estimé de tout le monde.
85. Jean est respecté par tout le monde.
86. Marie est terrifiée d'un serpent.
87. Marie est terrifiée par un serpent.
88. Marie est terrifiée de serpents.
89. Jean est respecté.

Notice the similarity of the above examples with respect to stativeness to the following, adjectival predicates:

90. Jean est rouge de colère.
91. Le plancher est couvert de sable.
92. Jacqueline est habillée de soie.

Clearly then, the examples with verbs of emotion containing de must be interpreted in the stative sense; those with par, in the action, or verbal sense. Sentence (89) is ambiguously either stative or verbal.

Mansion cites the following examples of two conjoined agents where one selects de and the other par:\n
93. Il est respecté de tout le monde et même par son domestique.
94. Il est estimé de tout le grand public, et même par ses adversaires.

Since in the cases of (93) and (94) the use de with the first agent noun phrase implies stativeness, while the use
of par with the second agent noun phrase implies the non-stative sense, these sentences require a deep structure like the following:\(^{20}\):

Diagram 4.11

The derivation of (93) from this deep structure requires that the second occurrence of the dative, il, be deleted

\(^{20}\)For the purpose of this example, and without further justification, the conjunction et is described as a predicate which accepts two sentences as its arguments. Cf. C. J. Fillmore, "Types of Lexical Information," Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics, No. 2 (Columbus, Ohio, 1968), p. 74.
as well as the modality constituent and respecter in the sentence under NP₂. The preposition par marks the non-stative interpretation.

Many other two-place predicates behave in the same fashion, depending only on the possibility of their being interpreted statively and non-statively in the passive voice. Thus, the surface contact verbs, as frapper, battre, etc., the two-place predicates of motion, and verbs like laver permit sentences like the following:

95. L'ennemi a été frappé par son adversaire.
96. La maison est frappée de tous les vents du ciel.
97. Henri est accompagné de toute la classe et même par son professeur.
98. La plage est toujours lavée de toutes les eaux de l'océan.

The generalizations presented in this section are obviously very important for any grammar of French which attempts to provide an adequate description of the grammatical knowledge of the native speaker. The alternatives to the description proposed above either fail to capture the facts, or do so awkwardly. For example, a grammar which insists on strict adherence to the superficial surface structure relations of subject and object, and which fails to note the basic similarities of adjectives and verbs is totally incapable of doing more than noting the fact that
some verbs may accept either *de* or *par* in passive sentences. Pedagogical materials based on such grammars, as is the case today, can do no more than inform the learner of the existence of both types of sentences (note that different methods of language instruction have no effect on the nature of the generalizations the learner draws, but merely influence the kind of practice he gets) and, consequently, leave him completely uninformed as to which preposition he should employ to convey the appropriate message. A grammar which insists on the notions subject and object, rejecting the generalizations of number of places in the predicate, but which does note the existence of stative and non-stative homonyms is capable of an adequate description of the semantic interpretation of the kinds of sentence pairs listed above. However, this kind of description is awkward in that it requires dual lexical entries for each verb which can accept either *de* or *par*, and misses the general rule that all, or nearly all, two-place predicates in French behave in this fashion. The difficulty this presents to the language learner lies in the fact that, regardless of the method employed, he is forced to memorize exactly which verbs have this property, effectively doubling the demand on his storage. If, however, he is
permitted to generalize that all verbs which must take two nouns, and which may be interpreted statively and non-statively select de in the stative and par in the non-stative, his memory capacity is freed for the acquisition of new vocabulary, in addition to giving him more correct generalizations of the semantic structure of French.

Some Miscellaneous Verbs

In addition to the classes of verbs all of whose members behave in similar fashion, there are many verbs in French which exhibit similarities to only a few other verbs, or which occur in pairs which mean essentially the same thing and differ only in the type of noun phrase which may become the subject, or which are completely idiosyncratic in their behavior. Since an adequate grammar of French must account for facts of this kind, this last section is devoted to outlining the properties of verbs of these types.

One small subclass of verbs whose members behave in similar fashion is the group of verbs of perception as voir, entendre, goûter, etc. In general, these verbs are two-place predicates which accept a dative and an objective case since it is inherent in their meaning that a physical object produces an effect on an animate noun. The dative
occurs as the subject; the **objective** as the direct object.

Thus,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{entendre} & \\
\text{voir} & + [ \quad \text{D O} ] \\
\text{goûter} & \\
\text{etc.} &
\end{align*}
\]

Note that *voir* and *écouter* can accept abstract objectives as is illustrated in the following sentences:

100. J'ai entendu chanter les garçons.

In addition, these verbs have roughly synonymous twins which are interpreted as referring to purposive perception, as *regarder* and *écouter*. *Goûter* is also open to the purposive sense. These verbs, in short, are paraphrases of the following:

101. regarder = se faire voir.
102. écouter = se faire entendre
103. goûter \_2 = se faire goûter

This difference in interpretation may be formalized by:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{regarder} & \\
\text{écouter} & + [ \quad \text{A O} ] \\
\text{goûter}_2 &
\end{align*}
\]

One additional member of the group of verbs of perception is *montrer*, which is paraphrased by:

104. montrer = faire voir à quelqu'un d'autre

Thus,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{montrer}, & + [ \quad \text{A D O} ]
\end{align*}
\]
where the person affected is not the same person as the subject of *montrer*. This type of causative sense of perception can only be given by the *faire* construction for the other verbs of perception as in:

105. Je vous ferai goûter une crème au chocolat.

While these verbs behave very similarly to their English translational equivalents, and tend, therefore, to present little difficulty to the English speaking student of French, it is obvious that the learner must be allowed to generalize on the kinds of sentences they occur in and on their semantic interpretations.

Among those verbs which are members of synonymous pairs differing only in the particular type of noun phrase which becomes the subject are *donner* and *recevoir*, and *vendre* and *acheter*. Notice that *donner* and *recevoir* both mean that some object has been transferred from one person to another, and have the same lexical entry:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{donner} & \quad + [I \quad A \quad D \quad O] \\
\text{recevoir} & \quad + [I \quad D \quad A \quad O]
\end{align*}
\]

They differ only in the fact that *donner* takes an agent subject, whereas *recevoir* takes a dative subject. Note the synonymy between:

106. Henri a donné le livre à Jacques; and
A similar difference exists between *vendre* and *acheter*.
Both verbs mean that a physical object has been transferred from one person to another through the instrumentality of money. Thus,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vendre} & \quad + \quad [\quad \text{A} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{I} \quad \text{O}\quad ] \\
\text{acheter}
\end{align*}
\]

Like *donner* and *recevoir*, they differ only in the fact that *vendre* takes the *agent*; and *acheter*, the *dative* as subject.
Other verb pairs exist which exhibit similar properties; for example, *prêter*, *emprunter*, etc. *Envoyer* is similar to *donner* with the exception that *donner* presupposes that the two persons involved are in direct proximity, whereas *envoyer* presupposes that they are not, and that there is some mediating instrumentality as the post office, or a middle man which is responsible for the delivery of the object.

Among those verbs which exhibit idiosyncratic properties are *se souvenir de*, *s'en aller*, *se battre*, and many others. The idiosyncracies of these verbs must be noted in the lexicon for descriptive purposes, and the language learner is forced to learn them individually. There are, however, other verbs which exhibit idiosyncracies of subject and object choice which are, nevertheless,
explainable by the general notion of case. Two such verbs are *voler* and *décider*. *Voler* is idiosyncratic in that it has the entry:

\[
\text{voler} + [ \quad \text{A D O} \quad ]
\]

and occurs in sentences like:

108. Henri a volé l'argent à Pierre.
109. Henri a volé l'argent.
110. Henri a volé Pierre.

Thus, if there is both an objective and a dative present in the surface structure, the objective is the direct object; and the dative, the indirect object. If only one of the two is mentioned, that noun phrase becomes the direct object. The difficulty for the English speaking student is that English has the synonymy pair *rob*, *steal* which are identical in meaning but taking different types of direct objects; *rob* taking the dative and *steal*, the objective. Thus, care must be taken to see that the student learn all the surface structures of the types shown in (108), (109), and (110), in order to guard against incorrect transfer from English.

*Décider* is idiosyncratic in that it occurs in the following three types of surface structures:

\[21\]
111. Jeanne est décidée à faire la vaisselle.
112. Jeanne décide de faire la vaisselle.
113. Jeanne se décide à faire la vaisselle.
114. Jean décide Henri à partir.
115. Voilà qui décide la guerre.

However, the general semantic properties of French verbs developed in this chapter serve very well to clarify the different structures shown above. Sentence (111), for example, describes an action that is completed and, therefore, décidée in this sentence has the stative interpretation. Sentence (112) occurs with an agent and an objective, and, indicating an action taking place, is non-stative in interpretation. Sentences (113) and (114) include a dative indicating that the agent has directed an action discussion which follows. There appear to be some general properties of French verbs which influence the selection of à or de with the dependent infinitive; however, there are many verbs which do not, apparently, behave in accordance with these general properties, and for which the choice of preposition is completely idiosyncratic. Thus, verbs like commencer, se mettre, aider, etc. are followed by à and the dependent infinitive. The selection of à is reasonably consistent with verbs which take dependent infinitive clauses indicating an action which will take place in the immediate future, i.e., an abstract factitive clause. Other verbs which take dependent infinitive clauses in which the action has stopped like cesser, finir, etc., or which, in some manner which is not obvious, introduce a negative notion concerning the action of the infinitive clause like empêcher, défendre, craindre, etc. take de. However, there are many verbs which do not follow this general classification. Nevertheless, this is an area of French grammar which would appear to be fruitful for further research for both descriptive and pedagogical purposes.
influencing the dative which results in the objective clause taking place. In short, there is a resolution of a conflict of opinion in these sentences. Sentence (113) differs from (114) only in the fact that in (113) the agent and dative are identical. Sentence (115) differs from (112) in the fact that the objective is sentential in (112) but not in (115). Note also that the subject, qui, of (115) is ambiguous since it can refer either to agent or an instrument, e.g.: 

116. Charlemagne La bombe atomique } a décidé la guerre.

Thus, it is clear that the general semantic properties of French verbs may aid the linguist and the student of French to describe or internalize respectively many idiosyncratic properties of individual verbs.

Presuppositions of Verbs

In addition to the semantic notions described above which influence the syntax of verbs, there are other semantic facts which, although they are somewhat more abstract, are equally important for an adequate grammatical description. One such property is found in the notion of presupposition, or the conditions under which a word is properly used ("happiness conditions"). Some elementary
presuppositions are found in such verbs as fermer, ouvrir, and in savoir and croire. For example, the appropriate use of the sentence:

117. Fermez la porte!

presupposes that the door is open and that there be some person, other than the speaker, who is in a position to perform the action; ouvrir is similar, but opposite for the first presupposition. Similarly, the sentence:

118. Henri sait que Paris est la capitale de la France.

presupposes that the person uttering it believe that the assertion of the que clause is true. Notice that there is no such presupposition connected with:

119. Henri croit que Paris est la capitale de la France.

The evidence for these claims is found in the fact that (120) is semantically anomalous, whereas (121) is fully acceptable.

120. (?) Henri sait que Paris est la capitale de l'Italie.
121. Henri croit que Paris est la capitale de l'Italie.

While the kinds of presupposition described above seem to be rather trivial, there are important presuppositions which are extremely significant in French grammar. Among these is the presupposition of the truth value of
certain predicates which influences the choice of the subjunctive or indicative mood. Thus, predicates like douter, souhaier, il est peu probable, etc. are used appropriately only if the speaker (or the subject) believes that the assertion of the que clause is not necessarily true (note that it is not required that the assertion of the que clause be presupposed to be false). Many other verbs, requiring the indicative in the que clause, are used appropriately only in the case that the speaker (or the subject) believe that the assertion of this clause is true, or probably true.

In conclusion, there are many semantic facts connected with French verbs which have a significant influence on the syntactic structure of the language. Any grammar which fails to take these semantic facts into account is either unable to provide an adequate description of French syntax, or, at best, is able to do so only in very awkward fashion. Interestingly enough, these semantic facts, as was repeatedly shown, are equally important to the language learner and in highly analogous fashion. Failure to permit the learner to generalize on the semantic facts either leaves him completely unable to produce an appropriate utterance, as was the case with the selection of de and par
where the stative, non-stative distinction is not internalized, or permits him to produce correct utterances at the expense of doubling the demand on his memory load, as was seen in two instances above. Therefore, it is obvious that permitting the learner to draw the correct generalizations has the two-fold benefit of allowing him to possess a grammatical competence in French which more nearly resembles that of a native speaker, and of reducing the load on his memory, thereby freeing time for learning more vocabulary. In short, a better description of a language, properly applied, can result in highly improved teaching materials.
Syntax and Semantics in Language Teaching

The years since 1957 have seen marked changes in syntactic theory, and it is likely that the conceptualization of syntax used in Chapters Three and Four to describe the propositional core of French sentences will be changed at least to some degree in coming years. However, while the theory of syntax is likely to be refined and new relations in abstract syntax may be discovered, the facts revealed by the advances in theory during the last decade will remain unchanged. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to propose that pedagogical materials be designed to assist the second language learner to acquire, in so far as current theories of grammar are able to categorize it, the same implicit knowledge (grammatical competence) that a native speaker of French has about the language.

Thus, in spite of the fact that much of the material in Chapter Three dealt with the application of a system of formal notation to such well known and described syntactic properties as gender and number in French noun
phrases, this same formalization has served to focus the attention of modern grammarians on such topics as nominalizations of infinitives and on prepositional phrases. Hence, in Chapter Three the attempt was made to construct an integrated description of the noun phrase in French including such basic notions as gender and number, as well as nominalizations, sentential complements, and notions of semantic case. It is clear that, since information of this kind constitutes at least part of the implicit knowledge that a native speaker of French has about grammatical relations in French sentences, teaching materials need to incorporate techniques to impart control of grammatical structures of this nature to second language learners regardless of the basic, methodological approach.

Similarly, some of the grammatical description of the French verb phrase in Chapter Four consists largely of the formalization of relationships which have been well known for centuries. However, modern views of linguistic structure have made possible the description of important syntactic generalizations which are dependent on such considerations as the membership of a verb in a particular semantic class. Thus, many aspects of French grammar, such as some uses of the third person reflexive pronoun and
active and passive voice paraphrases, have been described in detail in the earlier literature, but these descriptions consist, in general, of observations that English verbs employ the passive voice whereas French verbs use the indefinite agent or, frequently, the reflexive form of the verb. Furthermore, observations of this kind typically consist of listings of sentence types (as active, passive, reflexive, etc.) without the vaguest hint as to the nature of the criteria the native speaker uses to choose one form over the other. However, some of the more recent concepts of the nature of the semantic structure of human languages permit much more systematic generalizations to be made concerning phenomena of this kind. Hence, as was noted above with the French noun phrase, teaching materials should incorporate devices to aid the second language learner to internalize these facts about French verbs.

The Teaching of Meaning

Perhaps one of the most often criticized parts of the audiolingual method is the dialogue. It is widely claimed that students are able to recite dialogues fluently, 

with excellent pronunciation (frequently with more than acceptable dramatic ability) and yet are unable to respond in similar situations if the speech of the other participant in the dialogue is at variance from the memorized text. Since, in this case, it is obvious that students have failed to learn to use the foreign tongue as a true means of communication, and have, therefore, little concept of what the dialogue means, the problems which are present in the teaching of meaning in the dialogue will be used to illustrate the teaching of meaning in general.

Thus, the teacher's manuals of many textbooks advise the use of paraphrase in the learner's native language, or offer filmstrips, motion pictures, or other visual aids, which illustrate the situation in which the dialogue takes place, to convey the meaning of the foreign utterances. However, while these techniques can convey much information about the situation in general, or about one line in particular, they offer little or no direct aid to the student in deciphering the meaning of the individual lexical items or in determining significant syntactic relationships between them.

An interesting parallel to the case of the student learning a dialogue in a foreign language under the
conditions outlined above is given by Roger Brown who cites the case of a group of students who were asked to memorize the following series of numbers:

5 8 1 2 1 5 1 9 2 2 2 6

After the lapse of an hour, the subjects were asked to recall the list of numbers; they were able to do so with relative ease. After a whole week had elapsed, the subjects were again requested to recall the sequence of numbers. This time, they failed completely in their attempts.

Another group of students was presented with the same string of numbers and asked to memorize them. However, this group was given additional information. They were shown that there is an underlying structure to the list of numbers, e.g.:

5 8 12 15 19 22 26
3 4 3 4 3 4

Thus, the second number is three larger than the first and the third is four larger than the second with the spacing sequence repeated after the third number. Note too that the series begins with the digit 5 and ends with the digit 6.

These facts, together with the three-four variation, yield

the convenient mnemonic device, 3456. This group of students learned the sequence faster than the first group and achieved perfect memory scores both one hour after the study period and one week after.

While this experiment is only somewhat analogous to the mimicry-memorization of dialogues in foreign language classes, it is, nevertheless, useful as a point of comparison. Thus, just as the original, unbroken number sequence meant (in so far as it can "mean" anything) to the subjects the number, five hundred eighty-one billion, two hundred fifteen million, one hundred ninety-two thousand, two hundred and twenty-six, so a perfectly memorized dialogue where the learners understand only the general situation (and none of the structure or individual lexical items) becomes an inflexible, hard to remember reaction to one specific social context. Moreover the use of various types of visual aids, in place of the native language paraphrase, to illustrate either the situation, i.e., the dialogue, as a whole, or to key the meaning of each sentence is, in theory, little more helpful to the student for the
induction of latent structure. 3

Thus, in the case of the paraphrase of the whole dialogue, or simple visual presentation of the situation, all that the learner can justly be expected to learn 4 is to repeat the dialogue without obvious faltering and to explain its meaning by paraphrase in his native language. Similarly, the student who has had a line for line paraphrase, or a separate visual cue for each line of the dialogue can be expected to do no more than to recite the utterances without obvious faltering, to give a paraphrase of each line, and to react appropriately in a highly similar situation with nearly identical linguistic stimuli. While the last two of these three abilities are improvements over the first case cited above, neither of them can be called language learning in any reasonable sense of the word. Both of these cases are, in most respects, identical with the case of the singer who has memorized perhaps dozens of operas in languages other than his native tongue, who knows

3Visual aids do, of course, aid greatly in recall of a specific sentence or situation, but this is not the point at issue. What is important is that the typical visual aid does not directly aid the learner in inducing underlying structural relationships.

4Some students do learn more than this; however, the above techniques do not teach more than this.
the story of each of them (i.e., the dialogue paraphrase), and who can sing them flawlessly. It is not hard to imagine that this singer is a monolingual who would be strained to recognize more than **buò́n giorno!** after hundreds of performances of **Aida**. All too frequently, this has been the case with serious students in foreign language classes. They have performed well in learning the dialogue, in drill activities, and have beautiful pronunciation but are hopelessly lost whenever they are actually forced to use the language for communication.

Some recently published audiolingual text materials have reverted to a literal translation of the foreign language sentences of the dialogue in the students' native tongue in the hope that the additional "meaning" conveyed by this kind of device would aid the students in learning the structural relations in the utterances. However, this approach is open to criticism that was leveled at the


"fractured English" of the grammar-translation approach. 7 Furthermore, it is even difficult to justify the use of distorted sentences in the native language for the purpose of clarifying structural relationships in the foreign language on any grounds. Thus, while 'I have cold' does indicate, in spite of the fact that it is not a grammatical sentence of English, that the student is to use a form of the verb avoir in French to express sensations of heat, cold, fear, hunger, etc., as J'ai froid, the distorted English sentence 'The window closed itself' does not indicate the nature of the structural relationships in the French sentence 'La fenêtre s'est fermée' since, as was pointed out in Chapter Four, the subject of English sentences of this form (with the exception of sentences containing one of the small class of verbs as suggest, present, manifest, etc.) must be understood as agentive, and the reflexive pronoun must be understood as the patient. This paraphrase, then, will lead the learner to infer incorrectly, if he takes the distorted English translation seriously, that the subject la fenêtre is to be understood as a personification of some sort, and that the sentence should, therefore, be

---

interpreted analogously with the sentence Henri s'est tué. Such cases where distorted translation lead the learner to make incorrect guesses about the syntax of the foreign language are not difficult to find, even in languages as closely related as French and English. For languages which are not so closely related, the differences become even more striking and the falsehood of the assumption of pedagogical applicability of the distorted translation is obvious at first sight.

However, even if it were the case that such literal translations could be effective for the clarification of the underlying structure in the foreign language, the same problem of practice exists which brought the audiolingual method into existence. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that mere intellectual awareness of some rule of grammar does not necessarily entail the ability to produce new utterances based on it in an automatic fashion. The production of fluent speech requires not the memorization of a set of rules and lists of lexical items, but the internalization of those rules and words through practice in using them.

It is, of course, true that audiolingual text
materials\textsuperscript{8} provide for some form of exercises based on the structural relations found in the dialogue sentences. In spite of the fact that these pattern practice drills provide for sufficient repetition of the grammatical point to ensure automaticity in production, the dialogue drill sequence is open to the same criticism since the practice of the structure follows the dialogue in which it is first presented to the learner. Thus, the meaning of individual lexical items and the syntactic relations between them remain obscure to the student until after the dialogue has been learned thoroughly.

At first sight, it appears that the solution to the problems of teaching meaning in the dialogue would be to teach the meaning of the individual lexical items, and to practice the structural relations which are found in the new dialogue sentences by oral exercises until the point of automatic control is reached. In actual practice, this technique is, for the most part, reasonably effective for the teaching of French to Americans. However, there are

\textsuperscript{8}Some textbooks do not provide drills of points of grammar, but provide, instead, exercises utilizing the substitution of lexical items in the basic dialogue sentences. This is probably of doubtful value. Cf. W. F. Twaddell, et al., Ecouter et Parler (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966).
are some rather serious theoretical objections to such a simplistic approach to the problem. As was shown above, the necessity for the teaching of structural meaning is obvious and the techniques straight-forward. Thus, any objections to the teaching of vocabulary and structure before the dialogue must rest with the procedures for teaching the individual lexical items.

It has been common practice to teach vocabulary in one of two ways. The traditional approach was to give a native language equivalent for the foreign word. This, however, leads to rather serious difficulties for the learner in some cases since there are often no perfectly similar lexical items in the two languages.\footnote{The difficulties are probably much less severe for languages which are as closely related as French and English due both to their common origin and to the similarity of the cultures in which they are spoken.} For example, the French verb voler, in the sense of illegal transfer of property, might be glossed in the vocabulary listing of a textbook in any one of the following three ways, depending upon the context in which the verb is used in the materials:

a. voler . . . . rob
b. voler . . . . steal
c. voler . . . . rob, steal

However, in the case of a above, listing the translation of
voler as 'rob' obscures the fact that voler can occur in syntactic environments which require the verb 'steal' in English. The converse is true for the listing in b above. The third choice, glossing voler as 'rob, steal' as in c above is little better; such a listing does serve to indicate that voler is in some respects equivalent to either of the English verbs, but it leaves totally obscure the exact nature of similarities and differences. Thus, the memorization of vocabulary lists of this sort leaves the learner with no clue as to the syntactic environments in which it is appropriate to use the lexical item.

Furthermore, the use of a visual aid depicting an act of theft, to use the same example, offers no final solution to the problem. The visual aid is probably a more effective teaching device in the sense that visual aids tend to produce better student recall of specific lexical items.

10 In English, rob takes a human direct object; steal, an inanimate direct object. The French verb voler takes either an animate or an inanimate direct object. Thus, it is possible to say either:
   a. Jean a volé l'argent. or,
   b. Jean a volé Henri.

items and to enhance the student's motivation to learn; however, the visual aid is, by itself, no more effective than the native language gloss in imparting information about the syntactic environments in which it is appropriate to use a given lexical item. Indeed, it is very likely that students, on associating a verb in the foreign language with a pictured action, form their own translations. In this sense then, the use of visual aids for the teaching of vocabulary is little more successful than native language glosses.

The presentation of the meaning of lexical items by the use of visuals does, however, avoid the trap of the teacher or the text presenting a gloss in the native language which is, at best, only a partially correct interpretation of the foreign word. Thus, the student is more likely to reject his own translation as an incorrect hypothesis than he is a printed gloss, or the teacher's definition. Moreover, through the use of pictorial presentation of the meaning of foreign vocabulary it becomes possible to present the learner with a set of sentences which provide, in effect, an inventory of the syntactic environments in which the lexical item may occur. Thus, using a visual aid depicting the action of theft, the
teacher may ask questions which require the student to produce, one by one, responses illustrating the separate syntactic environments in which the lexical item may occur. In the case of the verb voler, the teacher may ask questions which require first the use of an animate direct object (the affected person), then the use of an inanimate direct object (the stolen property), etc. In this way, the basic meaning is taught by the use of the visual, and the syntactic facts about the use of the lexical item are taught by question-answer practice or other form of oral exercise.

Morphology and Syntax in Language Teaching

Not too many years ago, learning the grammar of a foreign language consisted, in essence, of the laborious memorization of numerous charts and paradigms of verb conjugations, noun declensions and the like, together with a handful of rules on word order and gender-number concord. In short, the focus of the learning task was the morphology of the foreign language. Syntax was considered as being generally obvious and the subject was closed after a few comments about pronoun placement in French, or after mention of word order changes as the formation of questions by the inversion of the normal subject-verb order. The
development of the audiolingual method brought little real change in the neglect of syntax. It is true, of course, that the technique of pattern practice was intended to aid in the teaching of syntax. However, it is evident that the concentration of drills in the domain of syntax is, in point of fact, very limited in most audiolingual textbooks and differs little from more traditional views of grammatical structure in that "syntactic" drills concentrate largely on gross word order changes as the formation of inversion questions from normal declarative word order, the formation of passive sentences from actives, and gender-number agreement. Most of the exercise materials in audiolingual (and traditional) French textbooks deal with the formation of automatic responses to the morphological patterns of verbs; in short, they provide intensive oral practice to aid the student in the memorization of the content of inflectional paradigms.

This practice leads to textbooks which sequence the presentation of basic grammatical material for French (exclusive of special requirements caused by the inclusion of fixed expressions or more advanced grammatical structures in the dialogue sentences) from problems of gender, number, agreement of adjectives, basic prepositional phrases, etc.
to the present tense of first conjugation verbs. Verbs of this class are usually followed by the introduction of the reflexive pronouns and several verbs which occur frequently with the reflexive pronouns. Some time after the present tense of the first conjugation and the reflexive forms have been mastered, the second conjugation verbs are presented in the present tense. After this group is mastered, the present tense of the third conjugation is introduced and practiced. Since several dialogues, many additional grammatical topics, and the present tense of a number of irregular verbs intervene in this sequence of presentation, it is frequently late in the second semester of high school French before the conversational past tense is introduced for first conjugation verbs. Typically, the same sequence of conjugational classes is followed with the past tense, interrupted by additional grammatical material. In short, hopefully sometime before the end of the second year of high school language study, all tenses of the active voice of all three conjugations have been taught. This period has probably also seen the introduction of the subjunctive and other grammatical topics, although it is not uncommon for the passive voice to be ignored until the third year of high school French.
The presentation of the tenses of the passive voice follows the same general procedure of first conjugation, present tense of the passive, then second conjugation, present passive, and so on. The problems presented by the passive voice in French are further complicated by grammatical generalizations which state, without further clarification, that the passive voice is not as common in French as it is in English. Mention is usually made of the indefinite agent pronoun on, and of the fact that the French sometimes use a reflexive form of the verb where English uses the passive construction. Thus, the syntax of the auxiliary in passive constructions is disguised to some extent by being fragmented by the interspersion of numerous morphological variants, and the syntax and semantics of the use of the passive is beclouded by inadequate formulations of rules.

While it is obviously extremely important that the student of French learn to use the correct grammatical form, it is also clear that the process of learning the morphological variations in the language should not eclipse the learning of the syntactic relations. Thus, it would appear likely that the presentation of the same tense for each conjugational class before the introduction of the
next tense spreads the structure of the auxiliary over such a long period of time and intersperses so much extraneous grammatical material that the generalization of the syntactic processes of tense formation becomes an extremely difficult task for the learner. Moreover, the fact that the infinitive form of verbs is not presented until relatively late in the language program may introduce additional difficulties for the learner since the ending of the infinitive form serves as an additional aid in the classification of morphological type.\(^\text{12}\) Furthermore, the postponement of the passive voice and other, related structures until late in the second year or early in the third year of high school French can only serve to obscure many significant generalizations about the verb phrase in French. For example, the student may not recognize\(^\text{13}\) the fact that the sentence: *La fenêtre est cassée* may be understood in two ways, one of which gives *cassée* adjectival force; the other, verbal. Obviously, if the learner has failed to

\(^{12}\) This should not be understood as a plea for the return of rote memory of inflectional paradigms, but as a recognition of the fact that infinitives can be introduced at an early stage in sentences as: *Marcher est difficile.*

\(^{13}\) Recognize should not be construed as necessarily meaning that the learner be able to state some kind of explicit rule of grammar.
internalize this distinction, he has missed a generalization of considerable importance in French syntax.

However, the problems presented by the existence of several conjugational classes of French verbs are not insurmountable. For, if the position is accepted that syntax is generative, then it becomes obvious that much of the structure of the auxiliary system in French can be taught in a relatively short time provided that the introduction of verbs of the second and third conjugations be postponed in favor of presenting several tenses for verbs of the first conjugation. Thus, by concentrating on verbs of the first conjugation—the most productive class—it should be possible to teach the present, the passé composé, the imperfect, the near future and true future during the first level. Since some of the reflexive forms are presented in first level courses at the current time, the postponement of some of the problems presented by the multitude of inflectional variants would permit additional uses of

---

14 This argument is not appreciably weakened by a view that semantics is generative since this position is chiefly concerned with the form of the base component and the point in the above discussion deals with the structure of the auxiliary system.

15 The other tenses require, in general, the existence of embedded structures before they are properly used.
reflexive verb forms to be taught as well as portions of the passive. Notice that, in addition to offering the learner most of the tenses which occur in 'kernel' sentences, sequencing in this fashion presents other advantages to the student. Hence, if it can be assumed that the average student knows, say, fifty verbs of the first conjugation and is able to use them correctly in all persons of the present tense, then teaching him ten new verbs in the second conjugation present tense amounts to an increase of only twenty percent in the total number of messages he can transmit. On the other hand, given the same knowledge of fifty verbs, teaching the student the past tense increases by one hundred percent the total number of messages he can transmit; teaching the imperfect doubles this number a second time, and so on. Thus, within the space of, at most, several months it should be possible to enlarge greatly the total range of experience that the student may converse about in the foreign language. It is not unreasonable to assume that such a rapid increase in fluency

16 It is probably impossible to teach the student the use of the reflexive with inanimate subjects as: 'la fenêtre se casse without teaching at least some passive forms.
should have a concomitant effect on student motivation. Moreover, the generalization of morphological facts of tense formation for the second and third conjugations could conceivably be made easier for the learner since the system of tense formation for the first conjugation should furnish a framework of syntax to which the learner may fasten the facts of morphology for the other conjugations. Furthermore, the early presentation of such contrasts as that between the passé composé and the imperfect in French would allow the teacher to spend much more time with the difficulties involved. Finally, although it is dangerous to generalize from first to second language learning, the evidence from the acquisition of the native language by children is that several tenses of regular verbs (or of the most productive class of regular verbs—the first conjugation in the case of French) before acquiring all the variants of

17 The end result after two years of study would obviously not be the ability to encode more messages. No more is being taught; only the sequence is being altered.

18 While it might be argued that this order of presentation could tend to obscure some of the morphophonemic facts of French verbs (Cf. Sanford Schane, *French Phonology and Morphology* [Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1968]), it is not at all clear that the current sequence for presenting each tense for each conjugation is any better.
irregular verbs. It is also generally true that children learn to produce most forms which occur in simple sentences before they master many embedded constructions. Both of these facts offer additional evidence in support of the position outlined above for the sequence of tense and conjugation presentation.

The sequence for the presentation of tenses proposed in this chapter can be argued with on at least two points. First, the proposed sequencing permits some very common grammatical structures to be delayed while some less common structures are introduced much earlier. Second, the postponement of the second and third conjugations entails the postponement of essential vocabulary. However, the first of these arguments turns out to be rather weak on close examination. It has been the case with frequency lists of grammatical structures, as was the case with the grammatical descriptions of both traditional grammarians and structural linguists, to base the evidence for relative frequency on morphological facts rather than syntactic relations. Thus, it is not reasonable to offer such lists as

prima facie condemnations of the proposed resequencing of tense presentation offered in this section since such lists ignore completely the basis for such resequencing. It may, of course, be true that lists of structural frequency provide the best guide for the order of presentation of grammatical material. Certainly, frequency lists cannot be totally disregarded; however, slavish adherence to them under conditions which tend to conceal grammatical facts from the second language learner can not be countenanced. The second of the arguments against resequencing given above would appear to be more serious. While many, if not most, of the verbs of the second and third conjugations have synonyms among the verbs of the first conjugation (or can be paraphrased in a reasonable manner), there are some verbs in these two conjugations which affect the choice of verbs of the first conjugation to be taught. Thus, it makes little sense to teach the verb acheter if vendre will not be presented for, perhaps, six months more. However, the number of such cases is not large, and may, indeed, prove to be of little importance. In any case, it should be possible to offer these few verbs at an early stage as irregular forms and thereby avoid the problem.
In conclusion of this section, the argument was raised that textbooks and exercise materials for second language teaching should be designed to give the learner control of as much syntax as possible during the first year of language study, even if so doing entails the postponement of some facts of morphology until the second year. While the force of the arguments for such an approach appears to be greater than the force of those that can be raised against it, the difference is not overwhelming. However, it is certain that such an approach is worth trying under controlled experimental conditions.

Grammar and Methods

No discussion of the application of linguistics to the teaching of foreign languages would be complete without a prescription of the methods to be followed in that pursuit. Some have claimed that the recent advances in the study of syntax and in the psychology of language learning have furnished a complete refutation of the audiolingual method. Since this is a matter of no small concern for

the language teaching profession, it would seem logical to consider the relevance of modern theories of syntax for the support of the grammar-translation method since this method is, apparently, seen by many as the major viable alternative to the audiolingual approach.

Since the problems encountered in the teaching of meaning through translational equivalents have already been discussed in some detail in this chapter, the following discussion of the support of the new linguistics for the grammar-translation method will focus on the type of grammatical knowledge which has traditionally been required of the student by proponents of the approach. Accordingly, it has been common practice by advocates of the method to present the student with a rule of grammar illustrated with one or two examples and then to require him to produce new utterances on command (cued either by translation from the native tongue or, occasionally, in response to an utterance in the foreign language). Rather obviously, the study of generative grammars does not prescribe any particular form of exercise or drill format for the teaching of foreign languages. Therefore, any claim that generative grammars lend support to the grammar-translation method must rest ultimately on the increased accuracy of the grammatical
the rules and vocabulary would not be able to respond orally to sentences in the artificial language without considerable practice. In short, some form of oral practice in the application of the rule is needed to give the learner the kind of control that is needed for fluent speech. The only possible advantage that a more accurate or complete grammar has is that the rules cannot lead the learner to produce ungrammatical strings through imprecise or incorrect statements of generalizations. Thus, the shortcomings of the grammar-translation method that led to the development of the audiolingual approach are in no way overcome or even affected by grammatical theory.

Another method which competes in importance with the audiolingual approach is the direct method. As it was originally conceived, this method makes no use of the learners' native language, and meaning and structure are taught by questions and answers concerning objects in the

---

23 The advantages of using an artificial language are: (1) there is no need to teach a new system of pronunciation, (2) the grammar of the language cannot, by definition, generate incorrect strings. In short, it is impossible to quibble over semi-grammaticality and the like.

24 The audiovisual method of film-tape-text is considered herein to be a special case of the direct method which differs primarily in the application of technology and very little in philosophy.
immediate environment and the actions that can be associated with them. Reading was typically introduced immediately and written exercises were assigned within the first few days of the beginning of the language course. With the development of the audiolingual method, many practitioners of the direct method began to withhold written materials thereby initiating a prereading phase within the method. The introduction of structure in minimal steps and the fact that direct method textbooks make little or no use of dialogues constitute the major differences from the audiolingual method. Therefore, the comments on the relative importance of morphology and syntax in teaching the structure of a foreign language made earlier in this chapter apply equally as well to the direct method as to the audiolingual method.

Thus, if the recommendations made earlier in this chapter for the sequencing of materials and for the teaching of meaning were to be carried out completely, the sole difference between the audiolingual method and a similarly restructured direct method would be in the use of dialogues. Obviously there is no linguistic reason for the inclusion of dialogues in a language course; however, the dialogue does serve the functions of presenting language in a
cultural setting and in initiating some form of conversation. The problems inherent in the teaching of the dialogue can be further simplified if the dialogue is presented at the end of a text unit and contains only structures and vocabulary which have already been taught, either in that unit or in previous units. Structured in this way, the beginning language course can provide swift buildup of syntax while emphasizing oral language ability and yet provide the fixed expressions and conversational stimuli of the established audiolingual courses.
CHAPTER SIX: RECOMMENDATIONS TO TEXT BOOK WRITERS

The purpose of this chapter is threefold. First, a general methodological approach to develop all four skills will be suggested. This approach will be consistent with the description of French syntax developed in this dissertation, with the changed views of the nature of language learning described in Chapter Two, as well as, and most important, with sound techniques of language teaching and recognition of the need for competent oral language skills. Second, a sequence for the presentation of the major syntactic components of French will be suggested to facilitate the development of fluency in all skills. Third, several illustrative units will be provided to demonstrate the kinds of activities which may be used to develop both linguistic competence and performance.

General Methodological Approach

The general methodological approach which will be developed below is a variation on the direct method, with several highly important modifications.
First, this version of the direct method has the constraint that only one structure may be introduced in one lesson. Structural material is presented orally in a manner designed to permit the student to induce the significant syntactic and semantic relations. In addition, morphological complexities are presented much later than is typical in order to teach more syntax as early as possible.

Second, after each unit, the structures which have been taught are to be recombined in the form of a dialogue. Notice that although the dialogue is poorly suited to the purpose assigned to it in currently available texts, the introduction of basic sentences for overlearning and the induction of structural relationships, it is ideally suited to the adaptation of previously taught structure and vocabulary in conversational situations. Furthermore, there are many idioms and transition words which are best taught in the form of a dialogue, and which can be taught only awkwardly outside a conversational situation. Since the function of the dialogue in this conceptualization is not to furnish lexical and structural material for overlearning and "habit formation," there is no need for it to be learned by heart. Once the general situation is learned (the structures and vocabulary have been mastered before
the dialogue is introduced), the lines may be changed by the use of visual or oral stimuli by the teacher to provide immediate adaptation of all the structure and vocabulary taught in the unit within the cultural situation defined by the context of the dialogue.

Third, the general approach depends highly upon visual aids depicting elements both within the immediate school environment and in an authentically depicted French environment, with an aim to make the language learning task relevant to classroom demands and to provide for instruction in the foreign culture. In addition, the use of visuals permits continuous reinforcement of the semantic content of the lesson.

Fourth, the audiolingual techniques of choral and individual repetition, oral question and answer practice, oral structure drill, directed dialogue, etc. are used to develop the skills of listening comprehension and speaking.

Fifth, a pre-reading phase is recommended for the first few weeks to allow full concentration on the development of pronunciation skills.

Sixth, reading will be introduced gradually by teaching the sound-symbol relationships of French. Writing will follow the same schema, beginning with simple
phonic-based exercises. The purposes of this approach are to teach students the spelling variations of the French sounds which they can already produce with excellent pronunciation, and to avoid pronunciation errors caused by the students' incorrect application of English phonic rules—a phenomenon which is bound to occur if sight reading techniques are used to the exclusion of the teaching of sound-symbol relationships.

In summary, the outline of course content and methodological approach sketched above is clearly in harmony with the description of French grammar given in Chapters Three and Four and with the pedagogical implications discussed in Chapter Five. The content suggested is arranged in an orderly, logical sequence from which the learner may generalize the significant syntactic and semantic properties of the language. In addition, the postponement of morphological complexities in favor of early introduction of more varied and complex syntactic generalizations should permit the learner to describe more adequately his thoughts in the foreign language and should provide a framework of tense formation rules which should simplify the acquisition of different morphological classes. That is, after having learned the passé composé of first
conjugation verbs, the generalization of formation with the present tense of *avoir* followed by the past participle should transfer without difficulty to the second and third conjugations. Furthermore, the approach is consistent with the changed views of the nature of language learning in so far as these may be relevant to second language learning. At each stage of the learning process, the student generalizes the underlying semantic and syntactic relationships being presented; the ample oral practice and the variation of the social context in which such structural relationships may occur (by dialogue adaptation) provide opportunities for the development of fluency in differing situations. Finally, the adoption of many audiolingual techniques provides for the adequate development of the classic four skills.

A Suggested First Year Course Sequence

The sequence of grammatical topics which is presented below is designed to provide for the rapid internalization of syntactic processes at the expense of learning morphological variants. It is not unlikely that an attempt to construct a complete first year text based on this outline may uncover some irresolvable conflicts between the
introduction of some points of syntax and of some morphological variants. Every attempt has been made to avoid or overcome such problems; however, suggesting an outline is a much less demanding task than is the creation of a viable text. Therefore, this outline should be considered only as a general guide and not as an absolute and immutable rule for grammatical sequence.

In the following outline, each lesson should require approximately one fifty-minute class period. The dialogues and dialogue adaptations may require more time.

UNIT ONE

lesson

1. gender of nouns; the indefinite article. (C'est un sac.) interrogation with Est-ce...?

2. indefinite noun plurals. (Ce sont des sacs.)

3. gender of nouns; the definite article; predicate locative phrases. (Le livre est sur le bureau.)

4. predicate adjectives; gender agreement. (La maison est verte.)

5. pronoun agreement. (Le livre est bleu--Il est bleu.)

6. present tense of Être. (Nous sommes sur la plage.)

7. dialogue one and adaptations.
UNIT TWO

8. non-reflexive present tense of first conjugation verbs like laver. (Papa lave la voiture.) Third person singular and plural.

9. first and second persons singular.

10. first and second persons plural.

11. drill on use of tu and vous.

12. dialogue two and adaptations. (all dialogues and adaptations contain material from previous units in new combinations with the structures taught within the current unit.)

UNIT THREE
(introduction of sound-symbol relationships; single word reading)

13. present tense of avoir. (Henri a un livre.) Third person singular and plural.

14. first and second persons singular.

15. first and second persons plural.

16. avoir with expressions of age; kinship relations.

17. dialogue three and adaptations.

UNIT FOUR
(continuation of sound-symbol instruction)

18. passé composé of verbs like laver, non-reflexive use. third person singular and plural.

19. first and second persons singular.

20. first and second persons plural.
21. introduction of the instrument phrase (avec noun phrase).

22. dialogue four and adaptations.

UNIT FIVE
(whole sentence reading; early dialogue reading)

23. class II possessives. (...la porte de l'eglise.)

24. partitive with adverb of quantity. (...un peu de lait.)

25. true partitive. feminine singular mass nouns; singular mass nouns beginning with a vowel sound.

26. masculine singular mass nouns; partitive with count nouns.

27. il y a--partitive--locative phrase. (Il y a du lait sur la table.)

28. dialogue five and adaptations.

(approximate end of first six weeks)

UNIT SIX
(paragraph reading; recombination narratives)

29. present tense of aller with locative phrases. (Paul va à la plage.) singular forms.

30. plural forms.

31. near future tense. (aller and infinitive.) singular forms.

32. plural forms.

33. dialogue six and adaptations.
UNIT SEVEN

34. reflexive use of verbs like *laver*, third person singular and plural, present tense.
35. first and second singular, present tense.
36. first and second plural, present tense.
37. dialogue seven and adaptations.

UNIT EIGHT

38. near future of reflexives like *laver*, singular forms.
39. plural forms.
40. passé composé of reflexives like *laver*, third person singular and plural.
41. first and second persons singular.
42. first and second persons plural.
43. dialogue eight and adaptations.

UNIT NINE

44. present tense of change-of-state-in-animate verbs. (*tuer*, *blesser*, etc.) agent and instrument
45. near future tense. agent and instrument subjects.
46. passé composé. agent and instrument subjects.
47. passé composé with the reflexive.
48. dialogue nine and adaptations.

(approximate end of second six weeks)
UNIT TEN

49. present tense of change-of-state verbs like casser, briser, brûler, etc. agent and instrument subjects.

50. present tense with objective subjects (pronominal voice).

51. dialogue ten and adaptations.

UNIT ELEVEN

52. passé composé of verbs like casser with agent and instrument subjects.

53. near future with agent and instrument subjects.

54. passé composé of pronominal voice.

55. near future of pronominal voice.

56. dialogue eleven and adaptation.

UNIT TWELVE

57. past participles of change-of-state verbs used as predicate adjectives. (stative use of participle.)

58. adjective embedding in position after nouns. (C'est une fenêtre cassée.)

59. adjective embedding in position before nouns. (C'est un petit rocher.)

60. adjective embedding in any noun phrase, following adjectives. (Une pierre rouge a brisé la fenêtre.)

61. adjective embedding in any noun phrase, preceding adjectives. (Maman lave le petit bébé.)

62. dialogue twelve and adaptations.
UNIT THIRTEEN

63. imperfect of être followed by a stative adjective or a predicate noun phrase. third person singular and plural.

64. first and second persons singular.

65. first and second persons plural.

66. imperfect of avoir with body states. (avoir mal à.) third person singular and plural.

67. first and second persons singular.

68. first and second persons plural.

69. dialogue thirteen and adaptations.

(approximate end of first semester)

UNIT FOURTEEN

70. imperfect of verbs like laver; tuer; casser, with repeated or habitual action in the past. third person singular and plural.

71. first and second persons singular.

72. first and second persons plural.

73. dialogue fourteen and adaptations.

UNIT FIFTEEN

74. present tense of verbs like donner, envoyer, etc. all persons. introduction of indirect objects.

75. passé composé. all persons.

76. near future. all persons.
UNIT SIXTEEN

79. direct object pronouns with the present tense.
80. indirect object pronouns with the present tense.
81. order of object pronouns, third person indirect object.

le
la
devant
lui
les
leur

82. order of object pronouns, first and second person indirect objects.

me
te
devant
le
us
vous

83. order of object pronouns with the imperfect tense.
84. dialogue sixteen and adaptations.

UNIT SEVENTEEN

85. direct object pronouns with the passé composé.
86. indirect object pronouns with the passé composé.
87. direct object with third person indirect with the passé composé.
88. direct object with first or second person indirect with the passé composé.
89. dialogue seventeen and adaptations.

(approximate end of fourth six weeks)
UNIT EIGHTEEN

90. replacement of de and noun phrase by en. pure partitive.
91. with partitive after adverbs of quantity.
92. with de and noun phrase preceded by a numeral.
93. order of en with other pronoun objects.
94. dialogue eighteen and adaptations.

UNIT NINETEEN

95. possessives type I. être à moi, etc. singular forms.
96. plural forms.
97. possessive adjectives. singular forms.
98. possessive adjectives. plural forms.
99. dialogue nineteen and adaptations.

UNIT TWENTY

100. future tense. third person singular and plural.
101. first and second person singular.
102. first and second person plural.
103. position of object pronouns.
104. dialogue twenty and adaptations.

UNIT TWENTY-ONE

105. surface contact verbs. (frapper, pincer, etc.) present tense with agent and instrument subjects.
106. passé composé.
107. near future.
108. future.
109. imperfect.
110. stative interpretation of the past participle with de and instrument noun phrase. (La maison est frappée de tous les vents du ciel.)
111. other two-place predicates (laver, etc.) in the stative with de plus instrument phrase.
112. dialogue twenty-one and adaptations.

(average end of fifth six weeks)

UNIT TWENTY-TWO

113. relative clauses with qui. verbs in present tense.
114. relative clauses with à qui. verbs in present tense.
115. relative clauses with que. verbs in present tense.
116. relative clauses with verbs in near future and future.
117. with verbs in passé composé and imperfect.
118. dialogue twenty-two and adaptations.

UNIT TWENTY-THREE

119. sentence negation. present tense.
120. sentence negation. imperfect and future.
121. sentence negation. passé composé.
122. noun phrase negation. relative clauses with qui.
123. noun phrase negation. relative clauses with à qui.
124. noun phrase negation. relative clauses with que.
125. dialogue twenty-three and adaptations.

UNIT TWENTY-FOUR

126. review of interrogatives with est-ce que. sentence interrogation.
127. sentence interrogation. inversion questions.
128. noun phrase interrogation with relative clauses with qui and à qui.
129. noun phrase interrogation. relative clauses with que.
130. dialogue twenty-four and adaptations.

UNIT TWENTY-FIVE

131. present passive. par and agent. avec and instrument.
132. passé composé of Être.
133. passé composé passive. par and agent. avec and instrument.
134. future passive. par and agent. avec and instrument.
135. near future passive.
136. imperfect passive. habitual and repeated action.
137. contrast action sense of passives with similar surface structures describing statives.
138. dialogue twenty-five and adaptations.

(approximate end of level one)
It should be noted that only one hundred thirty-eight lessons have been provided. Most of these will probably require a full class period, some will require more time, and still others will require less time. Thus, it seems likely that one hundred thirty to one hundred fifty days will be required to teach these structures adequately. Furthermore, it is likely that several irregular verbs will need to be taught in a viable first year course, thus consuming some additional class time. In addition, some eighteen to thirty-six class periods need to be reserved for bi-weekly or weekly class tests, thereby consuming at least the one hundred eighty to one hundred ninety days of the normal school year.

In summary, the number of syntactic structures included in this outline would, at first sight, seem quite formidable. However, it must be borne in mind that several weeks have been saved for this purpose by postponing the tenses of the second and third conjugations until the early part of the second year. Notice too that the numerous dialogues included in this outline do not need to be memorized by mimicry-memorization, a process in classic audiolingual teaching which consists of memorizing from right to left and top to bottom numerous near nonsense syllables. The
early introduction of verb tenses for the first conjugation, as well as the early introduction of the true reflexives and the pronominal voice permits longer and more intense practice on these traditionally difficult concepts. The framework of syntax which the student has learned in this first year sequence should also provide a firm foundation for the acquisition of the tenses of the second and third conjugations as well as the perfect tenses in the second year course. Finally, the inclusion of learned structures and vocabulary into conversational situations featuring immediate adaptation in new combinations with older structures should provide a high degree of motivation since the procession of learning is from brief practice to immediate application.

Sample Lesson Plans

The following lesson plans have been included for the purpose of illustrating some basic techniques for teaching grammatical structure in a manner consistent with the basic approach and sequence of presentation of materials suggested in this chapter. It is likely that the choice of vocabulary items would need to be changed for consistency of use in a completed text. Although only four plans are
shown, the techniques are easily adapted to any of the structures listed in the suggested course outline.

**Sample Lesson One**
(visuals are on page 196)

I. **Repetition Phase**

Using the appropriate visual aid shown, the teacher models the pronunciation of the first model sentence several times. The class is then required to repeat the sentence in chorus four or five times until the pronunciation is good; the teacher reinforces each class response. Difficult sounds or syllables may be isolated for pronunciation practice. Following the choral repetition of each sentence, a number of individuals are asked to repeat after the teacher who reinforces each response. Each model sentence is treated in the same fashion.

**Model Sentences**

1. C'est un livre.
2. C'est un chien.
3. C'est un garçon.
4. C'est un crayon.
5. C'est un arbre.
6. C'est un sac.
7. C'est un tapis.
8. C'est un revolver.
PLATE I
Visual Aids for Sample Lesson One
II. **Question-Answer Practice**

Following the same procedure of choral response followed by individual response outlined above for repetition, a number of question-answer practice types may be used. These are:

1. **Qu'est-ce que c'est?** - C'est un livre. etc.
2. **Est-ce un livre?** - Oui, c'est un livre. etc.

Using an inappropriate sentence with one of the visuals, the teacher may ask the following type of question:

3. **Est-ce un chien?** - Non, c'est un livre. etc.

A question requiring a choice may be asked.

4. **Est-ce un chien ou un livre?** - C'est un livre. etc.

III. **Structure Drill**

For this activity, the entire drill is done chorally, then individuals are required to give the appropriate response. All responses are reinforced by the teacher.


Teacher: C'est un livre.

Class: Repeats.

Teacher: C'est un livre. chien

Class: C'est un chien.
Teacher: C'est un chien. garçon., and so forth.

The full form of the drill is:

C'est un livre.
   chien
   garçon
   crayon
   arbre
   sac
   tapis
   revolver

IV. Directed Dialogue

In this activity, the teacher asks one student to ask another a question based on the visuals and model sentences used in the unit. Thus, using the first visual and model sentence, the instructions would be as follows:

Teacher: (holding the appropriate visual) Jean, demandez à Marie ce que c'est. Jean, vous dites: Qu'est-ce que c'est? Marie, vous répondez: C'est un livre.

The same procedure would be used for the remainder of the visuals and model sentences.

V. Grammatical Generalization

The purpose of this activity is to get the students to verbalize the facts they have induced and to provide a general statement of the grammatical point in question.

The generalization for this unit is rather simple.

Teacher: Which word in the sentences we have just practiced names the object in the picture?
Class volunteer: The last word.

Teacher: What stayed the same in all the sentences?

Class volunteer: [setoē](c'est un)

Notice that, only having heard and spoken these sentences, the class would be unable to generalize beyond this point. However, after some feminine nouns have been practiced in the same type of sentence (C'est une fleur, etc.), the class will be able to differentiate un and une as the noun markers, and thereby to the existence of two noun classes in French.

Sample Lesson Two
(visuals are on page 200)

I. Repetition Phase

In this lesson, an additional technique is used: the induction by the class of structural relations through the use of contrasting structural environments. The general techniques of teacher modeling, followed by choral and individual repetition is still used. However, after the first sentence is practiced, the teacher pauses in his presentation to allow an individual student (who has induced the structural principle) to supply the correct response.
PLATE II
Visual Aids for Sample Lesson Two
Model Sentence One

Teacher (pointing to book in visual #1): Qu'est-ce que c'est?

Class: C'est un livre.

Teacher (pointing to desk): Qu'est-ce que c'est?

Class: C'est un bureau.

Teacher: Où est le livre? (asks question several times, pretending to look for the book.)

Teacher: Le livre est sur le bureau. (models sentence several times and calls for choral and individual repetition until class is fluent with the sentence.)

Model Sentence Two

Teacher (pointing to dog): Qu'est-ce que c'est?

Class: C'est un chien.

Teacher (pointing to bed): Qu'est-ce que c'est?

Class: C'est un lit.

Teacher: Où est le chien?

Here, the teacher pauses and asks for a volunteer (who has induced the replacement of un by le for previously mentioned nouns) to supply the response: Le chien est sur le lit. If a student is able to answer correctly, he is congratulated for his effort, and the choral and individual repetition is done for the sentence. The same pause for inductive response is given for the third, and other
similar examples. If no student has yet seen the structural relationship, the teacher supplies the answer which is practiced with choral and individual repetition. The inductive pause is then provided in the next following example. (Note that only the first three examples on the accompanying visuals are suitable for this technique since the others contain prepositions which have not yet been learned.)

**Model Sentences:**

1. Le livre est sur le bureau.
2. Le chien est sur le lit.
3. Le chat est sur le fauteuil.
4. Le stylo est dans le sac.
5. Le garçon est devant le bâtiment.
6. Le garçon est derrière l'arbre.
7. Le professeur est derrière le garçon.
8. Le stylo est par terre.

**II. Question-Answer Practice**

Several types of question-answer practice are possible for this lesson. They are:

1. **Teacher:** Où est le livre?
   
   **Class:** Le livre est sur le bureau.

2. **Teacher:** Est-ce que le livre est sur le bureau?
   
   **Class:** Oui, le livre est sur le bureau.

3. **Teacher:** Est-ce que le livre est sur le lit?
   
   **Class:** Non, le livre est sur le bureau.
4. Teacher: Est-ce que le livre est sur le bureau on le lit?

Class: Le livre est sur le bureau.

III. Structure Drill

An open-end substitution drill may be used for this lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>le chien</th>
<th>est</th>
<th>sur</th>
<th>le lit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>le chat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le livre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>le bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le stylo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>par terre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and so forth.

IV. Directed Dialogue

A direct dialogue should be presented based on the model sentences. The techniques are identical with those used in sample lesson one.

V. Grammatical Generalization

Teacher: What do all the nouns in the sentences we have just practiced have in common?

Class: They are all masculine nouns.

Teacher: What word replaces the un when we are speaking of the objects' location?

Class: Le.
Teacher: Which words show the location?
Class: Sur, dans, devant, derrière, par terre.
Teacher: Where do these words come in the sentence?
Class: Before the le that goes with the last noun.

Sample Lesson Three
(visually are on page 205)

I. Repetition

This section of the lesson is performed exactly in the same manner as the repetition phase of sample lesson one. No inductive phase is possible here since this is the first introduction of verbs like laver.

Model Sentences
1. Papa lave la voiture.
2. Maman lève le bébé.
3. Maman couche le bébé.
4. Papa réveille le garçon.
5. Maman habille le bébé.
6. Papa lève le pneu.
7. Le coiffeur rase le client.
8. Le garçon gratte le chien.

II. Question-Answer Practice

The question-answer practice has one additional question type:

Teacher: Que fait Papa?
Class: Papa lave la voiture. etc.
PLATE III
Visual Aids for Sample Lesson Three
III. Structure Drill

An open-end substitution drill is suitable for this lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>lave</th>
<th>la voiture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papa</td>
<td></td>
<td>le bébé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maman</td>
<td></td>
<td>couche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papa</td>
<td></td>
<td>réveille</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and so forth.

IV. Directed Dialogue

There is no change in the techniques of the directed dialogue from the first two sample lessons.

V. Grammatical Generalization

Teacher: What word names the person doing the action?

Class: The first noun.

Teacher: What word names the person or thing affected by the action?

Class: The last noun.

Teacher: Where is the word that describes the action located?

Class: Between the two nouns.
Sample Lesson Four
(visuals on page 208)

I. Repetition and Induction

In this lesson, as in sample lesson two, it is possible to make use of contrastive structures to allow students to induce the structural relations. Thus, making use of visuals similar to those in the last sample lesson to contrast with the visuals for this lesson, the teacher says:

Dans ce dessin, Papa lave la voiture. 
Mais, dans celui-ci, Papa se lave.

This second sentence is practiced chorally and individually. Moving on to the next set of visuals, the teacher says:

Dans ce dessin, Papa couche le bébé. 
Mais, dans celui-ci, ...

Here, the teacher pauses to allow a volunteer who has induced the structural and semantic change to supply the correct response. This is repeated chorally and individually. The same technique is used for the remaining model sentences.

Model Sentences

1. Papa se lave.
2. Papa se couche.
3. Le garçon se réveille.
4. Papa s'habille.
5. Le garçon se lève.
6. Papa se déshabille.
PLATE IV
Visual Aids for Sample Lesson Four
7. Papa se rase.
8. Le garçon se gratte.

II. **Question-Answer Practice**

The techniques and question types are the same as those used in sample lesson three.

III. **Structure Drill**

An open-end substitution drill may be used at this point in the lesson. After the other persons have been taught, a person-number substitution drill is effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papa</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>lave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>couche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le garçon</td>
<td></td>
<td>reveille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and so forth.

IV. **Directed Dialogue**

There is no change in the techniques for the directed dialogue.

V. **Grammatical Generalization**

The following two columns of sentences are written on the chalkboard.
A.
Papa lave la voiture.
Papa couche le bébé.
Le garçon habille le bébé.
Le coiffeur rase le client.

B.
Papa se lave.
Papa se couche.
Le garçon s'habille.
Le coiffeur se rase.

Teacher: In the sentences in column A, which noun refers to the person doing the action?

Class: The first one.

Teacher: Which noun refers to the person or thing affected by the action?

Class: The second one.

Teacher: Does the first noun in each sentence refer to the same or a different person than the second noun?

Class: Different.

Teacher: Now look at the sentences in column B. What word refers to the person who performs the action?

Class: The noun.

Teacher: Who is affected by the action? Is it the same person as the subject or a different person?

Class: The same.

Teacher: What word has been added to all the sentences in column B?

Class: Se.

Teacher: Where does this word come in the sentence?

Class: Before the verb.

Teacher: What does this word refer to?

Class: The same person as the subject.
Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, a general methodological approach and a tentative outline of the sequence of grammatical topics for a first year text book of French have been suggested. In addition, several illustrative lessons have been provided. The general approach and the content and format of the sample lessons contain no radical breach with accepted pedagogical principles. Indeed, in the writer's experience, many teachers are turning to a similar general approach and are adapting their current text books to this set of techniques. Thus, the only controversial element of this chapter is the suggested sequence for the presentation of syntactic structures. While this sequence is unproven, it is nevertheless plausible. Nonetheless, it must remain controversial until a full set of materials is developed and tested under experimental conditions in the classroom. Certainly the techniques, as illustrated in the sample lessons, are both adaptable to and adequate for materials using the suggested sequence. In addition, the grammatical insights furnished by a case grammar of French will aid greatly in the development of correct grammatical generalizations. It is the writer's hope that the methods and
sequences suggested in this chapter will be tested in the near future.
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