ANALYTICAL SYNTAX FOR TEACHING ENGLISH (2)

— a non-native approach —

October 1972

Kan KATAYANAGI

Chapter II   Predication[1]

2.1 We now depart from the realm where speech, among other modes of human behavior, happens to be an immediate action or its substitute, confined to each situation and occasion. Predication, the act of making a statement and of comprehending what is stated, belongs to another realm where language is a paramount, if not the sole, agent, existing on its own, independent of what is being stated or who is doing the stating. Whereas exclamatory and imperative utterances are confined within the immediate context, i. e., the actuality in which the speech is being enacted, every statement is in a pair of suppressed parenthesis, so to speak; in other words, when one makes a statement, what he is actually doing is *quoting* himself. As we go thus across the borderline, we should be fully aware of the fact that the status of the speech is shifting from that of pragmatic to idiational.

  Pedagogically, the transition may be made either abruptly or subtlly, but it is essential that the distinction should be clearly established, for an instance, by bringing up the fact that there is an important discontinuity between, say, "You, go!" and "You go." Even a dog might react to the first but it is only the human intelligence that comprehends the second, whether the person implied goes or stays being utterly irrelevant. It is not the mere addition of the so-called 'subject' to what is otherwise an imperatiave formation that distinguishes a statement from a .verbal command, nor is imperative formation simply something short of predicate formation. To formulate the predicative intent in the articulate two terms—one static, the other dynamic—is perhaps a logical universal, but that its expression should rigorously embody the formula may be another matter.

---

1) Continuation from the article entitled "Analytical Syntax for Teaching English (1)", appearing
    in the previous issue of the present publication, p. 13 ff., 1971.

The binary structure of English predication, i.e., Subject-Predicate juxstaposition, should be pointed out with extra emphasis to our subjects, Japanese learners, in whose language it is not a formal requirement of predication. In the process of teaching, however, acquainting the learners exclusively with examples of binary formula may enhance the habit but it will not offset the potential of forming sentences which are vague of their formal subjects, i.e., teaching of one language should include the suppression of another. Some measures should be taken, therefore, to cancel that latent inclination of Japanese learners.

Appeal should be therefore made to the learner's intellectual understanding, above all, of this fact rather than imposing automatization of mental operations. We should convince the learners of the fact that, like mathematical equations, every English sentence standing for a statement is formed on this jusxtaposition of the two explicit terms, S and P. The intellectual training and behaviorial conditioning of comprehending and constructing units of predication in the binary format should be enforced with vigor and it should replace the efforts spent in translation from the vernacular expression into an English expression, and vice versa. (cf., 2. 3).

Now that the basic verb formations have all been presented and practiced upon in the preceding stage of our curriculum (Chapt. I), we should like to present the entire paradigm of the English predicate system in the form of tables to the learners *at the beginning*, and *as a whole*, so that the gestalt be imparted before the introduction of local and concrete individual knowledge items. Knowing that the teaching method and curriculum tend to be linear-additive where language teaching (and learning as well) is considered as something to be done by rote with the total image of the language as an open-infinite system, we would rather present English (more than any other foreign language) as a closed-finite system, even though the actual English may very well be otherwise. Especially since such apparent finiteness of Englishs strikes the Japanese learners as diagonally opposite to their vernacular whose constitution appears to be open and additive, it will be at least effective if we could impress, wrongly or rightly, the learners with this outlook of the language as a guiding map at the very onset.

The paradigm is here presented not as a stylistic prescription nor as a statistical reduction of actual English sentences, but as an à priori prescription for constructing and analysing English sentences at a level of approximation, i.e., sentences that do not develop out of the paradigm and those that will not reduce themselves into either of these patterns are simply not *considered*. The paradigm is proposed as representing what is necessary and sufficient for any and every English predication in the form of the sentence at a certain level of approximation, beyond which, the matters exceed our present scope of interest and perfection.   'A definite number of formulae for a

finite system with a set of vocabulary' is the image of English we are attempting to implant; in other words, we should like to impart to the learners a total gestalt of the language as an anticipation, rather than to have them work towards a desired degree of perfection in mastery of the language by accumulating piece by piece the partial knowledge they acquire without an à priori orientation.

The paradigm is presented below in several tables, and accordingly in the subsequent sections, explanations with necessary advice for actual teaching will be proposed.

PARADIGM OF ENGLISH PREDICATE VERB STRUCTURE

Table 1

Subject	Predicate		
	verb	α	
1. $\boxed{S}$	$\longrightarrow$		complete verb formation (2)[2]
2. $\boxed{S}$	$\longrightarrow$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \boxed{C} \\ <C> \end{array} \right.$	dependent verb formation (5)
3. $\boxed{S}$	$\longrightarrow$	$\boxed{O}$	accusative verb formation (3)
4. $\boxed{S}$	$\longrightarrow$	$\boxed{O_1}$ $\boxed{O_2}$	dative verb formation (4)[3]
5. $\boxed{S}$	$\longrightarrow$	$\boxed{O}$ $\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \boxed{C} \\ <C> \end{array} \right.$	causative verb formation (6)

Table 2

Subject	Predicate	
	verb	α
	(be)/am/is/are was/were	
	go/goes went	

---

2) Numbers in parenthese show those in the tables at the end of the Chapter I.

3) (4) was originally 'transitive' formation, thus revised hereafter.

Table 3

Subject	Predicate		
	auxiliary		α
	$\dfrac{\text{do/does}}{\text{did}}$	[root]	
	$\dfrac{\text{can}}{\text{could}}$	[root]	
	$\dfrac{\text{x}}{\text{ought}}$ to	[root]	

Table 4

Subject	ditto		
	$\dfrac{\text{have/has}}{\text{had}}$ to	[root]	
	$\dfrac{\text{have/has}}{\text{had}}$	[p. p.]	
	$\dfrac{\text{x}}{\text{had}}$ better	[root]	

Table 5

Subject	ditto	
	$\dfrac{\text{may}}{\text{might}}$ have to	[root]
	$\dfrac{\text{may}}{\text{might}}$ have	[p. p.]

2.2 The first table of the paradigm (Table 1) is derived and simplified from the table attached to the last chapter, plus the initial noun element as the subject of each predicate formation, 1—5. The formations are here reduced to five for pedagogical purposes, and could be further reduced to four if we relegate the dative verb formation by construding the dative object as adverbial phrase minus preposition. The table makes use of symbols and letters for operational purposes, thus: square, ☐, for noun element (or in our terminology, noun syllables), wedge type parenthesis, < >,

for adjective syllables standing in complmentary positions; intransitive verbs (in our terminology, complete verbs and dependent verbs) are expressed by a one-blade spare-head, —➘, while transitive verbs (in our terminology, accusative, dative—or the hitherto 'transitive'—verbs) are expressed by a double-blade sparehead,——➤; the letters S, C, O, likewise stand respectively for subject, complement and object, specifically O_1 for dative and O_2 for accusative object[4]. α represents the post-verbal structure of the predicate.

The practice to be assigned along this table cannot but be very simple and limited. Consideration should be given so as not to involve case-number-person declensions. What can be prescribed at first may be a simple introduction to what has been practiced in imperative formations of the subject in the form of pronoun, except, in the case of the unexperienced learners, the third person singular and the verb 'be'. The vocabulary items to be put into the operation on the table should also be narrowly selected and limited to only those items whose status is clear-cut, avoiding those which are amphibious and ambiguous, especially in the case of verbs and adjectives. If some essential items happen to be ambivalent, it is better to assign to them the prominent function and to suppress the other until the first is well established, as confusion usually arises when two terms are each half settled.   The important point to be noted here is that the structure remains unultered while each element is replaceable and interchangiable, and that the result will be grammatical, as long as the vocabulary items are each mobilized from within the specified class of the vocabulary and this will, in turn, reinforce, in the learner's mentality, the recognition of the formal image of the language: that the formula is to be filled by the incidental and substitutable vocabulary items of the class designated by the formula, is the basic algebraic setting for our curriculum.

As the main point of this table is the establishment of the habit of binary predication, the contrast in structure (and in implication) between the imperative and the predication should be brought up to maximum attention, with vivid classroom activities, while the declension, especially those of irregular verbs, may, for a while, be overlooked in the interest of the said emphasis.

When the incidence of the third person singular and the statement structured on 'be' cannot any longer be suppressed in the classroom reality, the number-person declension may be incorporated into the table.   Irreqularities, however, should be introduced only with an apology—mechanical memorization of any paradigm may be

---

4) The symbols are to be used for any lower denominations, thus $<$ $>$ may be later used as any
    adjectival element that modifies the preceding or following noun element that will, likewise,
    appear within $[$ and $]$.

prescribed only upon the concession of the mentality of the learning party as any foreign paradigm is to him, an arbitrary, if not meaningless, convention. As some psychologists have stated, memorization is only done at the expense of intelligence; it is not the perfect sentences memorized but the competence to manipulate upon the abstract formula that enables one to perform in language. Priority, therefore, should be given always to what is general and regular (that is, consistent) and this hierarchy should be respected throughout. The third person singular 's', for a flagrant example, is a minority in the hierarchy, hence it should not be made an inhibiting force in the course of learning. The verb 'be' should be handled with special care as it is the only verb that conjugates with extra irregularity, but without virtual semantic value-shifts.

It should be remembered especially that the irregularity of the verbal declensions in English is concentrated on the present tense and on those of the higher frequencies: it is unfortunate that we must initiate our youngs into English through that *pugatory*. From this point of view, we could perhaps do better if we begin teaching 'past' first rather than 'present'. We should remember that the faculty of language is basically formal and as such it is orientated towards generality, consistency and simplicity. We must awaken the learners to the formal aspect of language, i. e., the fact that the conventionalized structure, apart from the itemized meaning carried by each vocabulary item, constitutes a very basic frame of meaning (if that is also called *meaning*) for each statement. The functional distinction of lexical meaning from that of syntactical . should be fully explained to the learners whose language depends, in our case and for that matter, more on the explicit post-positional devices. It is not too much, however, to expect the learners to comprehend the formal structure and obtain the total meaning through a mental calculation on the formula of the lexical meaning separately carried by each vocabulary item. Let them realze that, as long as structural formalities are observed, any product thereof is valid and correct. Nonsense sentences produced in classroom manipulation, as long as they conform to the structural formula and the vocabulary items are drawn from the specified class, do make sense, or at least they make *English* nonsense. If this could be experimented with younger pupils, the monotony of classroom activity due to the restriction and limitation can be allev-iated by the variety of unexpected, original, and most often alive and humorous examples. The goal of the practice should be placed at the establishment of the structural pattern, not at the immediate usefulness or versimilitiede of the products in actual speech environments where English is natively spoken.

Vocabulary items for noun syllables, when exhausted, can be added ad hoc... or vernacular words may even be tentatively substituted. Use of symbols and initials may be fully employed in order to bring up the formal skelton of the structure and

the one-ness of each element if consisting of a number of subordinate elements, and to evade the burden of orthography. Even pictures may be inserted in the place of actual nouns and pronouns. The immediate reference to reality is of course desirable, but it will soon be exhaused in classrooms. To practice under a borrowed reality, on the other hand, will not hinder, but will rather foster the grasp and operation in the categorical properties of langauge. Orthographical burden and concern should not be taxed upon in earlier stages; the orthography, the spelling, is best avoided as a menacing obsession. Apparent lack of order in English orthography will frustrate the intellectual approach to the language. Unless the learners are already broken to some way of writing[5], their dependency on the sounds and on the mental images will continue even in foreign langauge acquision. The generalizing, frame-forming faculty of mentality is free and spontaneous as long as it is based on the acoustic images.

The adult learners and those who have already gone some way into the learning of the language may confront problems when the present method is thus imposed upon as an additional unfamiliar ruling. A process of adjustment and adaptation will have to be prescribed in such cases. A combination of the conscious-mental effort and the spontaneous or even kinetic conditioning will be the rule of prescription for such adult learners. Intellectual understanding is the basis for foreign langauge learning; what is considered as instinctive or empirical comprehension is actually a projection or rather a forced back-formation of the sensibility upon the subconscious intellectual acquisition of the formal structure of the language being learned. Teaching a foreign language to children before the age of native-tongue establishment should not be considered as teaching of a foreign language; it is, in fact, a teaching of another native-tongue.

When the practice so far prescribed becomes too monotonous in spite of expansion in vocabulary items and their free combinations, the time is ripe for presenting the second table of the paradigm, which is another version of the same paradigm, one moment closer to the reality of the language.

2.3 Table 2 presents the finite-verb formations in two kinds; one, the so-called 'be' verb, which is the sole member of the class, and the other, all the rest of the verbs standing in this position. The distinction here is strictly formal, that is to say, the additional irregularity of the 'be' verb in the so-called present form, i.e., 'am' and 'be' over the others.

---

5) As majority of the Japanese pupils are already taught in Roma-ji transcription, (in which consonants are spelled in English, vowels in Italian and no set system seems to govern the intonation and word-separation, etc.) the difficulty they confront when they meet English orthography is doubled.

This section features also the addition of one more dimension to the paradigm, i. e., the *syntactical* past to the statement of every kind, i. e., the tables below this level find evey English statement to be either a 'present statement' or a 'past statement' as determined by the form of the verb element.   Notice that the word 'tense' is here avoided; we would rather have the learners acquire the image of the alternate time-system of English predication—a formal, rather than semantic, property.   The usual concept of 'tense' is confusing as it is a mixture of meaning and form.   The person-number declension of verbs is simpler in the past form, the only difficulty being again the irregularity of some important verbs—first and third person singular cease to be inhibiting irregularities in the paradigm.

Thus the main objective of the present stage of the curriculum is, of course, to impress the learners with the formal universality of the alternate time-system in English predication, which strikes the Japanese learners as simple and insistent. What each of these two time-designations implies need not be too far explained since they do not exactly reflect the actual chronology of the reality referred to—the present form concurrently indicating the present as well as the state of affairs indifferent to actual chronology while the past form, in its turn, overtly expressing something other than chronological past, being understood as imaginary, or even as contrary to the implied reality (so-called subjunctive past.)   The time-indication in Japanese is also peculiar in its own way and, the bilingual explanations, therefore, if done semantically, will only blur the formal contrast.   Simple practice in altering the time-index of a given statement into another may be admistered to the learners almost mechanically. A sequence of statements that make up a story either in present or in the past form may be inspiring for younger learners and the automatic shifting of the time-index may add variety to the classroom atmosphere.   The internal relationship of the elements within the formula should be the focus of the practice, and it should be better if it could be done with least of external reference, i. e., referential or semantic implications.

The difficulty of the irregular verbs, again the *pugatory*, must be somehow wisely overcome, depending, of course, upon the level of the learners.   Some general principles such as the addition of /t/ or /d/ making the past for most of the cases, while the verbs ending in these sounds usually stay as they are, etc., may be tentatively offered if this alleviates the difficulties for the time being.   It is a real paradox that important verbs are irregular and have to be learned by rote, as in the multiplication table, only to blur, at the very onset, the image of the regularity of English.   It is deplorable that we should convince the learners into thinking that every foreign language is incorrigibly illogical and that there is no royal way but to swallow all the oddities.   It is as if foreign langauge learning is not an intellectual mastery but

a willing suspension of intellectual propensity; as if acquired language is not an intellectual competence, but a kind of index that one once had enough mental docility and a peculiar talent. Even without orthography, ofi which English is notorious, the irregularity of the verbs will still constitute a considerable difficulty for the learners. Perhaps we should introduce an equal number or preferably more of regular verbs to offset the detrimental effects of the irregular but indispensable verbs at the earlier stages. The regularity should be given priority and respect in our à priori hierarchy of the language image.   After all, what is most important here is to indoctrinate the learners with the major regularity, i.e., that every sentence is either in the present form or in the past form and that there is no third alternative throughout English paradigm, the conversion being always reversible. Other time considerations as 'future', 'perfect', etc., should not be brought into the picture yet as they would only offset the distinction.

It should be mentioned in some way or other that past as another dimension of speech is not known in the exclamation or in the imperative.   Upon second thought, however, even the present is bound to an actual time and situation.   Past is the first of the imaginary dimensions language is capable of fabricating; only present and past are syntactical in English; other imaginary dimensions being rendered in stylistic, i.e., auxiliary formations to be optionally selected, which again cannot help but be either in present or past form (cf., 2.4). The past is as much a part of imagination as is the future or other modal realms, of which the modals are capable of expressing,— perhaps the reporting of past events in past form assumes the nature of a statement as quotation (cf., 2.1) any less than description, the verbal re-enactment, does of the present events.

Since to impress the learners with the fact that the present-past alternative is the universal in English predication is basic, the verbs should be rearranged according to their regularness or otherwise to enable easier mobilization.   Rote practice must be somehow imposed and continued until the initial willful concession to the formula is habitualized and even forgotten and conformity becomes free and unconscious.   If possible, we should try to invoke the empathy of the learners so that the recited formula turns into something real and alive, even in the make-believe situation of the classroom reality.   The process of filling the abstract, formal entities with proper empirical substance, a mental and emotional back-formation, is an essential phase of language learning.

Care should be taken whenever vernacular paraphrasing is employed for explanation or confirmation, that surface-to-surface translation does not replace the immediate comprehension. The habit of translating sets in when a formal-intellectual grasp of the structure becomes feable; learners then begin to fail in distinguishing *form* from

meaning, thus, instead of conceiveing the explicit past form as such, they take it as an equivalent of the vernacular term or form comporting some comparable effects. As term-to-term replacement is an easier procedure than the categorical operation of the forms, weaker learners gradually recoil into translation and take to the vernacular version so obtained, thereby rendering the original text devoid of its immediacy as the source signal *enacting* and *conveying* the meaning by itself, complete and sufficient. As translation is a tempting short-cut escape, once the habit is formed, the learners will always be drawn into that leeway from which later escape will be very difficult. To prevent such hahits from forming it should be cautiously guarded off at the incipient stages. Practice, therefore, should be administered always within the range and level where the learners need not fall back into translation. Predication, in contrast to imperative and exclamation, because of its very nature, far more easily courts for translation and paraphrasing in the vernacular, and we cannot be too alert to losing the learners to the translating rut, particularly at this stage of the curriculum. The traslation as a middle term between the expression in the foreign langauge and those in the native tongue is all the more detrimental in the case of English and Japanese whose structural parallelism is often non-existent or utterly haphazard.

An ample variety of sentences could be produced and arranged to make interesting stories of some kind for the beginning learners even within the limitation so far imposed. The learners may be encouraged to produce new combinations with what they have; the practice could be done in the utilitarian domain for adult learners. Right-wrong as a criteria of speech in our concept at this stage is only in reference to the formal convention conceded to by the learners themselves. Unless the products of the learners fail to comply, by negligence or by error, to the formal requirement the learners themselves had conceded to observe, the divergence from the actual usage of native English should be tentatively torelated. Teachers must endure the irritation of such *un-English* English for a while until the learners are ready for a still finer set of paradigm of an approximation one order closer to the reality of the language. If the learners come up with grammatically possible but practically unacceptable stentences, the reason for unacceptablility should be sought not in their incongrous meaning, but in the improper selection of the vocabulary items for the intended predication.

2. 4   This section is on Table 3. From the formal point of view this type of verb structure may be defined as a phrasal verb constituting of more than one element that sould be bound together as an equivalent to a finite verb.   The whole paradigm of the auxiliary structure begins with the intermediate 'do' which functions both as finite and as auxiliary, and in the finite funciton it serves as 'pro'-verb, in an analogy with 'pro'-noun in its relation to noun, a substitute for any individual verb, and ends

with those auxiliary verbs that take 'to-infinitive' formation (cf., 2.5).

As can be observed, the present-past alternative is consistently conformed to in this category and others to follow throughout the paradigm; the time alternative takes place in the first element, usually called 'auxiliary verbs'. The auxiliary elements could be introduced as if they were prefixes to the verbs, carrying the present-past alternative and occasionally the person-number declensions (in the case of 'do' and of 'have' later, cf., 2.5), while leaving the pattern-forming function and the meaning-specifying function to the verbal stem that follows the auxiliary.

The fact that prevails over the three types of auxiliary structure under consideration is that the first element, the auxiliary, each carries some proper implication, and by adding up the values of the terms, the total meaning can be reached; whereas, as a pro-verb in the power of a finite verb implying the content already expressed and understood by previous mention in the given context, the 'do' as a modal may also be explained as a kind of prefix, or pure emphatic signal and later as a device for negation (cf., 2.5). Hence, these three kinds of auxiliaries are here named 'modals'.

The class of modals, as the name suggests, may be presented with specific overtones, the implication, the modes, if not meaning, of each member. Special attention should be given to the fact that auxiliaries in the past form are generally more allusive and remote than those in present form, a fact resultant of the subjunctive-expressing power of the past form (cf., 2.3).

The time-reference is not to be mishandled here especially with 'shall' and 'will', both considered usually as modals of the future tense. The fact that future is one of the semantic aspects (i. e., modes), rather than tense, in English must be born in mind and we should refrain from presenting it as if present-past-future makes a grammatical tense, a syntactic system, so as not to contradict what we have postulated in 2.3. That even the future is expressed in both present and past tense is an unacceptable tenet for any *intellectual* foreigner unless otherwise explained.

The attention of the learners should be directed to the fact that the auxiliay expression of this group is more of an expression of attitude, the insinuation, on the part of the speaker than that of a state of affairs so stated or *quoted* as such. The suppressed parentheses or the quotation marks for every statement (cf., 2.1) may be recalled here again to illuminate the situation. The auxiliaries of this group express or convey something that should be expressed beyond and before the actual statements: thus "I could go" may be rendered as "I consider (or considered) it possible that 'I go' ", "He might come" as something like "I think (or thought) it probable that 'he comes' ", whereas direct declarative statements, e. g., "I go" may be rendered as "I thus state or quote myself saying or imagining 'I go' " and "He goes" as "I thus cite what I observe and imagine, i. e., 'He goes' ", etc. These auxiliary expressions are

statements concurrently expressing the attitude of the speaker and what is being described verbally. This distinction is what makes the modal expression different from the direct declarative statements, the predication, and for this reason we might adopt the usual designation for these expressions, the 'modal' expression, as distinct also from the auxiliary expression with 'have' as its first element (cf., 2. 6).

All the psychological overtones and implications involved here should be explained but the essential fact to be taught and learned is the allusive, aspective overtone, the attitudial implication, of the modal expressions where past or present in chronology is only one of the implications so expressed. Modal expressions are by essense in imaginary tenses—whether present or past—and do not fully fall in the time-space continuum of the actuality.

This group contains such a formal irregularity as 'must' that does not seem to have separate forms for present and past. The fact that the modals are exempt from person-number conjugation may also be presented as a tendency towards regularity in English. Historical explanations could be given to adult learners for these irregularities, and yet it should be done so as to encourage the regularity-orientated tropism of the learners.

The third variety of this series are such irregular auxiliaries as take 'to-infinitive' for the second element. Unless the learners are already familiar with the 'to-infinitives' we will do very well to refrain from introducing this formula as yet. Otherwise, 'ought to ∼', 'used to ∼' and the vulgar 'gonna∼', 'wanna∼', including the worse variants 'oughtta∼' and 'usedta∼' could be grouped together as a transitional shape of verbs shifting into auxiliaries. The lack of present form for 'ought' could be explained historically whereas the same for 'used, is almost impossible to explain unless done semantically. (The distinction between "I *used* to come" and "I am *used* to such an abuse" may be another riddle to the learners, incidentally.) Historical prefixation of 'to' to infinitives that had lost the declension for its infinitive-ness should be mentioned, which fact, however does apparently conflict with the current tendency above mentioned. The matter will confront us again with the 'to-less infinitives' in the position of the so-called objective complement later on (cf., 3. 1).

Other memebers of the class contain such drifting phenomena as 'need', 'help,' etc., those leading infinitives with or without recourse to 'to'. With 'to' added, infinitives obtain freedom and gain in adverbial nature, which in turn, gives back to the drifting ones, the quasi-auxiliaries, the finite-ness, so to speak.

It should also be mentioned here that the combination, i. e., 'auxiliary+root', itself is equivalent to a finite verb and for that very reason there are again five sentence patterns constructed, and that the sentence pattern is determined by the kind of verb selected for the second element, the auxiliary element as such being indifferent to the

sentence pattern selection. It should also be pointed out that auxiliaries do not produce imperative expressions, except in the case of the amphibious 'do', thus, "Do be careful" ('do' as an emphatic modal and as an imperative forming 'root'), but not "I do be happy" ('do' as emphatic modal), nor "I do him" (in answer to "Do you like him?" and 'do' as a 'pro-verb'), in ordinary collocation.

To consider and classify the 'be' verb as auxiliary forming the so-called progressive and passive formula (in parallel with 'have' as perfective forming), along with 'let's' as an auxiliary to lead verb root, implying the intention of the speaker including the interlocutors, is often the pedagogical practice.[6]   We should like, however, to avoid the confusion caused by such treatment, in the interest of formal consistency at this level—non-native approach in its midway.

2.5 Negation should be introduced at this stage as 'do' comes into the picture (cf., 2.4). It should be reminded to the learners that prohibition was indicated by the element 'don't' prefixed to the imperative formation (cf., 1.8).   The general direction to be given here is thus: Insert a 'not' after the first element throughout the paradigm across the table as it were a minus-symbol added retroactively to the preceding verb or auxiliary (and it could be phonetically and orthographically contracted forward.) The only irregularity involved, the second series of the finite verb structure, "I go not", etc., is not *illegitimate* but is only *stylistically* avoided whereas the pro-verb formation with 'do' is universally preferred. Thus, although the general rule " 'not' after the verb" is superceded in the case of the second variety, the conformity, paradoxically however, is reinstituted in the auxiliary formation.

That the negative 'not' is to be suffixed to the first element holds in the subsequent formations, i. e., the formation with 'have' as the auxiliary (cf., 2.6). This establishes the consistency that 'not' is suffixed to the first element, or to the verb itself when it appears by itself (i. e., as finite verb). Thus, the negative symbol 'not' as a form could be considered as syntactical, whereas other words and idioms intimating negation could be classed as stylistic or semantic. "I am not happy" is ambivalent: it could mean "I am *un*-happy" or that the statement "I am happy" as a whole is negated or

---

6) 'be' verb as auxilizary on the basis of apparent formal parallel in

$$\begin{cases} \text{be} + \text{present participle} \\ \text{be} + \text{past participle} \\ \text{be} + \text{to-infinitive} \end{cases} \doteqdot \begin{cases} \text{have} + \text{---} \\ \text{have} + \text{past participle} \\ \text{modal} + \text{root} \end{cases}$$

violates the superior consistency, 'dependent verb + complement (adjective). Likewise, 'Let's' as auxiliary is in further conflict with grammatical hierarchy: it only appears in imperative, no present-past alternative, etc., whereas it is thoroughly tenable and consistent as imperative of causative formation, besides the fact that the meaning of 'Let's+root' collocation finds no difficulty in deriving it from the self-adressed demand calling for an action.

yet, "I am × *not* (a negation of verb, incl. vulgar 'ain't' and other contractions) happy", etc. Of the three, unless so specified, we would rather consider the third as the norm, that is to say, as syntactical phenomena, we have for every predication, two phases, one positive, the other negative, the negative only being marked by a symbol 'not' postposed to single, i. e., finite, verbs or to the first element of phrasal verbs.

It should also be remembered that contracted 'not' registers acoustically very low and the actual negative effect in oral expression is attained more by an umlaut, the change in the preceding phonic syllable, thus [ou] of 'don't', [æ] or [aː] of 'cannot', etc., with the stress always on the *negated* element, but not on the *negating* signal 'not', an irony which is seldom noted except in phonetic classes. The other stylistic 'not-s' in expressions are to be handled as independent adverbs either modifying other words or other elements of the sentense, as does the 'not' of the 'not-happy' in the examples in the form of 'un-happy' a few paragraphs above. The whole classic negotiation and discussion on the problems of partial negation, etc., could also be reserved as strictly stylistic-semantic.

2. 6 The second in the auxiliary formation is the phrasal verbs that take 'have' as the first element, where 'have' carries over all the conjugations except the root form (hence no imperative) from the finite verb conjugations (Table 4). Although 'have' should still be considered as an auxiliary, it is devoid of the specific implication those of the first group contain; it has not only lost the original meaning of the verb 'have', but also, as an auxiliary, has come to function as purely formal signal—the main difficulty involved in teaching this group. The formula hence is arbitrary, that is, the total meaning is not attainable as the sum of the elements, unlike the case with the modal expressions (cf., 2. 4). To comprehend that a word should have no proper referential meaning and that its function is only 'to form a set collocation which arbitrarily constitutes a specific meaning and implication' is something not to be accepted easily. This is because in native language, one is inclined to assign and to identify specific meaning to each word or form. The essential difficulty here is, therefore, not semantic, but formal. If such a formal difficulty is intellectually overcome, the formula itself is simple enough to be mastered, nor is the meaning too subtle to explain or to understand.

There are two kinds of formations under this heading: 'have' in combination with 'to-infinitive' and that with past participle. The first, 'have + to-infinive' collocation, may not be a serious difficulty to be taught or learned if not easy to explain. And, of course, if 'to-infinitive' has not yet been introduced to the learners, this formation should again be relegated to a better occasion elsewhere where the infinitive is already understood by the learners. To introduce both the 'to-infinitive' and this formation at the same time will be too abrupt and heavy, besides there is the fact

that the combination is not a typical aspect of the infinitive at work. Likewise, for the second, introducing the past participle as a part of the perfective formula, is not the ideal occasion for initiating the learners into this new grammatical category, past participle. For the learners who are already familiar with the 'to-infinitive' and the past participle, the two 'have' formations here can be introduced with ease, but some theoretical explanation will have to be given from a syntactical as well as from an etymological point of view.

For the *meaning-less* 'have' of the two formations, historical accounts can be given if such is considered helpful, provided that the adjectival uses of the infinitive and participles (especially of the past participle in this case) are already known to the learners. In way of historical explanation, the indefinite object, say, 'someone' or 'something' could be supplied immediately after the 'have' thus reinstituting the latter as a regular causative verb. The transition from "I have something to read" through "I have to read something" to "I have to read (no concern as to what is to be read)" and that from "I have something bought (by anyone including myself)" to "I have bought something (regardless of the agent who is most likely myself)" may be given as an etymological explanation. The cases of intrasitive verbs (complete and dependent verbs in our terminology) should be explained as a diviation from the structure 'dependent verb+past participle as complement', a formation to be introduced later in the curriculum (cf., 3. 1).

There is a slight, incidental parallel between the two sets of formations, "He is to go"/"He has to go" and "He is gone"/"He has gone". There are parallel doubts here as to whether the infinitive should be considered as a portion of the verbal syllable or an independent syntactical element, and likewise, as to whether the past participle is a part of the verb syllable or an independent element. Reduction to obtain something from between 'is' and 'has' through this setting seems to be rather fruitless and even irrelevant.

The alluded elipsis of the anonymous object above could have been perhaps the real cause of the auxiliarization of the verb 'have' (or it could have well been otherwise), but once the convention is accepted as such by the learners, the semantic implications would be described as far as the learners desire to know.

The formation 'have+to-infinitive' as a unit is supposed to signal what is actually a combination of the meaning and attitude, thus "I have to come" is to be rendered as "I consider it obligatory and inevitable that 'I come' ", which is said to be synonynous to say "I must come", a modal expression. Remember, however, that 'have' itself carreis no implication of obligation or of eventuality—the point of difference between 'have' and 'must', hence the difference between the modal formation and 'have-formation', both of which are under the present heading together, i. e., auxiliary

formation. The equation "must = 'have' + to" is irreversible, i. e., 'must' is not alwasy renderable in the 'have + to-infinitive' formation.

The perfective formation, 'have + past participle' is a kind of predication that has been considered as one of the English tenses, parallel with present, past, progressive, future, etc., etc. We would, however, rather institute this formation as a variety thus located in the paradigm, that is, not under the general category 'tense' but as one of the two varieties of a type of predication that has 'have' for its first element. It is here presented in parallel with other formations in the paradigm so far explained and those to be introduced later. In its form, it is of a peculiar formtion, and in its implication, as well as in its mode of predication, it is again unique, deserving a separate category among the so-called phrasal verbs.

Pedagogically again, prerequisit to the teaching of the so-called perfect tense is the recognition that the past participle of a verb is no longer a verb[7], even though it could form analogous subordinate structures (cf., 3. 1). The learners should be convinced of the fact that the participle, as well as infinitives, by itself has no power to predicate.

The matter will have bearings on the later discussion of the verbal complements (cf., 3. 1) and we shall here bypass the discussion for a while. The perfective formation is not exactly modal in its nature any more than the 'have + to-infinitive' formation above. It does not reveal the speaker's attitude, and in that sense it is a degree closer to the finite predications, thus it is often grouped together as one of the tenses expressing the formulæ of English i. e., present, past, present perfect and past perfect, etc., etc. We should, however, like to relegate the present-ness of present perfect

---

7) The misunderstanding as to this point is one of the symptoms the learners carry over from such rote learning as memorization of 'go-went-gone' as a verbatim phrase, at least in Japan, of which the first two are in finite function while the last is not. Strangely, other comparable conjugations such as infinitive and two kinds of participle as well as gerund are usaully ommitted from the rote phrase. Hence the mental tendency to consider the third, the past participle, as another finite use indicating perfect, something farther past than past in chronology. Besides, the terminology 'past' participle also misleads many a beginners. It should have been better if it were called 'perfect'-participle for all the verbs, and 'passive'-participle for those of the transitive verbs, the latter partially overlapping with the former, a situation resembling that for the overlapping between present participle and gerund. 'Present' participle is likewise misleading as a terminology. It would have been better if it had been called, say, 'actual'-participle and classified as an derived adjective with the power to express the state of affair, where the action is taking place or materializing, either repetatively or continuously, etc. Such explanation as *Present* participle with *past* of 'be' forming past-progressive" only defy the simple and clear intelligence of young learners.

tense, and the past-ness of the past perfect tense as a common feature to all the formations of predication, leaving what is perfective of the perfect tense alone to be here defined and described.

In its formal structure, 'perfective' as a predication is partially commensurable with one of the finite verb formations, i. e., 'dependent verb+complement', the complement being the past participle of intransitive verbs (i. e., complete verbs and dependent verbs in our terminology.)   The ambiguity, so it seems, of the perfective expression arises from this synonymity. The perfective formation with 'have', 'have' being the perfective-index, may be considered as a substitute for certain dependent verb formation created particularly for avoiding the convergence of passive formation in 'dependent verb+past participle of the transitive verbs'. In other words, 'have' as the perfective-index is instituted essentially to avoid the passive-participle from being mistaken for perfect-participle which is identical in form; or else any dependent verb could have served well for perfective making. To put it in another way, the use of 'have' is invoked in order to avoid "He seems loved" from meaning "He seems to have loved (somebody)" instead of meaning "He seems to be loved" or "He seems to have been loved (by somebody)".

Thus the perfective should be explained essentially as something that should have been one of the formulæ of the state-expressing predication in parallel with other 'dependent verb+adjective' formations.   This is to say, to explain the meaning of "He *has* gone", we would rather explain semantically what is meant by "He *is* gone" and thence proceed to "He *has* gone" and onto "He *has* loved her (which, however, is irreversible to "He *is* loved her (ungrammatical)". The aspect called perfect itself, apart from its mode of predication, however, is not too far-fetched to explain. We could say that it is a state of something that has enacted an action intimated by the verb, and when it is referred to in a dependent formation, it signifies that the subject cited is in the state of such and such action already enacted, and so on. It should be avoided at any cost to give the impression that perfective is a mode of enactment itself, present or past. It would have been far easier if there had been a single conjugation for every verb to express perfective by itself (if we were to handle perfective as a tense, not as aspect), say "He *gones*" instead of "He is (or has) gone"[8] and could have given every transitive verb a distinct passive-participle as adjective either in the function of modification or complementation.   The idea itself may provoke aversion on the part of the natives, no doubt...

The Japanese learners, will not, however, find the situation too complicated or

---

8) 'gone' must be either present or past as a matter of necessity, thus 'gone' present, and 'goned' past, for an instance.

subtle even though a comparable expression does not exist in their vernacular. 'Perfect tense' is, or has been, one of the stumbling blocks to them simply because of the explanation too far inclined towards semantic and of indoctrination too much dependent on testimonies of native experience, or at least, on the empirical conviction of the teachers about the affairs involved, while no consistent formal explanation was being given.   The sourse of difficulty could also be ascribed to all the more subtle and precarious structure of the perfect-indicating convention of the Japanese langauge, hence the translation as the cause of further confusions.   Formal consistency should be upheld with less dependency on the semantic explanations and for that matter Englist structure is always simple and clear enough even to the Japanese pupils.   It is only the meaning that is subtle and it is the relation between the structure of the language and structure of the meaning that is all the more haphazard and lax between and within the languages.   The explanations spanning those two dimensions will not ellucidate either of the affairs.   The system of meaning should be explained on its own terms and so should also be the forms of a langauge.

After all, most likely, is it not a sheer back-formation that one feels a nuance of obligation in the 'has' of "He *has* to go" and the nuance of perfective in the 'has' of "He *has* gone", while 'is' remains neutral in both "He *is* to go" and "He *is* gone" (cf., some paragraphs above.)

The third variation includes the sole incidence of the 'had better' formation which could be well ignored in earlier stages.   This could, however, be considered and presented as an irregularity or a variant of the first of the series, i. e., 'have + to-infinitive', implying obligation.   It is short of the said formation by 'to' but has an adverbial element 'better' obligatorily inserted between the two elements involved. The fact that there is only the past form available for this formation resembles the case for 'ought' and 'used'.   The semantic explanation may also be given as "It is a milder form of obligation expressed, with the subjunctive effect of 'have' in the past form at work (cf., 2. 3)."   The interrogative of this formation is again unstable.   While "Did I have better go" is odd, "Had I better go?" and "Had I better to go?" seem to be both accepted—a fact attesting to the gaining auxiliary-ness of 'had' in the use over the 'have' in the "I have to go" formation, where "Do I have to go" rather than "Have I to go?" is yet in use. (cf., 2. 8).

Another variant should be mentioned for the first of the series where 'got' or 'gotten', the past participle of the verb 'get' is suffixed to the auxiliary 'have' as if the formation were of the second series, only to render the 'have' more devoid of content and the expression more colloquial, thus, "I have got to go" etc.   The process goes back to the finite use of the verb 'have', thus "I have got(ten) a pen", etc.   "I've got going" may represent another extention of this use, in which 'get + going' constitutes

a problem (on this, cf., 3. 1 below). The idiom, however, does not seem to go any farther, thus "I have got gone", etc., does not seem to obtain. The contracted vulgar 'gotta' may be considered the intermediate state of the ankylosis toward the advent of a new auxiliary, a colloquial alternate of 'have', thus:

{I have a pen   {I've got a pen ` {I v'nt got a pen
{I have to go   {I've gotta go   {I v'nt gotta go

as well as:

{Do (or Have) I got a pen?   {Don't (or Havn't) I got a pen?
{Do (or Have) I gotta go?   {Don't (or Hav'nt) I gotta go?

The parallel situation with 'gonna' and 'wanna' may be recalled here (cf. 2. 4). These may be grouped together as pseudo-auxiliaries, even though for pedagogical considerations they may not yet be included in our curriculum. The pedagogical paradox here is that if a simpler structure should be ranked higher in our hierarchy of grammar, we should start teaching these pseudo-auxiliaries first and then, by process of refinement and correction, the simpler ones should be replaced by more complex and accepted versions—which actually is the way natives acquire the langauge. Native children will first learn these simpler forms, whose meaning and use are not quite diffrentiated nor analysed. With education and cultural-social imposition and influence, they come to acquire the refined, articulate way of expression. The difference between the two types of learners, one natural and the other foreign, is that the former begins with the empirical *whole* while the latter begins with the fixed arbitrary assembly of the *parts*, in a form of an asembly of individual elements already analysed, according to the unknown code. In a way, natives learn the process in the direction from the cause to the result, the product, while the non-natives learn what is actually the result, and gradually, and inversely proceding, reach the latent structure, i. e., the reverse of the order in which the natives have reached the surface product, until the latter come to comprehend the structure itself (conscious or unconscious) eventually surpassing the direction of the mental process undergone.

2. 7 The next phase of our curriculum on the paradigm is the combination of the first and the second series in that order, which is rendered possible by the privileged feature of the auxiliary 'have', i. e., it retains all the conjugational variants thus enabling itself to be suffixed to the first series. Inversely, erraneous formation as "He is can come" is precluded also on the basis that auxillaries (other than 'have) do not have an infinitive to follow the dependent verbs, nor do they have a participle to form the so-called progressive or passive, hence "He is canning come" nor "He has could come" rendered impossible. (Table 5)

With this possibility of combination, the verbal phrase will become clustered, but the basic principles laid in the beginning do govern even in the most complex of

the structures, i. e., the first element is either in present or past, second element either infinitive or past participoe, etc.   The meaning can be calculated by adding up the meaning each module contributes.   The sequence may be recurrent, thus "He might" might take the infinitive 'have' forming "He might have" whose 'have' might again *locally* take, among other possibilties, a past participle of another 'have' again, thus resulting in "He might have had", a sentence still valid in semantic, as well as in formal point of view, even though it is stylistically unrealistic.   But again this last 'had' could behave as if it were locally the past form of the auxiliary 'have', forgetful of being itself a past participle, and might form a perfective, and thus take a past participle of any verb, hence, 'gone' as the case may be, to yield "He might have had gone".   The 'gone' could have well been another 'had', likewise a past participle, and so on.

    This formation is as a whole too far advanced and complex for younger learners and could well be reserved to a later date.   Incidentally, however, the pro-verb 'do' does not substitute the auxiliary 'have' or any other auxiliaries.   Thus "I do have come" or "I do can come" is eliminated (while, "I do have to come' " is ironically no less possible than "Do I have to come?").

2. 8   Interrogative formations should be taught perhaps at the end of the earlier section where 'do' was introduced (cf., 2. 4).   As a matter of fact, since it is a general operation prevailing over the entire spectrum of the predicate structure of English, and since interrogation is really the fourth facset of human speech, comparable to interjection, imperative and predication, it deserves to be taken up in a separate chapter. It is, in principle, a matter above that of syntax.   From the formal point of view, however, it does not involve a drastic operation, and hance is included in the present chapter as if it were a derivation of predicative formations.

    Interrogation as a type of behavior is again strictly human and presupposes a predication in latent form: one portion of the imagined predication is missing and therefore is in need of being supplied by the partner interlocutors, or the entire predication proposed is in need of verification by the interlocutors addressed to.   The context of interrogation is again in the immediate situation as it is with the imperative and exclamatory speech where the interlocutor's presense is presupposed and essential.   In that sense interrogation is closer to the imperative than predication, the last standing alone, in its autarchy, among the four basic facsets of motivation for human speech.

    As for the interrogative of the first type, an algebra should be introduced so as to express the unknown element by an 'x' which can be subdivided into a class of interrogative pro-elements, namely, those beginning with /wh/ or /h/, i. e., 'who'. 'whose', 'whom', 'where', 'when', etc., and any phrases containing any of these, e. g.,

'whose book', 'how long', etc.[9]   The first operation is to replace the element that is unknown and in need of being supplied answers, with the specified type of interrogative pro-element in the related formation of predication.   Then comes the transfer of the pro-form to the very beginning of the sentence.   The remaining process is common to both types of question, i. e., transfer the first element of the verb structure, and do likewise if they consist of only one word, i.e., in the case of finite verbs, before the subject of the sentence.

The interrogative of the second type can be simply produced by transferring the first element of the verb structure to the position before the subject, and if it is for negative interrogation, transfer 'the first element of the verb phrase + not' to the position in front of the subject,—that is all the formal requirement for the operation. The general rule is that the '/wh/-pronouns' (and the phrases containing these), if involved, are placed at the beginning of the predicate structure while the inversion of the predicate structure takes place in all the cases of interrogative formation as a principle.

Every speech presupposes the receiver of the message; in the exclamation the speaker is self-centered; the expression departs from the person without consideration as to whom it may reach. In the imperative, the speaker would not have taken the trouble of uttering the demand unless he expected someone, specified or unspecified, to hear and obey if so prevailed upon. In predication, the interlocutor is also anticiplated; either addressed or undressed to, but the statement itself does not have a gesture of talking immediately to the addressee, a feature unique to predication. (cf. 2.1).

The interrogation brings us back again to the realm where we anticipate someone to respond, to cooperate in making the predication complete between the partners.   It is not exactly a paradox that the form of the interrogative resembles that of the exclamation, both involving immediate response to the out-going speech, and that many of the exclamations take exactly the same form with (or without) the 'wh'-element.

The exclamatory as the fourth of speech motivations taking form in the English expression may be handled and taught as a formal variant of interrogative expressions. Thus "What a big house this is!" may be rendered as a question that intacitly anticipates the response "Yes, it certainly is!"   This takes us back to the embryo sentences, the exclamation we discussed in Chapter I.

2.9 To conclude the chapter, we should like to stress again the importance of the total view of English predication and its hirarchial structure.   The paradigm given in

---

9) Even those accompanying prepositions may be handled en mass, thus 'in whose house', 'of what
     colour', etc., come to the front of interrogative sentences.

several tables above should be conceived as a whole and all the local affairs should be derived from the totality of the system. The learners, accordingly, should be convinced that the kinds of predication are exhaustively covered by the paradigm, both for constructing and or analysing *any* and *every* English sentence. The conscious and intellectual operation will be essential for the mastery of any non-native language, and through articulate practice, the operation will become less and less conscious until it takes not much more mental effort than it takes in one's performance in his own langauge.

In the syntax of English, consisting of four kinds of syllables—noun syllabels, predicate verb syllabels, adjective syllabels and adverbial syllables—the most essential and indispensable—the predicate verb syllable—is thus *completely* (not *perfectly* in details) laid out. The prospect thus given will be at least a convenience to the learners, if not the canon. The paradigm tells that the verb-structure, whatever it is, follows the subject, and continues onto α which could be object, or complement, each specific to the verb selected.

Since the explanation for the formations according to the kinds of verb has been made conveniently with the cases of imperative formations (Chapter I), the main body of the proposed syntax is hereby concluded. The remaining portion of the present curriculum is the discussion on the constitution of each type of syllable and a local grammar which would govern the language without reference to the total syntax of the sentence involved, i.e., the laws to bring the isolated elements mechanically into higher structure or module, without concern to the ultimate meaning, the intent of the speech so to be enacted.

In actual teaching, what follows hence and what has been dealt with up to this point may go on simultaneously, not necessarily one after another. In the pedagogical reality, however, parallel progress should not give the learners an impression of conflict or disorder. The principle of the pressent curriculum is to teach the foreign language as if it were a set of algebra, autarchial as a finite system consitent of itself, with a set of vocabulary as the stock of variables and constants, so to say. The curriculum, as any other curriculum, contains two phases, one is the indoctrination, the other, the practice. What can be intellectually taught belongs to the first, while that which can be empirically cultivated belongs to the second. The first, the explaining process, may have two kinds of subject matter to be taught, one is the comprehension of the convention and the formula of the operation—purely formal or categorical manoeuvre, the other is a static accumulation of individual knowledge items, grammatical or semantic. The second phase of the curriculum is the process of accumulation of experience in enacting what has been schematically comprehended in the first phase, the empathy exerting process, so to say. The present propostion is

chiefly on the first phase, presupposing a proper manner and amount of the second phase of teaching, or coaching rather, by the teachers themselves elsewhere.

Even in the indoctrination process, what is essential is that the oppositions should be presented clearly and distinctly. The dual features, whatever they may be, should be presented at every level distinctly in contrast, as the teaching of a foreign language may in some way be different and opposed to the native way of acquiring a language competence. How to accomodate the paradoxical orientations in the curriculum inherent in foreign language teaching will be the major problem remaining to be solved. A foreign language, whatever it may be, is a language, hence its acquisition may be most efficient if it is learned as langauge, in the process analogous to the way a native acquires it, and yet, the process should be inverted, since it is not a natural experience for any mentality that has been constructed on its own native language. In short, a foreign language should not be taught as if it were not a language. Thus the most natural, and therefore fruitful or at least harmless way to teach any foreign language is to teach it as a *foreign language,* with a definite principle and process for that particular purpose, that is, however, if it has to be taught and learned for any reason at all.

At any rate what is static and what is dynamic, what is synthetic and what is analytical should not be administered in mixture or at random; not by compromise but by contrast only, the dual reality of language can be objectively and effectively explained and imparted. The curriculum should be seconded eventually by a "synthetic grammar" to complement the present *analytical* syntax for teaching or learning English.

One additional chapter, however, will have to be inserted here, which is not a discussion on a syntactic affair, in the principle of the present syntax, but on the matters usually onsidered and handled as syntactical, before we will launch into the synthetic grammar and the practice therein.

Chapter III   Verbal Complements

3.1 The present chapter is introduced as an inevitable compromise to the reality of the language as well as to the traditional and native handling of the verbal elements. Since English verbs have such derivatives as infinitives and participles, their dual nature naturally involves the problem of whether they are mentally so conceived and therfore should be classed and handled as a part of the verbal system or should be construed and formulated as a part of the adjective system. The present proposition is, without respect to the mental reality, to classify these hybrid elements, on their formal consistency, as something extraneous to the verbal structure and to assign them

to complements, hence to handle them as adjective syllables—the latter approach. The diagram below should, therefore, belong to that of derived adjectives rather than annexed thus to the paradigm of the verb structure. (Tables 6, 7 and 8)

Empirically and traditionally, however, some combinations in the form of 'verb+ complement', or in our terminology, 'dependent verb+complement', and 'causative verb+complement'—the complements being in the form of infinitive and participle— have been considered as extensions of verbs, while others have not been admitted as such. To quote a few of such uneven or inconsistent treatments, we have the follow- ing: whereas the so-called progressive form is given a status as if it were a verbal formula for the aspective expression called by that name, the analogous formation 'be+to-infinitive' is not given an analogous status. The past participle as complement is randomly handled, e.g., the *irregular* ankylosis 'have+past participle' is given a status of a distinct verbal formula for perfective expression thus rendering the more *legitimate* verbal formula 'be+past participle intransitive' as a redundant minority, while conferring on the *incidental* formation 'be+past participle transitive' an extra status as an exclusive passive formula. All this may be verifiable to the native ex- pereince of the language, if apart from their formal consistencies, but such uneveness in the treatment, not perhaps in mental operation, of the formal elements of the language could become the very shortcoming of native-orientared non-native teaching. Hence the following tables are proposed as a more form-conscious paradigm for this precarious region of English syntax to be imparted to non-native, but linguistically adult, learners.

As in the previous occasion, the total paradigm, in three tables, is given below (of which the first two, i.e., those for the present participle and for infinitive, are con- venieniently tabulated into a single table, as if they are alternate phases), and in the subsequent sections explanations are to be given on the respective tables.

The tables are also expressive of two versions concurrently, one for the cases where verbal complement is employed as subjective complement, i.e., after dependent verbs, and the other as the complement of the causative formation, i.e., after the object. The first case also includes those reflective formations that have lost their reflective object[10]. The five entries, 1—5, stand for the five types of verbs from which the infinitive and participle are respectively derived, thus constituting a set analogous to the five sentence patterns (minus the subject). To the right of the tables are the

---

10) the so-called idiomatic verbal phrases such as 'get up', 'get on', 'get well', 'get killed'; 'keep up', 'give up', 'make up', 'make merry' etc., could be classed under this category. The treatment here is only for avoiding the confusion between transitive-ness and intransitive-ness of the verbs involved.

schema of the sentence formations of the main clause and the analogous five patterns the participle and infinitive assume (expressed in smaller symbols and letters).

Table 6 / Table 7　Infinitive phrase/Present participle phrase, as complement

S	Vi/Vt+O	C (of the main clause) to+/+ing	C (of the main clause) α'	Subjective Complement	Objective Complement
	a)	1. $\dfrac{\text{(to) go}}{\text{going}}$		S V C	S V O C
		2. $\dfrac{\text{(to) be}}{\text{being}}$	happy	S V C c	S V O C c
	b)	3. $\dfrac{\text{(to) cook}}{\text{cooking}}$	apples	S V C o	S V O C o
	c)	4. $\dfrac{\text{(to) give}}{\text{giving}}$	him　books	S V C o o	S V O C o o
	d)	5. $\dfrac{\text{(to) make}}{\text{making}}$	her　happy	S V C o c	S V O C o c

P$_{2/5}$; S............C............ (Subjective Complement / Objective Complement)

a) majority of dependent verbs
b) transitive verbs, with elipsis of reflective object
c) causative verbs
d) verbs of perception (pure infinitive as complement)

Table 8　Past participle phrase as complement

S	Vi/Vt+O	C (of the main clause) [P. P.]		C (of the main clause) α'	Subjective Complement	Objective Complement
		1. come	perfect		S V C	S V O C
		2. grown	perfect	old	S V C c	S V O C c
	ditto	3. loved	passive	△	S V C △	S V O C △
		4. given	passive	△　apples	S V C △ o	S V O C △ o
		given	passive	him　△	S V C o △	S V O C o △
		5. made	passive	△　happy	S V C △ c	S V O C △ c

P$_{2/5}$; S............C............ (Subjective Complement / Objective Complement)

The real compromise consists in thus handling these combinations as if they were additional details of the predication discussed in the preceding sections, in spite of the knowledge that the ankylosis of the main verb and its verbal complement is inconsis-

tent and accidental to the syntax so far formulated.

The compromise will force us to ignore the internal structure of the verbal phrases so formed, and to give to whatever comes in the columun α en mass a comparable status of an element of the main clause of predication. Thus "He is sleeping" is parsed as "He + depeddent verb 'is' + adjectival complememt in the form of present participle 'sleeping'", bu not as "He, not 'sleeps' but 'is-sleeping', a kind of new conjugation added to the verb 'sleep'".

As a matter of fact, in the teaching practices, "He *sees* her", "He is *seeing* her" and "He *is seen* by her (though not "*she* is seen by *Him*") are all considered and handled empirically as aspectual variants of the same verb 'see' in reference to the same Subject 'He' in this instance. The first two incidences of 'her' are there treated as syntactical object in spite of the difference in the formal structure of the 'sees' and 'is seen', the implied 'seer of the seeing' also being different referents. The present proposal is to reconsider the practice and re-formulate the paradigm in favor of the formal, rather than empirical, consistency.

As observable, the first table of the paradigm is of the case for infinitive, both with and without 'to', and of the case for present participle as complement, both in transitive and intransitive verb formations. According to the verbs from which the infinitive or participle is derived, each complement leads either of the five patterns from 1 to 5, i.e., diminished or analogous sentence patterns. Infinitives lose their 'to' in the position of the complement for causative verbs. The actual shape of the combination depends upon the verbs and their idiosyncrasies. The verbs may be classified and graded, e.g., for the dependent verbs, 'be' may be the minimal followed by 'become', 'look', 'remain', 'feel', etc., in the order of increasing restrictions as to the kind of complement they select. The idiosyncrasy of the causative verbs is more various. It will be always better to present the whole spectrum, from extreme to extreme, and therein locate the item in question, e.g., the causative verb 'let' should be at one of the extremities as it can only take 'to-less infinitives' for its complement, and not any participle nor even the regular adjectives or nouns. This is to say that 'let' should be recognized, first of all, as one of such causative verbs indosed with regular full scope of freedom in selecting its objective complement as a matter of categorical anticipation, then only, by local rulings particular to this verb, the possibility is suppressed one by one until the said category, the 'to-less infinitive' alone is left to it. (cf., footnote to 2.4). This order, the *grammar* of grammar, should not be impeded retroactively by the *local* irregularity, i.e., the restrictedness of its uses in the given paradigm.

It should be noted that since these verbal complements may be those derived from dependent or causative verbs that could take still another complement which in turn

could very well be another verbal complement, the process could go on to n-th degree to form a cluster. This recurrent situation is expressed by the reduced size of the 'o' and 'c' in capitals, connected by a tag[11]. Thus, "He is to come" and "He is coming" match up in the paradigm both in form and meaning:"Subject+dependent verb+ infinitive (or present participle), infinitive as complement +'subordinate elements brought into by the infinitive (or the participle)" implying the state or a nature of something not (yet) materialized but anticipated (or paresent participle as complement, implying the state or a nature of something taking place actually or continually)[12]. Whatever follows the infinitive (or participle) is considered to be the internal affair of the complement (adjectival). The parallel case with present participle has been given an equivalent status to the verbal conjugation, e.g., 'progressive' form, leaving the comparable formation with to-infinitive without even a name.

The second table of the paradigm illustrates the cases of past participle as the complement either of a dependent verb or of a causative verb.   In the case of both dependent and complete verb formations, likewise, the past participle of the dependent verbs and of complete verbs are capable of expressing perfective, while those of the accusative, dative and causative work as passive. To put it simply;the past participles of the transitive verbs are passive participles unless they are in 'have+past participle' formations. Special attention is to be paid to the so-called 'retained object' and the cases of likewise *retained* 'objective complements'. In the table, these retained elements are entered along with the vacancies caused by the loss of the object or complment to the subject of the new clause.

Although the concept of participle and infinitive are the most confusing to Japanese learners in whose language no commensurable categories exist, when learners are thoroughly familiar with the use of the ordinary adjective in dependent formations, it may be opportune to teach them the participles and infinitives as partaking of a similar adjectival function. The present participle and infinitive may be introduced as

11) These sequences, i. e., clauses minus their subject with the verb in derived form, are later to be handled as 'affairs of subordination' under which likewise come all that may be led by infinitives, participles and gerunds, regardless of their status in the superior structure, not limitted, as it is here, to that of complement.

12) The set collocation 'be+going+to-infinitive' is usually taught as equivalent of 'shall' or 'will' for no particular purpose or benefit. Grammatically the formation should not be given too much emphasis. "He is going to study" is enate to "He is coming to study", the only difference being the semantic specialization for the verb 'go' as to mean the preparatory or impending state of the subject (cf., the counterpart in French). In spite of the easiness and usefulness in practical uses, this feature is rather incidental, from the formal point of view, and its premature introduction should be avoided in teaching practices.

if they were an alternate pair. Impress the learners with the idea that infinitive and present-participle (and later, past participle likewise) are adjectives with an additional privilege, if they so choose, to bring in what they can do as if they were predicate verbs, save the predicative power in reference to the subject, the performer of the implied action. Whatever the latter function brings in, it is an affair within the complement, a *subordinate* affair, even though the product assumes a 'subject-less analogue' of the five sentence patterns. To conceive the subordinate element of the converted verb as the internal affair of the complement (or whatever it is) is, perhaps, too far-fetched, but it is more consistent and therefore simpler, from a formal point of view, than otherwise.

Thus the so-called present progressive as well as past progressive form may be taught side by side with the 'be + to-infinitive formation, past and present', one as the description of what is actually taking place, whether continuously or repetatively, with or without reference to the actual time, while the other as an expression of immediate or eventual anticipation of an act or motion, or of an abstract, supposed tendency. The latent implications of infinitives would be later learned on the basis of this use of the infinitive in complement position. It would be a mistake to teach as if the progressive formation 'be + root + ing' constitutes a distinct aspect expression, almost a verbal declension, while handling 'be + to-infinitive', which to beginners would appear 'be + to + root', as something frequent but accidental. The contrast of present participle and infinitive should be the primary focus and the doublet should be presented where their contrastive nature is most conspicuous, i.e., in a neutral setting, e.g., after the 'be' verb[13].

This arbitrary dictomy of what is empirically felt and handled as a unit might very well provoke irritation of the teachers, native or non-native, to say nothing of the native speakers. But here again we wish to uphold the scheme of lesser formal inconsistencies rather than empirically established compromises. How to present the formal constitution of English to non-native learners in its most consistent and simple aspect, whether assumed or actual, is the primary consideration of this curriculum. It is not presented as an absolute observation or a perfect description of the language, but as a logical and efficient programme, at a given level of perfection.

Thus we will not go very far into the fine description or distinction of such implicational ambiguity as seen in "He is sitting down" implying either that the subject

---

13) Interchangeability between infinitive and present participle as complement, however, fails in the cases of auxiliary 'have' which happens to have both 'to have' and 'having' forms; thus possible is "He is to have gone", but not "He is having gone". Meanwhile in the cases of objective complement, neither is possible; thus, neither "We made him have gone" nor "We made him having gone" is possible.

cited is in the transitional state of sitting down from a *standing* posture that will end up in a *'sat'* position or that he is in the state of being *seated*, may not be too important.   Ambiguous cases of purely adjectivalized present participles in the parallel structure, e.g., "He is charming or interesting" vz., "He is charming or interesting someone", may also be mentiond provided that it does not defeat the immediate objectives.   We would consider these as more or less incidental, not structural, to the entire scheme, and believe that the learners will become aware of these semantic details as they grow more experienced in the language

The 'to-infinitive' as complement may be rather too sophisticated for beginning learners but to present the infinitive in this function will lead the way to other uses of infinitives, i. e., adjactival and adverbial and finally as noun element, and later 'to-less infinitives' in causative formations.   To teach the learners here that infinitives are adjectives may yet be somewhat difficult and premature, but comparison and contrast with present participle as adjective may be nevertheless tried. Thus, when someone is, or was, in the state of anticipating the act of something to take place, the correct form should be 'to come' and not 'coming', and so on.   Presenting these two as alternate pairs will add to the understanding.   One is actualized while the other is potential, one is real while the other is presumed, both being employed to express the situation as a state of something, not as the action of the said 'something'.   In both cases it should be recalled that the subject of the sentence and the implicit subject of the verbal complement are identical in their reference[14].

The situation becomes even more pronounced when the verbal complement happens to be those so-called objective complements of causative formations.   The present participles remain as they are while infinitives lose the preposition 'to', a riddle of English grammar: Centuries ago English infinitives, shedding off their specific declensions, became *bare,* and when confusions were met, they went on to take a prepostion, namely, our 'to'.   The use of the very 'to' of the preceding sentence, for instance, is very ambiguous as to what function it assumes. Thus in the remote areas of the so-called objective complement, the infinitives appear still in their original, i.e., in the form of bear or pure infinitive, hence we have the cluster of such expressions for causative formations: "I let him come", "I made him go", "I saw him go" etc. Some verbs, not established as causative, will pose problems as to the shape of the infinitives for their objective complement, e. g., "I help him to go" or "I help him go"; "I expect him to go" or "I expecte him go" etc.   In such cases it is safer to take the recourse of 'to' which will open the way for the infinitives to drift away towards

---

14) The use of infinitive in "He is to blame", accordingly, is permissible only as a freak—the performer of the act 'blame' being someone other than the 'he' there cited.

free adverbial orbit from the fixed complementary position, e.g., "I help him to go" could be thereby made to mean "As for the matter of his going, I help him", etc. Inversely, "I want him come", if possible, is far less grammatically ambiguous than "I want him to come", where the infinitive can be construed as object (noun), adjective (modifying the preceding noun, or as objective complement) and as adverb (the manner or purpose of the 'waiting').

The past participle as complement may present two problems; one is the convergence of two aspects, i.e., perfective and passive, the former being general to all the verbs while the latter only with transitive (accusative, dative and causative,) hence the distinction between 1, 2 and 3, 4, 5 in the table, which is again analogous to the sentence paterns of 2.1 above.   As compelemt, the two kinds of verbs are again clearly divided and distinct. When perfective is sought to be effected on the base of past participle of transitive verbs, the auxiliary 'have' in some way or other has to be employed: thus, not "I am taught her" but "I have taught her"; not "I made him taught her" but, at least, "I made him (to) have taught her (not grammatical)"; not "I know him taught her" but "I know him having taught her (with some grammatical doubt, notwithstanding)"[15].

As stated already, while passive structure displaces the objects of the verb, it retains the remaining object (of the two) and even retains the complment, if there is one.   The proposed scheme, with small triangles and other indices, may seem too meticulous, but it is better to explain thus the situation in full than try to convince the learners with such compromise explanations as equating "He is loved", "He loves her" and "He is loving her (if permissible)".   These will only confuse the learners and discourage generalization-regularity tropism of the intellectual learners.   The change of transitive verbs into passive participles involves the shift of what has been the assumed object into the subject, and the former subject is displaced from the immediate scope of the predication.   The mention of the possible 'by-phrase' as the ghost of the subject displaced will add to the confusion.   The implied subject of the past participle, if it ever exists, is the one that receives the action, no longer the doer of the action.   This is a decisive change which cannot be put on a par with other verbal declensions as for infinitive, gerund and present participle where such change of the inherent subject of the verb does not take place.   Remember that Equation "A loves B = B is loved by A" is dependent on the identity of the contextual meaning, beyond the scope of the grammar or syntax presently involved.

Grammatically incidental, but practically un-ignorable uses of such formilæ as 'get

---

15) "I know him to have taught her" is of course rightful, but why not "having taught her"? The gerundial counterpart "I know his having taught her" is available, nevertheless.

up', 'get on', etc., as used in "I get up at ten", "I get on the bus", etc., may be handled along with such cases as 'keep quiet', 'give up', etc. (cf., footnote 1) above. Because of the apparent simplicity of the form and usefulness in daily rounds (of those who live in English-spoken communities), these are being taught at an earlier stage of teaching. From the formal point of view, however, these phrases do, because of the structure, offset the transitive-intransitive contrast of English verb system at the very beginning. What should be taught as primarily transitive 'get' is here presented as an intransitive complete verb in the collocation 'get-up', while 'get-on' is taught as if it were an easier version of transitive 'ride'. The similar situation prevails with 'keep', 'give' etc. This applies also to 'get killed', 'keep running', etc. All these degraded (not morally, of course) uses should be suppressed in favour of the regularity orientated principle of our curriculum; thus these should be taught if they must for any reason, as regular transitive (causative, dative or accusative as the case may be) verbs with their reflective objects in pronoun suppressed, eliminated and finally forgotten. Such logical explanation should be given priority, and the curriculum will wait until such logical explanations can be made to the learners. The sitaution resembles the case in teaching the set phrase "If you please". It should be taught rather as the inverted form of "If it please(s) you" with an accidental —grammatically, at least,— dissapearance of the object 'it', than by rote for practical utility, undermining the primary meaning of the verb 'please' as transitive.

This concludes the discussion on the verbal complements, and on the entire paradigm of the verbal structure of English sentences. Whenever a new collocation appears in the classroom, the teacher must locate it in the paradigm or demonstrate which structures are being amalgamated in the apparently complex verb structures. It will be only rarely that the paradigm be surpassed, if ever, and the beginning non-native learners must be spared of the freaks and caprices of living English, something essentially a matter to the natives, not to the foreign learners.

Where English (or any other foreign lnanguage) has to be taught by individuals who are not themselves native English-speakers nor perfect acquired-English speakers, the teaching procedure must be logically and explicitly laid out so that the teachers need not depend upon their own personal but insufficient experience nor on their precarious performance competence in the language. No teacher of mathematics is required to be the *final* mathematician himself; he can teach at every stage of his understanding and mastery of mathematics, so can any non-native langauge-teacher with varying degree of competence-and-knowledge, if he is well equipped with explicitly designed curriculum, and with advantage in performance expereince sufficient enough over and above that of those whom he teaches.

As alluded to at the end of the last chapter, a diagonal approach to the language

on converse principles has to be formulated to achieve what is intended by the discussion thus concluded. As a matter of fact the competence imparted by such approach elsewhere has been intacitly presumed and depended upon, all the way to this point behind all the description and prescription we have presented. We have to formulate in our own way the mechanism of the elements, mental and formal, as they form themselves into modules of higher structure, not as dividends of a total speech, but as an integration of à priori parts into a specific kind of formal unit each of which is to be mobilized in an intention-charged, meaning-carrying unit of speech.

In the following chapters, the parsing technique of sentences according to the principle so far set forth will be presented to some details and demonstrated for actual teaching, along further discussions of the structure of the constituent elements toward the 'complete speech', in spite of the haunting doubt that any unit of speech can really express and convey *the* meaning[16].

16) to be continued.