INTRODUCTION

It is certainly a truism today to assert that traditional, structural, and transformational generative grammarians approach the study of language from different angles and that the three also have important historical relationships, for each reacted against its predecessor. This article will be concerned with how the traditionalist / prescriptivist and the transformational - generativist deal with the passive voice in general, but the focus will be on the passivisation of ditransitive verbs such as 'give' and the so-called 'retained object'.

I. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE MAJOR GRAMMAR / LINGUISTICS SCHOOLS

Although definitions do not always do true justice to the object or activity being referred to, it can, nevertheless, tentatively be said that, from a functional viewpoint, a traditional grammarian is any linguist who worked before the structural revolution, or before about 1930. Of course, such a definition covers a considerable variety of grammatical philosophies and approaches among which the "universalist" grammarian - epitomised by Roger Bacon (1214 - 1294), who felt that there was an ideal, or universal grammar in whose terms the rules of all particular grammars could be discussed - and the "prescriptivist", who viewed language morallyistically: there was "good grammar" and there was "bad grammar" (Whitman, 1975).

The structuralist, at least the American one, is best defined with respect to the status of meaning. Leonard Bloomfield, the father of American structuralism, wrote in 1933: "the study of language can be conducted... only so long as we pay no attention to the meaning of what is spoken." Chomsky, one of the leading exponents of transformational - generative grammar, reacted against this view through, among other examples, his celebrated "Colorless green ideas sleep furiously", which, while syntactically well structured, is nonetheless a nonsense in English and in any other language, unless used for highly rhetorical effects in poetry. The struc-
turalist was committed to the study of objective data, so meaning fell outside the scope of his / her science. The transformational - generative grammarian, on the other hand, is concerned with the proposition that grammar entails a psychological reality on the part of the speaker / hearer, and that it is his / her job to work out the details of that reality.

As can be seen from what precedes, the three groups have each their approaches to language study / analysis which more or less clash. They disagree as to how to present or describe several grammatical features. One such feature is passivisation of ditransitive verbs in English.

2. THE ENGLISH VERB PHRASE AND THE VERB GROUP

Before dealing with the ditransitive verbs proper, it stands to reason to remind the reader of what a verb phrase, a verb group, and a lexical verb are. It will also be shown what they share in common and what makes them different to some extent.

Within transformational - generative grammar (TGG), a verb phrase or VP is generally made up of a verb and or without a noun phrase or NP. According to Burton - Roberts (1986), the one constituent that a verb phrase must contain is the verb group. In other words, no phrase can be referred to as a verb phrase if it has no verb group, which necessarily consists of a lexical verb often listed and explained or commented on by lexicographers in dictionaries. The lexical verb is optionally preceded and modified by other verbs which are more often than not found in the general class of the auxiliaries and modals.

Lexical verbs can be easily identified by their morphological changes. They indeed can take some or all of such inflections as: -s, -ed, and -en. A lexical verb belongs to the indefinitely large general vocabulary (as opposed to the finite set of grammatical rules) of a language. It always appears last in the verb group whose head it is.

When the lexical verb or head displays a tense (= is tensed), the verb group in which it appears is called a finite verb group. In contrast, verb groups without a tensed verb are referred to as non - finite verb groups, such as present / past infinitives and participles.

The English lexical verbs are roughly subdivided into six main sub - categories that are: transitive or also called monotransitive, intransitive, ditransitive, intensive, complex transitive, and prepositional. On the basis of this categorisation, it is often argued that the English verb system consists of six main sub - categories of verb groups.

The concern of this article being only one of the six sub-categories, it is unimportant to say more about the others. However, readers are referred to Quirk et al. (1972) and Burton - Roberts (1986) for further details.

2.1. DEFINING THE ENGLISH DITRANSITIVE VERB GROUP

It is in general contended that verbs are sub - categorised according to what other elements must appear with them in the verb phrase, which means that they are sub - categorised in terms of their complementation types. Thus, a ditransitive verb group is one which requires two (2) noun phrases (NPs) as its complementation. Lexical verbs such as 'give', 'send', 'buy', etc. fall within this sub - category. In a verb phrase containing a ditransitive verb group, the first complement noun phrase usually functions as the indirect object (IO) of the ditransitive verb group whereas the second one is the direct object (DO). The latter, therefore, functions as the noun phrase that complements a monotransitive verb group.

It must be noted that an important characteristic of verb phrases consisting of a ditransitive verb complemented by two noun phrases is that the indirect object noun phrase corresponds to a prepositional phrase (PP) in a position following the direct object noun phrase. This structure, however, is less formal and often used by new learners of English as a Foreign Language, especially speakers of French, who also find it difficult to deal with the use of verb phrases containing passivised ditransitive verb groups.

3. THE PASSIVE VOICE OF DITRANSITIVE VERBS FROM THE PRESCRIPTIVIST STAND-POINT.

That the description of the very concept / nature of the passive causes disagreement among linguists can be seen in the following quotation:

...Passivisation is a rather touchy subject now among most transformational grammarians who are aware of recent thought in the field. It is embarrassing because until a few years ago, it was one of the best understood rules in the grammar. (Robin Lakoff, 1969 : 129)

No doubt we know exactly what a passive sentence looks like on the surface, but its adequate explanation does pose problems. In Zandvoort (1962), the approach clearly forces English into a Latin - based framework of language analysis. One of the immediate consequences of such a situation is the invention of the label 'Retained Object' to deal with ditransitive
verbs in the passive and their objects. It is worth men-
tioning that the Zandvoort text is designed as a manual
of English grammar for Dutch and French students.

Like most traditional grammar handbooks, the
text argues that only transitive verbs can be used in the
passive. As a consequence of this, the rule states that
the passive voice is obtained by making the direct
object and the subject of the active verb become respec-
tively the subject and the agentive by - phrase of the
passive verb.

Dealing with verbs that have both direct and
indirect objects in the active voice, the text becomes some-
what confusing. In this respect, Zandvoort says that the
subject of a passive sentence may correspond to the in-
direct object of the active sentence and that the direct
object of sentences with an indirect passive is known as
the retained object (p.55), which sounds like an echo to
Jespersen's (1927):

When a verb in the active has two objects, both
cannot be made
subjects in the passive. There can be only one sub-
ject in a
sentence, which determines the person and the
number of the
verb. The other object then is "retained" as
such... (p. 33)
Zandvoort proceeds to speak of two possible construc-
tions with verbs that have an indirect besides the direct
object: the old and the new construction. In the old con-
struction, « the direct object is made the subject of the
passive, and the indirect object is retained.» The new
construction, he argues, «is the one in which the indirect
object is retained as such...» (p.57). To justify the gen-
eral preference for what he refers to as the new con-
struction, he contends that such a phenomenon is due in
the first place to the effacement of the formal distinction
between the dative and the accusative. The second rea-
son, he says, seems to be the same which assisted in
changing the construction of many verbs, namely the
greater interest felt for the person. He writes:

This, as we have seen, is the reason why in the
active the indirect
is placed before the direct object, as in the sen-
tence: he offered
the girl a gold watch. Thus, it became natural to
place the dative
in the very beginning of the passive sentence: the
girl was offered
a gold watch. Now, the position immediately be-
fore the verb is in
most sentences, active and passive, reserved for

the subject: so
the girl, though originally a dative, came to be
looked on as a
nominative, and instead of: she was offered a
watch, the new
construction arose: she was offered a watch. (p.57)

4 - PASSIVISATION WITHIN THE
TRANSFORMATIONAL -
GENERATIVE FRAMEWORK

Transformational - generativists cannot share the
notion of retained object simply because the key to the
concept of retained object lies in the discrepancy between
the rule that passives do not take objects and the obvious
fact they do sometimes. The modern linguist, if s / he is
working within the Chomskyan tradition, would rather
argue that it is wrong to invent the 'retained object' when
what is clearly necessary is a better understanding of the
rules concerning the passive, mainly the transformation
and movement rules that make passivisation simpler.
The first formulation of the passivisation rule in
Chomsky's Syntactic structures (1957 : 43) was:
Pass NP1 Aux V NP2 NP2 Aux BE
- en V by NP1
which has been since then modified by Chomsky himself
and many other linguists working within his broad frame-
work.

In the specific case of the passivisation of
ditransitive verbs and the so - called retained object.
Chomskyan linguists simply argue that passives can oc-
cur with the indirect object surfacing as the passive sub-
ject, as well as the direct object. That means that we can
have both:

The apple was given (to) John by Mary
and
John was given the apple by Mary,
whose active form is something like
Mary gave John the apple:
Mary gave the apple to John.
But a remark needs to be made about the passage from
Mary gave the apple to John
to
John was given the apple by Mary.

There is indeed an intervening step, the object switch /
movement, which establishes the indirect object noun
phrase as the NP immediately following the verb. This
ultimately means that the passive operation does
not work on direct objects or indirect objects so much as
on whatever NP happens to come after the verb group.
Building upon what precedes, the passive deep structure (DS) of

Mary gave John the apple will be

Mary past be - en give the apple singular to John.

By the object movement rule, it will become:

Mary past be - en give John the apple sing. by Mary

By the Flip - Flop rule:

John be - past give - en the apple sing. by Mary

and by the morphophonemic rules

John was given the apple by Mary

in the surface structure.

5. IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TEFL)

In actual fact, the acronym TEFL stands for Teaching English as a Foreign Language or Teacher of English as a Foreign Language depending on the context in which it appears. This part of the English teaching endeavour has to do with imparting English knowledge to people for whom English is neither a native nor an official nor a second language. It is, therefore, taught in multilingual contexts for more instrumental than integrative purposes, mainly at schools and universities. The teaching heavily relies on textbooks as learners have little opportunity of interacting with native speakers. This amounts to saying that this category of learners have little access to the use of English in real life situations.

Most grammar handbooks used in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts are prescriptive as is the Zandvoort and, consequently, often fail to describe the language under study in an adequate way. Such a shortcoming is the one concerning the so-called retained object in the passivisation of ditransitive verb groups. As most linguists know by now, the concept of retained object was merely devised to justify the claim that a passive verb group cannot have a direct object. Such a claim can remind the reader of the Latin sentence “Petro liber datus est” (literally: to Peter the / a book has been given) in which Petro is necessarily a dative and ‘liber’ a nominative. But, since English does not belong with the same immediate language family as Latin (though both are proto-Indo-European languages, Latin is a Romance language whereas English is a Germanic language) it is unfortunate to assume that it syntactically behaves like the latter.

It then follows that the teaching of the passive voice of ditransitive verb groups to university first or second year students specialising in English as a Foreign Language must be done from a contrastive standpoint by following these important steps:

a) the basic rule of passivisation in English will be taught: BE -en,
b) it will be clearly stated that, unlike what happens in French, for example, most English verbs can be passivised, even the intransitive ones provided that they are followed by a prepositional phrase, for example: this bed has been slept in;
c) the various movements and transformations involved from the deep structure to the surface structure will be discussed;
d) it will be demonstrated with several examples that all the ditransitive verbs do not have the same syntactic behaviour

(e.g. give, offer...are syntactically different to some extent from verbs like: explain, suggest...);
e) It will be shown, through the parsing of the so-called retained object, that even a passive verb can and does take a direct object, which is not possible in French. It will clearly be stated that

John was given a book

does not have its term for term equivalent in French, so that there is in French no sentence like:

*Jean a été / fut / était donné un livre.

The best French equivalent is:

on / a donné / donna / donnait un livre

à Jean.

The rationale underlying the contrastive approach is that there is always a translation course (English into French and French into English) in the undergraduate years of francophone departments of English studies. The contrastive approach can, therefore, be profitably exploited to teach how to translate the passive of English ditransitive verbs into French since in francophone Africa, French is still seen as the source language and English as the target language in EFL classes, where instructors and learners are literate in French, but not always in their first languages.

CONCLUSION

In French - speaking contexts of learning or teaching English as a Foreign Language, many a pitfall has to be tackled and dealt with in light of the findings of modern linguistics, especially by drawing on transformational - generative grammar. The passivisation of English ditransitive verbs is an example of such pitfalls as shown in this article, which has argued against the concept of “retained object” and contended that, unlike the French verb groups, most English ones can be passivised, even the intransitive. It has eventually shown the impossibility of a term for term translation from French or English of passive verb groups.
Elles s’opposent souvent aussi sur les méthodes d’analyse. Ainsi, les tenants du structuralisme et les générativistes divergent sur la nature du complément d’objet direct d’un verbe attributif quand ce dernier est mis au passif en Anglais. Cet article attaque l’approche structuraliste et suggère comment le passif de tels verbes devrait être enseigné à des étudiants francophones qui se spécialisent en Anglais, langue étrangère.
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1 As a matter of fact and sheer irony of fate, John Lockwood Kipling, the father of Rudyard Kipling, was both an artist and a scholar and had worked as a sculptor during the building of the Victoria and Albert Museum. When he went out to India with his new bride Alice Macdonald, it was with the aim of studying and fostering the arts and crafts of India (not, according to his recently acquired in-laws, an especially notable ambition). Then, during the nearly thirty years he spent in India, John Lockwood Kipling was at first Professor of Architectural Sculpture at the School of Art and later Principal of the Mayo School of Art and Curator of the Museum at Lahore in the Punjab (Chapter one of Kim is set outside the Lahore Museum).

Also, one product of all those years of work was Lockwood Kipling’s book Beast and Man in India (1891), an illustrated study of Indian life much admired by the author’s son, as the Jungle Books in part suggest.

Lastly while the writing of the book which was to become Kim goes as far back as 1885, the outline was already in Rudyard’s head in 1894 when he again set to wrote on it. Finally, with the advantage of hindsight and of early experiences of India that could easily be placed in perspective, parts of Mother Maturin went into Kim, as well as a good deal of advice from Lockwood Kipling, and at long last in 1900, the book was published.

2 An Introduction to the English Novel, vol I, London, 1962 3 Dennis Austin, author of “The Commonwealth in Eclipse?” (title of the JB. Danquah Memorial Lectures - Februrary 1972) - rightly put South Africa (Apartheid South Africa, that is) at par with India, Ghana and Kenya, as “turning points” in the process of the turning of British Empire into Commonwealth including Canada, fifty odd years ago, when in 1972 in the concluding part of the third and last lecture sub-titled “Dusk 1962-72” he spoke thus “looking back over the past three decades, it is difficult to explain why there should have been so rapid a decline. The enemy
with which the Commonwealth grappled and came to terms was of course nationalism, that established religion of our secular world; and there are no grounds for withholding our admiration for the way in which Empire was turned into Commonwealth in Canada, South Africa, India, Ghana and Kenya. These were the turning points, the rest were illustrative of the general movement”. (Ghana Universities Press, Accra, 1972, p.36).

4 As a rule, those authors are of urban origin and became known from the early 1940’s, and their undisputed leader and elder, Peter Abrahams, born in 1919 in Vrededorp a non-White location in the suburbs of Johannesburg, released his first book, entitled Dark Testament, in 1941. Ezekiel Mphahlele, a close acquaintance of Abrahams’, hailed from Marabastad (Pretoria). The others are William Blake Modisane, Alex La Guma and Richard Rive, born in 1923 (in Sophiatown - Johannesburg), 1925 (in Cape Town), and 1931 (in the slums of the Sixth District-Cape Town) respectively.

5 Apartheid did not vanish with the emergence of Black majority rule in South Africa.

6 Dennis Brutus was shot in the belly in his attempt to cross the border to former Southern Rhodesia.

7 See note 200 in our first doctoral thesis.

8 See A History of English Literature, J.M.Dent and Sons Ltd, 1926, 1927, by Emile Legouis. Louis Cazamian and Raymond Las Vergnas (Book VIII) (Translated from the French by Helen Douglas Irvine) where Cazamian and Las Vergnas made the following statements: “Among the English novelists, Dickens is neither the most consummate artist, nor the finest psychologist, nor the most accomplished realist, nor the most seductive of tale writers. But he is probably the most national, the most typical, and the greatest of them all” (p.1137) CAZAMIAN “...his (Orwell’s) novels remain the chosen field, in which his nightmare imagery - even 1984 is fundamentally here and now, it is not a prophesy, it is a vigilant satire on an existence model-attains a forcefulness whose importance largely exceeds the innate possibilities of its creator. Even Coming up for Air, though from the strict point of view, of novel-writing it is his masterpiece, sins by the clumsiness of its construction, the lack of cohesion in its Central Character, because he is at bottom fragmentary and improbable - the author is too intrusive, he lifts the mask too openly for us to be able to delude ourselves for long” (p.1399). LAS VERGNAS

The year 1954 also introduced William Goldberg, who was born in 1911, his first novel, Lord of the Flies, which made little or no stir at the time of its publication - possibly because it did not belong to the eddying and counter-eddying stream of ‘anger’ - has gradually become better known.

It is a sort of Robinson Crusoe: after an aircraft accident, some children land on a desert island, but that simple and picturesque story is made the starting point of a philosophical allegory on the duality of human nature.

The ‘God of Flies’ is none other than the Devil, lurking in the hearts of those fledglings and held in check by the taboos of civilization” (p.1409). For further details on the story in the novel, see James Gindin, Postwar British Fiction, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, pp.196,197,198.

9 The issue of anteriority on South African soil. See Baba Kake’s writings on the History of South Africa.

10 «I don’t think Chris will get a job here. There are fifty men standing by for every job there is. Sure there’s less colour bar here, but there are also less chances of making a living. Life is hard for the poor here, harder than in Johannesburg in some ways». (Tell Freedom, p.284)

11 Tell Freedom was published by Faber and Faber (London) in 1954, that is, fifteen (15) years after his “life in South Africa had come to an end” (p.311), which demonstrates the writer’s capacity for retrospect. Abrahams left the country with a clear mind about the Whites some of whom he said he was lucky he had met; because, “meeting them had made a straight ‘all blacks-are-good-all-whites-are-bad’ attitude impossible” (p.311). In 1999, an experienced elderly white man who knew Abrahams to some extent and with whom we discussed Peter Abrahams in Johannesburg, said he did not think Abrahams would bother to connect with black majority ruled South Africa.

12 Cecil John Rhodes (1853-1902) deserves a special mention here for two reasons the first of which has to do with British politics in South and East Africa over more than half a century (1890’s - 1960’s). Rhodes, a British financier and colonialist who managed to win the post of Prime Minister in the Cape Province, dreamt of British domination in South Africa, given the autonomy of the Boer States (Orange and Transvaal mainly) where diamond and gold were discovered in 1867 and 1886 respectively. The second reason is based on Rhodes’s idea which he owed to Harry Johnston, his lieutenant and an explorer who on 22nd August 1888, wrote in the “London Times” that with Government support to businessmen and missionaries in the Lakes Area, “our possessions in South Africa may be linked some day to our sphere of influence in Eastern Africa and the Egyptian Sudan by a continuous band of British do-
minions”.
Hence the Cape-Cairo “railway” linkage project.
13 Homecoming. Heinemann, 1972. p.46


15 ibidem. p.46. this reads like an anticipation of the theme
of Wole Soyinka’s Nobel Prize Acceptance Speech enti-
tled “This past Must Address Its Present: Dedicated to
Nelson Mandela”.

p.159.
17 Clifford Robson, for some reason, or may be because
he knows the true order of precedence, started his criti-
cal book entitled Nguni Wa Thiongo with The River Be-
tween, followed by Weep Not Child, A Grain of Wheat,
Secret Lives and Petals of Blood. Then, came “The
Plays”, followed by “A Critical Assessment” and two
other final chapters
18 There are books of English Literature dating from the
1950’s where texts written by Indians, Ghanaians or Ni-
gerians feature generally in the closing chapters under
the most convenient Commonwealth umbrella, assuming
that English authors and all these belong to the same lit-
ery background.

Later on, Literary Appreciation: Longman, 1968, by
H.L.B. Moody is described by its author as a book
“planned for use by students taking courses in higher
education in parts of the world where English is a Sec-
ond Language.
The “Foreword” to the book ends with the most edifying
remark that “if any students whose first language is Eng-
lish also find the book useful, we shall not be dismayed:
indeed, this will seem to bring closer together the world-
wide community of English-speaking people”.

See also: African Studies. Heinemann, 1994, a catalogue
containing items on social History of Africa, History, South
Africa, Politics, Economics Development. Current Af-
19 There are many critical books on African literature on
the issue of the value and relevance of with the books
and their authors vary from timid, lukewarm approaches,
then professional Europe centred analyses, to downright
revolutionary titles. In the first and second categories,
we have the many books published in the 1970’s and
1980’s mainly under Studies in African Literature, Criti-
cal Perspectives and African Literature Today (see Af-
The third category includes, among many others, five
books of which we want to make a special mention in
view of their rather unusual titles, such as: