

ANALYTICAL SYNTAX FOR TEACHING ENGLISH (4)

—a non-native approach—

October 1974

Kan KATAYANAGI

Chapter VI Curriculum Toward Syntax

6.1 Premise for pedagogy of non-native language

Will an infinite aggregate of local truths add up to that total and final reality we hope to reach? Can we presume our partial knowledge as valid unless and until we have the ultimate entirety in our hands? The tentativeness of every scientific truth, to remotely reflect a champion linguist of our time, is inevitable for any branch of scientific pursuit including that of language and languages. And well thus, for we might not, after all, be allowed to come to the absolute enlightenment of the things and affairs we want to know. But it is nevertheless true that, within the realms and dimensions that do matter to us, we can somehow manage and improve the subject and situation by manipulating such consecutive pieces of knowledge and experience we garnered; hence the variety of applied sciences including that for language and its teaching.

How to better teach or learn a non-native language, among others, is, therefore, a matter properly of a sub-branch of what is to be, and is actually to a certain extent already called 'applied linguistics' even though the time-honoured academic citadel traditionally represented by such an august name as 'faculty of English' at home and abroad may not as yet concede to acknowledge.

Acquisition of non-native language is of course a phase of cultural contact or conflict involving the entire scope of humanity as individuals and as communities, and, to recall a phrase from another eminent linguist, the locus of language contact is individuals¹⁾. So we started with the premise that it "is, above all, an intellectual incident" and that it is "basically an extraneous feat for any mental mechanism that is sufficient and consistent of itself. Human intelligence so far renderable in the inevitable and exclusive, native free language is there forced to accomodate itself to

1) Weinreich, Uriel; *Languages in Contact*, p. 1, Mouton, 1970; The original line reads: The language using individuals are thus the locus of the contact.

a new regime where it has to coexist with another system of mental recourse, redundant, incongruous and not without occasional 'violence'” and “the most crucial is the intellectual implication of the state of affairs involved.”²⁾

In the relative absence of orientation in this area of pragmatics, meanwhile, every conceivable means has been proposed and approved if only it had any effect short of detriment; while there is a long-established pedagogical truism that the purpose and motivation of the parties involved is anywhere a matter completely beyond being 'linguistic' but all the more drastic in affecting the efficiency of the pedagogy of anything, that of a non-native language being not at all exceptional. Thus if a foreign language has to be taught or learned for any purpose at all, and if efficiency or parsimony is a universal merit or virtue for any pragmatic diligence, we need, at least, a plausible policy rather than truth and knowledge, tentative or otherwise.

Whereas curriculum for native language teaching, like those for gymnastics, aesthetic performances, etc., may be dictated more or less by the nature of the feat and art being learned, the curriculum for non-native teaching should be subject to another kind of ruling. If we were to teach the cosmology as expressed by Euclidean geometry, for example, the curriculum to teach it is inevitably analogous and parallel to the structure of the geometry itself. It begins with a set of a priori axioms and develops through theorems, step by step, towards details of the entire system, but never going beyond the frontiers of that particular cosmology. The curriculum for non-native language should be likewise, as long as the subject remains to be 'non-native' to the learners.

We earlier stated, therefore, that we set our pedagogy on the policy that we arbitrarily freeze and fix the subject language so that it is no longer an indefinite corpus of reality, but a created known, a self-sufficient autarchy of code system. That is to say, instead of teaching a language by way of describing it item by item toward an infinite degree of perfection, we proposed to institute and impose an edited, arbitrary model, a simulation, designed *toward*, rather than *after*, that language. As the conventional pedagogy of non-native language, in a vague parody of that for native language tends to be imparting of the items of the actual language with an intact understanding that since whatever so imparted is each a portion of the real language, what matters is the quantity, not the sequence or structure of what is so acquired.

Our contention is, however, that if the thing to be imparted is not something natural, but a product arbitrarily formulated, a set of conventions, the process of its teaching, the curriculum, can be and should be designed independent of those for

2) p. 13, Introduction, present article appearing in Vol. 21 of this journal, 1971.

native learners. Since we have the subject so confined within the whole system we created, its curriculum can be and must be derived from that known totality, the gestalt, that is to say, the curriculum to teach such a closed system should be self-determined with its innate syntax, though not in tune with the natural propensity of the learners and most likely with that of the natives, but in agreement with the dictate of intelligence no matter whose.

A system, if it is a system, dictates the process of its teaching and it might perchance coincide with the mode of describing it. Our pedagogy is how to impose a complete system so that the recourse to intelligence is not only fully respected, but also found valid and dependable, in a word, to make the learning intellectually productive.

6.2 Structure of curriculum

Although a system of code may be without phonology, that is, its symbolism can be completely soundless (as a matter of fact, in this country, English at least seems to be taught as if its sounds are an unnecessary accompaniment), we cannot very well banish the sounds from the tailored English we are proposing, as abstract as it is, without losing its language-ness. And yet, even the phonology thereof should be administered as an intellectual rather than natural property. It should be taught not as of phonetics, but of phonemics; not as fixed response to a set stimulus, but as *ad hoc* operation of universal intelligence in which every one of us partakes, not as physiological or kinetic performance but as mental calculation; not as of empirical intuition but as of idiational logic. In short, our curriculum of non-native language teaching is based on the principles of 'emics' rather than on 'etics', to recall the witticism of some of our predecessor linguists.

Consider the status of mathematics, for instance. It is a man-made system of expression and operation of something thereby conceivable and communicable. Its lexicon contains only those members in glossary, mutually definable within the system; its grammar prescribes how to string the vocabulary items into formulae and equations; its phonology is completely soundless and matterless, thus invoking no problem of morphology. Its semantics knows no problem since it does not care what it cannot express—it does not care, for instance, if something considered to be 'one' should become 'two' when there are two of them; it only cares that two times 'one' should always yield 'two' regardless of the matter thereby counted or meant. Unlike language, meaning there is relevant, self-evident and valid but so only within the system itself. Each element means what it was meant to mean, nothing more, nothing less, and the aggregate of the elements can be calculated automatically according to the formula whose functional meaning is also predetermined. Syntax of mathematics, if there is such, is almost 'the' mathematics itself, the whole structure

reducible to the ultimate single equation with varying values, and, at the same time, reversible through the developing procedure to the surface product.

Now, how could this apply to our artificial language and its teaching curriculum? We earlier proposed to deploy language into two coefficients, "one, the so-called lexicon, in the form of memory reservoir, conveniently classified with indices and cross-references for scanning" and for retrieval, and the other, "the operational formula, the programme, some obligatory while others optional"³⁾ in a loose allusion to an English speaking machine. In short, a code system, whatever it may be, does consist at least of two properties, the elements and the syntax, to achieve its purpose, to communicate externally or state internally.

We must first designate the elements by a set of symbolism, either phonetic or completely visual; the elements must be made distinct from each other by definitions. We could be realistic and designate some vowels and consonants from the phonetic reality of the language and register them as phonemic symbols of the system. Superimposed phonemes could be relegated until such become necessary and possible.

Then we must institute vocabulary, the lexical items, only as parsimoniously as possible; they are incidental to the syntax. The lexicon should be structured so that the final individual elements of its members can be reached and retrieved through inevitable routine by stages of selections, that is to say, the lexicon should be 'generative'. The whole structure must be alerted and fitted to the paradigms (or synthetic grammar, in our terminology) through which it is connected on to the syntax of the total system.

The structure of the lexicon therefore should look like a set of lists of vocabulary items, dormant, arranged and sub-classified under proper designations (the so-called 'phrase markers') at each level of classification. The classification may look somewhat like the part-of-speech classification of the traditional grammar of the real English.

How to design the lexicon for the language at a given level of approximation will be a matter of policy. Suppose we were allowed to institute only one hundred words as our vocabulary items, how many classifications should we institute still representing evenly the entire English glossary (because the programme has to complete itself by that given stock of words)? How many parts of speech should we admit, what are the minority freaks that can be dispensed of if it was not for the copying of the actual English, but for representing English as a whole, no matter how sparsely? Suppose we need at least a class of words that is definable as nouns, (individual words that can be used as subject, object or complement of a clause without involving morphological changes upon themselves), what are the items we should include therein,

3) p. 43, 4.1, Chapt. IV, present article in Vol. 23 of this journal, 1973.

and how many? We must select the items not from utilitarian considerations but from efficiency and utility in representing the entire scope that has to be covered by the class of elements under the heading 'noun' so defined, in the entire system being proposed. We must organize the given items into a structure so that the path of selection and retrieval should be specified and formulated. What is the most logical sub-classification of the class 'nouns' as a section of the lexicon? What is the most efficient way for retrieval? We do not seem to have definite proposals.

Consider then, for instance, that if we were to increase the number of the vocabulary items by ten times, should we only multiply the membership of the population by that rate for each class, or should we institute sub-classes below what we have or should we incorporate new classes beside what we already have, all to bring the level of approximation of the system closer to the natural English we are trying to achieve? Whether it is to abbreviate the reality into a model, or to develop from the single whole into a desired complexity, we take the inevitable sequence as a matter of policy.

The lexicon, the classified glossary of the elements of our code system, being so set, the semantics is also thereby more or less automatically fixed, even if still variable on the relation between the two coefficient considerations subject to our policy. Perhaps we might recall, in way of explanation of the situation, a comedy, which is plotted on an assumption that the world is in a textbook for English conversation⁴⁾, where weeks, for instance, have only two days, Sunday and Monday; every woman is called Mary; every family lives in the suburbs of London, and so on. The inhabitants there do not care if there is any day in a week beyond those two days because they don't have themany. They neither care to know if there is anybody who is not Mary, because there is no one else... The life there is, of course, intorelably monotonous and banal as the comedy is meant to be... but there is no semantic problem as long as the inhabitants and their language are concerned. Perhaps we could write our curriculum likewise on the expense of its pragmatic adequacy as language.

Our pedagogically adequate policy, however, can be made with following options: we can first determine, according to the available time and the mentality of the learning individuals, the total number of lexical items, say, one hundred, as above, perhaps, if too un-realistic. Then we can distribute them into some classes at a level, say forty as nouns, thirty as verbs of which fifteen are transitive, ten intransitive and five in both functions, and the remaining into, say, five prepositions, five conjunctions of which three are subordinate and two coordinate, and ten adjectives of which some are articles and others determiners including pronominal adjectives and

4) Cf. Ionesco, Eugène; *Cantatrice Chauve*.

ten adverbs, thus intactly representing the actual distribution of the words into these categories. We can then condition the learners to memorize and operate in these terms, i.e., let them, the inhabitants, live within the world where only what is expressible by and within the vocabulary so given alone takes place, and they can be made very fluent and free indeed.

If they are to outgrow this stupidly limited realm into a slightly more variable and interesting world, they should improve or expand the lexicon. If the items to be added were limited, we could still do it in two ways; we could increase the kinds, not the membership, of classification with lesser members for each class or we could simply add more items to the existing classifications, or do both half-way.

Of course we could predetermine how far the system can be expanded or extended. We can stipulate at the beginning that some classes, like those for pronouns, prepositions, auxiliaries, etc., are closed, while for others like nouns, verbs, etc., are open⁵⁾. At any rate, one item added to a vocabulary is an expansion so much of the world for the inhabitants, but a specialization and restriction of the meaning of words to an observer outside the lexicon and the system. If only five prepositions are to represent hitherto possible every relationship a noun bears to the rest of the expression, each preposition divides the entire scope into five and carries one each. For the inhabitants, to have one more preposition added is to know one more kind of relationship hitherto unknown, thus it is an expansion and addition, but for the observer what has been one fifth becomes thus one sixth, i.e., the ratio of representation for each preposition is that much reduced. The designer of the curriculum should be aware of this and the teachers who administer likewise need be deft at handling the matter.

There will be no problem, however, in increasing the membership in an open class like nouns, adjectives, etc., but how to institute sub-classes will be a matter of policy, a policy better to be set at the beginning. If we were, for instance, to sub-group nouns into countables and un-countables, should we or should we not divide the scope allocated to nouns into two as early as possible in the progression of classification? If the parsimony is a logical necessity and if it allows, perhaps we should reserve two seats for nouns, one for the former, the other for the latter, if no more than two entries were to be allocated for nouns at the very beginning.

Eventually thus the lexicon may become so adequately detailed and fine as to serve the actuality, native or non-native, but the pedagogical efforts will be first to impart the items as distinct from each other as possible and to assign each a proper scope of meaning, which may be plotted over a spectrum spanning from concrete specific

5) Cf. p. 73, SAMPLE LEXICON (simplified), present article in Vol. 23 of this journal, 1973.

correlatives to general aspect and grammatical functions, i. e., from some proper names to grammatical idioms such as the so-called 'past perfect tense', etc.

Thus the next subject of the curriculum is duly the synthetic grammar or paradigms in our terminology, by means of which these classified vocabulary items are to be mobilized and strung together towards structured unity (though still indifferent to the impetus of the speech, the cause for any utterance to take place.)

The local grammar expressed in the form of paradigms may be considered from other directions as set routines each vocabulary item anticipates as its potentiality; thus any noun to be qualified by adjectives, preceded by preposition, etc. Morphological changes may also be set in paradigms, thus any verb can expect to become infinitive, with what it dominates as verb, and join the class of adverb, adjective or noun, or it can become a participle to function likewise as adjective or adverb. Nouns may undergo changes, if countable, into plural; pronouns, into other case-forms, etc. How far we can charge such prescriptions onto each class of lexicon as the so-called distinctive features (or else to the paradigms, i. e., to the grammar, which, in turn, carries some meaning—affected by the arrangement of the elements rather than by the adding up of the individual meaning carried by each individual element) also belongs to the policy of the curriculum.

To teach the formula, the paradigms, to give practice in the materials given and to teach what they imply, individually as well as in groups, no matter how abstract and limited, may be the pedagogical consideration and maneuver. The practice in paradigms, like that in lexicon, could be given without anticipation of the concluded expression; that is to say, one can construct phrases, the intermediate structures, as he can transact items in the lexicon, without reference to the syntax, the total impetus to say something to some consequence. Phrases or even clauses can be constructed without anticipating the sentence, i. e., without reference to the intention to say something to somebody in reference to actuality. It can be taught aside and independent from syntax. The curriculum for teaching syntax, after all, is therefore, a separate programme from, but nevertheless synchronical and parallel to, that for those we enumerated above.

6.3 Curriculum for syntax

When we have the whole, we can divide it into subdivisions to the desired degree of fineness covering the entirety of the subject, no matter how thin, with its every element representing each the area it covers and represents. We propose, therefore, that the syntax of a non-native language should likewise be the procedure to divide the known gestalt into hitherto unknown or unnoticed parts down to the desired level of fineness and details. Our procedure is thus "division of a given whole no matter how small into elements rather than an aggregate of known elements towards

infinity". And the syntax of a system is and ought to be the very constitution of the system, the formula for operations within the system, and the identity, or even the description of the system.

We somewhat delineated the nature and the pedagogy for the components of the language, such as phonology, lexicon, grammar, semantics, etc., as artificial as ours is, as something blind to the 'will' exterior to the system, the impetus of stating something as a piece of speech. It is like analysing qualitatively the materials forming a living organism, and observing how the materials cluster and constitute a higher order of structure toward something total and living. The analysis, however, will not explain the things and affairs in terms of life as distinguished from death, no matter how small or how large, how simple or how complex the said totality, the life, may be. As we set out in this thesis, our description of syntax was based on the tenet that since we are to analyse what we know and what is whole, thence to draw syntax and correlative curriculum. We said that the sequence we follow in explaining our syntax was to intactly express the sequence in which the syntax itself should unfold and be taught accordingly.

In Chapter I, we started off with the discussion of embryo sentences, the incidence of naked motivation in language, formless but nevertheless overt and full of intent, not void of its semantic content. Lexicon may there matter but the least, grammar no more. Then we proceeded into the imperative speech where the verbs are mobilized as the essential key for substantiating the imperative appeal. Actual incidence and form of speech in the imperative might defy analysis, but it could be rendered into several articulate formations, in terms of the kind of lexical items engaged therein and the kind of constituent syllables involved. The Chapter introduces several formulae in which articulate imperative speech is cast and into which they are likewise reducible. It also presents the formula for prohibition as a corollary.

Could we design a curriculum containing the least of vocabulary items, each item as a single word to fill the slots for the structural position? How many verbs should we need, how many nouns, and how many other miscellaneous fragments do we need to make the practice in the scheme possible? Here again the accepted axiom is that each sentence makes sense, and demands such and such. Then only precedes the analysis as well as the synthesis.

If we could concede to a pretention that English is such a language where only imperative (besides, perhaps, exclamatory) speech alone is possible, and that every valid utterance (of course, imperative speech) is there eventually analyzable into the stipulated formulae, each member of which is a single word, how many categories of words do we need, at most? How many words can each category contain, if the words are to be classified into the least number of categories? What are the

obligatory selections and what are the optional selections in the proceedings of analysis and synthesis? With these considerations and limitations beside those exteriorly imposed, such as the time given, the mentality of the learning party, etc., we could logically calculate and draft a curriculum and the prescription for its administration.

This, of course, is a symbolical expression of our procedure. The policy we are advocating is to institute 'the syntax' for syntax, the organic and inevitable structure of syntax, and the curriculum to second it with. So, on one hand, we take the content and intent of every valid speech as given, then, as if at second thought, we analyze it into constituents that have been in the realm below awareness. While on the other hand, we take it for granted that each individual mentality is storing up pieces of knowledge and experience in the form of grammar, lexicon and other static and partial elements of language we delineated in the preceding section.

Thus we proceeded to Chapter II and entered the realm where the verbal act of statement is incorporated into the scheme. The formula for making a statement is there given as an addition of one more term, the so-called subject, to the already given imperative format. The addition affects the whole structure so far established and concluded, i.e., every imperative speech can be now reformed, optionally, into declarative speech *mutatis mutandis*. The necessary changes, of course, include the variations in verb structure through which the scheme enables us to express other states of affairs beyond reality, past, future and other modes of perspective, imaginary and real, chronological or psychological. Thus the tense and modal expression become possible for our simulated language which has been so far actuality-bound. Chapter III gives an extended detail of the preceding chapter, while Chapter IV and V are discussions of such matters aside from the syntax. They deal with the paradigms and other static properties of our scheme, including synthetic grammar, whose pedagogy and curriculum should have been going on at the same time or even before that of the syntax.

Since the syntax is the generative formula of speech formation, the pedagogy of syntax demands a vigorous scrutiny. It should be so organized that the whole structure is, at every stage of its progression, a closed whole, derivable from one source and thereto reversible, with all the elements explicitly specified, all the operations consistently prescribed. In a way the syntax is to be presented as a set routine procedure to reach the eventual surface product set to the desired degree of approximation to the comparable natural version of the language. The process must be always intellectually conscious and articulate, and our policy is to narrowly construct the syntax so that it will also become the structure of the curriculum of its teaching. Was what we proposed in the early chapters adequately in line with the policy here stated? Could it be, if it was adequate, adopted into actual teaching? We have not

experimented yet to get a positive result.

To use the parable again, in describing the Euclidean cosmology, the geometry employed reveals of itself the structure and procedure of its curriculum. It may go on to express eventually furthestmost details of the cosmology, but it will not go beyond that realm covered by the geometry so defined. Transformational and generative grammar, in this respect, has described language only in analogue, but by turning it around, we could perchance make it a powerful procedure for teaching and performing, though not in a real, but at least for a while, in a simulation close enough to an actual language.

In the last section of Chapter IV, we attempted to show how to analyze given sentences into syllables, the mental reality a degree lower, counted downward from the surface, the totality of speech closed on itself, in lay terms, a sentence. This was introduced there as a sample for practice in actual site of teaching and drill. The learners may be asked to analyze given sentences into syllables and further until each sentence is reduced into one of the patented formulae (sentence patterns, in lay terms.) They are told that unless a sentence reduces itself into either of the set formulae, it is either incorrect or beyond the English they are allowed to know, and in either of the cases such samples do not concern them, and so on. In analyzing given sentences, the synthetic grammar should, of course, be fully invoked. Thus to construct or analyse, the sentences are handled in two directions of mental scrutiny, analytical syntax and synthetic grammar, which, we believe, are the complementary faculties constituting our intelligence. Although totally unaware, it seems, that this also is the way we operate in our native language.

6.4 Non-native syntax

The term 'non-native' is, of course, affixed in an attempt to distinguish not only our syntax but also our pedagogy from the traditional approach to the so-called 'foreign' or 'second' language. The essential distinction we are asserting for it is the basic realization that a foreign language, by definition, should not be taught in a vague analogy parallel to teaching of native language. The distinction may suggest a vast change in curriculum over the traditional ones as a whole and in parts (linguistic components such as morphology, phonology, semantics, grammar, lexicon with its vocabulary, and above all the syntax.)

As our emphasis is placed, in this proposal, chiefly on syntax, as the generative dynamics of a language, native or non-native, natural or artificial, the non-nativeness of the approach in this area is to present its syntax as an intellectually operatable system, rather than as an open assembly of items of customs severally collected and given. Thus non-nativeness of the approach precludes its pedagogy to be naturalistic or empirical, i.e., intuitive or behavioristic. We believe at least that native conviction

there should be imposed or explained to non-native learners, not by the force of native reasons and examples, but by explanations in universal terms.

Teaching syntax, a section of a non-native curriculum of a non-native approach, depends on general recourse to reason, orientated to the linguistic or logical universal of the things taught and of those who learn as well as those who teach, for the dignity of human industry rather than for its utility and efficiency. Why, let us ask ourselves, should the first lines of the textbooks of English, for instance, in Japan, consist entirely of a set of flawless, culturally accepted epitome of quotations from the supposedly natural speech of a six year old native. If the task is rather to surmount the difficulty of the foreign-ness of the language being learned, than to comprehend what is thereby expressed, the lesser the difficulty in the aspects other than those of linguistic nature, the better will be the efficiency, but it gives no reason why we should come down to the level of the natives at the age to begin reading—hence the textbooks are called ‘readers’, but readers in whose country? We are asserting that linguistic should be the subject and focus of interest and training. The language, though abstract as ours, is not itself an important part of the culture? Why should its material be allusive to the non-linguistic articles of the native culture? Language teaching should teach language before anything else. The training there should, above all, be intellectual as it is in mathematics. The main interest it should provoke and demand of the learners should be linguistic and intellectual. If the interest is fixed on the content, cultural or utilitarian, the language becomes transparent and can no longer hold the interest of intellectual learners.

Suppose the curriculum is in lexicon and the item to be taught is, say, “apple”; the main point in teaching the word is not to have the learners know the word as a counterpart of a native appellation of any fruit so named, or any cultural association and background that the fruit bears in an environment where it is found and called by that name, but to have the learners know to what category and to which subcategory of the lexicon the item belongs and to have them know how the word is expected to behave in combination and collocation with other elements according to the set routine, the paradigms, and to eventually constitute a specific syllable of a sentence, an incidence of speech, and so on.

If we have a complete, autarchial curriculum for English syntax consisting of two hundred items of grammar arranged in the way the generative and transformational grammar has invented, i. e., in the form of phrase structure rules and transformational rules, both optional and obligatory, with a lexicon containing a vocabulary totalling one thousand items with a minimum level of classification, each containing some population, together with a set of paradigms through which such elements are to be joined together toward a higher unit of structure, how should we begin teaching it

and administering drills; how could we insure that, upon the completion of the teaching, the entire structure is implanted in the learner and that it lives on in him generating valid expressions? Can we at the same time assess how much versimilitude, in the eyes of the standard natives of the language, the products would bear when every detail is observed to the letters in the process of calculation in our simulated language and its training?

Learners should be made, by the training, to understand, at each step, the convention imposed and be told how it works and be given enough drill until it becomes his habit—with desired, if not maximal, degree of freedom and ease, instead of becoming conditioned to retrieve and quote what is stored in memory. The process is somewhat like the learning of algebra, where the most essential is to understand the convention and become expert in its operation, and to become able to develop the given system into finer structures without direct reference to the actuality it may symbolically be expressing or representing.

The correctness and acceptability of the product in our pedagogy should be measured by the rate of conformity to the premise, the convention accepted at the beginning both by the learners and by the teachers, but not by the degree of acceptability of the product in the eyes of the native semantic-cultural-emotional continuum. So, the beginners' textbooks should consist of a lexicon with classified vocabulary items, a set of paradigms to manipulate them with, and syntax as a guide-line towards a complete speech, conscious and articulate, and of a workbook through which the learners are to obtain and undergo enough experience in manipulating the system so taught and to supply empathy for psychological reality of the things being said.

It can also be likened to learning how to play cards. One should first be told what each card means in the entire scheme of the game and what each operation implies likewise in the process of the play. The total semantics does not there go beyond how one gains or loses, and in what degree. The play, as such, does not operate the actuality nor transact the things bet—they are irrelevant and extraneous to the play. The operation itself can be nevertheless made interesting to moderately intelligent learners, child or adult, in cards or in syntax; only some operations are simple and obvious while others complex and subtle. The other factors affecting the ultimate accomplishment will be all extra-linguistic and renderable in units of time-effort complex.

English, as a live-language, seems, if compared to other languages, to be fitted to the kind of tailoring we propose, in other words, it is a comparatively easy language to skim and to attain a workable level of mastery, while conversely, it is a difficult language, they say, in which to attain native mellowness. This being true or half-true, the final syntax seems to be the best description for any language, natural or

simulated, in which fact the generative linguists intacitly place their hopes.

6.5 Practical considerations

In our pedagogy and curriculum, the most essential will be to design the whole curriculum so that the syntax, the basic structure of the code system, should be made the core of the whole programme wherever its level of completion is set. Phonology, lexicon and grammar should be so incorporated to the syntax that they give matters to syntax which, without them, is a bare vector and structure.

Of course, in teaching these components of language, the more they are true to natural speech, (which does not mean, however, 'native' but the 'emic' average or standard with reasonable consistency and efficiency), the more advantageous it will be in view of the ulterior purposes. Extra-linguistic values should be eliminated as much as possible in the basic drills in syntax and phonology, while some semantic allusions may be desirable in advanced instruction and drills.

Lexicon and its subdivisions containing a variety of vocabulary items should be selected from the real English, not by such criteria as utilitarian frequency count, but by the ratio of representation in the system. The distinction between the two kinds of vocabulary items, one, the so-called empty or functional words which are usually closed as classes (these include pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, auxiliaries, etc.), the other including those belonging to open classes (nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.), should be early established. The first group should be given as a whole, while, the second as consecutive members of an endless list.

Orthographical problems, especially those of English, as a part of phonology, should be relegated as irrelevant if the cultural utility is here at least for a while out of consideration. Our pedagogy cannot very well formulate a good policy or curriculum for this matter. We are divided between two policies. If orthography should be taught at any cost, and the orthography should be the one in current use, not a phonemic transcription of any kind, the inevitable and useful irregularities of spelling-pronunciation relationship should be first imprinted into the virgin brains of the learners as early as possible. The local consistencies whatever found may be taken advantage of, if the population of the vocabulary learned is large enough to draw any consistencies from. Another policy, however, directs us rather to try to give the entire scope of English orthography in a reasonable structure and to delay teaching it until we can present the totality and ask the learners for their mental concession to stomach it. To curtail the irregularities off the scope will leave us only too meagre a corpus to be handled as representative of English glossary. Thus the only solution seems to be a compromise, lenient and permissive scrutiny and correction in spelling errors. One may suffer considerably from inaccurate or vague memory in spelling in later days, but is forgetful of his present difficulty in

comprehending or composing in the language, spoken or written. Spelling can be corrected by dictionaries, but structural feebleness has no remedy. Remember, writing is the process we discovered to conquer time and space for language. Hearing and speaking should therefore precede the reading and writing of course, and this principle should no less be respected in our curriculum abstract as it is. It is better to learn even a non-native language as if one is blind rather than deaf.

The recourse to native-language is not a taboo, though it is often so considered by native teachers. A teacher who is not conversant, orally or otherwise, in the language he teaches is no doubt below qualification, but a teacher who is not conversant in the language of the learners is no less so. A native teacher should be careful not to confuse his role; whether he is playing the part of an informant or that of a language teacher in the non-native language. Unless he knows how the language he teaches appears and strikes the learners, how can he guess it by the threadbare surface products the learners produce in response to his call in the classroom. We have an abundance of both types of teachers, native or otherwise, inadequate in either of the functions or in both, if seen from our standard of non-native pedagogy.

Neither does the recourse to the native language mean 'translation' either or both ways. All the explanations should be brought home to the learners regardless of the method and language, native language included. To teach what "apple" means in the lexicon, we could bring an apple to the learners and show it to them, but the learners might think that it means "fruit" or even "red" or anything else... So it helps to confirm it by connecting it to the indigenous counterpart appellation, if there is one. But this again courts for an erraneous attitude. The learners tend to think that every item has its English version, but we must correct this attitude and convince them there that there is no reason at all why any two languages should contain parallel vocabularies in naming things and affairs. (Thus it is better to discourage the use of bilingual dictionaries.) One may do better to forget what "apple" means if he can somehow associate it with some kind of fruit or recall nothing at all rather than confuse the word with an unrelated word, say "appell" with its seeming vernacular counterpart, a verb.

We must convince the learners of the fact that one thing can be said in two ways, one in native and the other in non-native expression, but it does not at all mean that they can be translated from one to the other by operating on the surface of the two expressions. Things and affairs in one culture and climate may or may not exist in the other; if they did, they may not carry the same implication and cultural values, being in different environments. These indoctrinations should be made at the beginning. For younger learners, to know that everything has two names will be a fascination for a while but soon the law of economy and parsimony of intelligence

will expell the weaker of the doublet, and the non-reality-recalling memory merely spanning a name with another, will be fast to die away from memory and use. To learn a word, say, 'book' as a member of the lexicon is not to connect it with its native counterpart, but to record it in memory as a member of the lexicon at a particular address, belonging to a class at a level, along with other peer members, but to be able to retrieve and operate it in the way the paradigm and syntax expects of it as if in algebra, while the thing, the apple, remains to be an objective correlative, the variable of an equation, that could be any apple, Japanese or English, existing or imagined, an incidental to the syntax.

Meanwhile, if the 'book' is the only entry admitted in the vocabulary, the learners' world is filled with books and only with books, and wherever the word 'book' is mentioned, he is ready to evoke anything that that name, reminds him which cannot be but a book. Likewise, we can introduce another item, say "rose" making his world filled with both and either of these two items. The choice between these two is optional to him as long as the vocabulary of that particular level is concerned in his syntax.

A dosage of practice in referring to the things in the realm beyond the system of the language itself should be, of course, indispensable as a part of the exercise and experience in language operation, native or non-native, the act of speech in borrowed reality no less included. So when we are to teach that "X is y-ed." where y is a transitive verb, the learners should not only comprehend the formula and come to a categorical, algebraic understanding, an apprehension, of the situation so implied, still reserving the judgement as to who this X is and what kind of transitive action is meant by the y; he is supposed to go into his mental or real lexicon and find out what items of reality these refer to and what the value of the equation is, the total meaning of the statement. And, at the same time, he must mentally strain himself to imagine a situation where any such X is being y-ed, and if time allows, to put enough empathy into the scene, i. e., he should undergo the experience designated by the author of that expression. The empathy of the learners may be induced by having them operate in formula with a necessary amount of imagination towards the things or situation referred to, while mere repetition of nonsensical words or syllables could even collect for them some self-supplied experience with a quantity of experience and feeling.

When we teach football to a group of boys, the learners should be told that it is a play after all, not a battle nor a utilitarian skill for real life, even though the entire training is intended for cultural and physical well-being of the learners. The required skill may, of course, be taught by having them actually engage in the act while the rules that constitute football as a game should be taught separately perhaps

on a rainy day in the classroom. How to play is learned not for its own sake, nor for any utilitarian purpose, but for playing football, no matter what the purpose beyond.

The findings of comparative linguistics between two languages concerned should be fully invoked in our procedure. Those local features common between two systems should be pointed out to the full advantages of the learners. Such cases may include, in our case, the combinations like preposed adjectives and the nouns, or preposed nouns in modification of the following nouns, etc., with a caution, however, that it should not be confused with translation procedure. It means that we should spend the least effort and time on those grammatical features that happen to be parallel. The fact that standard English sentences have their subject at the beginning and that the sentences in Japanese are likewise statistically or that they could be made in that formula if so desired, do not constitute the said parallel we are here concerned with.

The grammatical differences should be taught as different by contrast and comparison, warding off ready-made translation formulae to intervene and span the gaps between the two systems. What is to be avoided here is to leave the way open for the native language to accompany or substitute the expression in the foreign language, natural or artificial. In the process of handling the analogous structures, the economy should come from direct comprehension rather than from easier translation. Translation as a skill is not at all linguistic though it may be cultural and literary. It behooves to dispell the misconception of the general public on foreign language teaching in this country that it teaches how to render the foreign, therefore nonsensical, to make sense (of course, in Japanese,) or to convert clear statements into impossible cryptograph. Classrooms are not training shops for blind translation, turning youthful brains into a 'black box' or a 'juke box'.

6.6 Environment for non-native approach

A foreign language, by definition, in this country at least, has been and still is a confrontation while it seems more or less a compromise for Westerners and perhaps for Chinese. One thousand years of our experience in acculturation with Chinese literature (not language, strictly speaking, however) seems not quite comparable to that with Latin for the mediaeval Europeans and for their descendants. We, in Japan, having lived in a finite closure of an insular territory with a tight homogeneity of race, culture and especially of language, tend to consider the difference in language as a discontinuity while Westerners, having lived on an infinite expanse of horizon with a constant awareness of somebody living nearby or beyond, or with a daily anticipation of meeting someone whose language is not theirs, seem to accept a strange speech or an imperfect version of their own spoken by strangers—in a word, Westerners take a foreign language as remote but no less a continuity with a varying degree of difference and parallel, and, hence, as ultimately learnable by natural

contacts and effort. For us Japanese, however, the encounter is a conflict, a discovery of an 'anti-language' with which learning or communication is mutually impossible. Relatively naturalistic, i. e., native approach, therefore, is western in its principle and has proved effective elsewhere but in Japan.

The indigenous method to surmount foreign languages developed in this country was, therefore, non-linguistic or indirect, where the original expression, spoken or written, in foreign terms is treated as it were a meaningless corpus wanting to be converted more or less mechanically and blindly into some form of tractable material. (So the immediate encounter with a live person who produces such an unnatural complexity of code signals in cascades of sounds, all in *ad lib* and *ad hoc* and forgets it no sooner than he has said it, is a consternation and embarrassment that should be avoided by any means...) The original Japanese attitude toward foreign languages is thus decidedly unlinguistic; a foreign language is not language, and what matters, therefore, is not the expression, the vessel, but the things, the ware thereby conveyed or therein contained. Not only was our experience of contact with foreign languages unique and peculiar, but also we even went on to invent a unique solution and a peculiar attitude to manage the situation. Our assimilation of Chinese literature well represents the process, especially the esoteric translation routine of Chinese classics, cultivated over a span of ten centuries, deserves notice.

The modern contact with foreign languages soon became overwhelming even in this country and the communication, rather than the information imported thereby, became the focus of training and education. Our fathers then found our grandfathers' non-linguistic approach completely inadequate and failing. They soon realized that even for the sake of efficiency in obtaining the information desired, the language, the media itself should be mastered for its own sake, or as language, and that mastery of a foreign language was itself a necessary accomplishment, independent of the things thereby conveyed or expressed.

Thereupon our fathers went to native experts to teach the language to them with the belief that since the natives are the ones who know the language the best and most, no doubt, they would make best teachers. Their sons, the contemporary Japanese are, thanks to the enlightenment at large, early exposed to the native-orientated foreign language teaching, after native examples contained in the textbooks compiled originally for native pupils of English or American grammar schools (*grammar* schools!), by ardent native teachers along the curriculum and pedagogy designed after those for school age native learners. The pedagogy naturally is such that it takes for granted that teachers, native or indigenous, are all supposed to have native competence or something close to it. With an increase in number of the learners and of the teachers, this part of pedagogy has become broadly legendary, and every

compatriot teacher of the learners in this country is willy-nilly playing the dubious role of a native teacher, or at least, he is delegating the English speaking community at large. Any regular course of 'English as a foreign or second language' presupposes that the teachers are natives or native like 'acquired-speaker' of English, and if that is the golden rule, it disqualifies a majority of the English teaching Japanese teachers, and the whole system collapses. We are not proposing to change the teachers, but to change the rules, not so much as to save the teachers, as to salvage English teaching.

The universal failure of English teaching in this country is chronic and its cause is obvious to every eye. We secretly plead, as it seems, that our mentality is so set that it cannot come to terms with any 'foreign' system of expression and idiation; we have been congenial in our own language so long and so well that our heart and mind refuse any other way of expression, our reason repels any extraneous recourse of linguistic communication, and so on. Admitting we are peculiar among the peoples of the world, perhaps, we may not be alone in this and we may not remain so for eternity; someday we may become broken to some foreign language, perchance. But until then we are determined not to let other means of communication adulterate what we think is integrate and completely reasonable and logical as language, and so on and on.

The problem is obviously that the learners are not permeable to foreign language until they have learned and acquired one. So it naturally follows that it cannot be helped but to introduce a foreign language as something unnatural, artificial, i. e., foreign languages should not pretend to be language. Instead, a foreign language should be introduced into Japanese mentality as if it were not a language. Until the learners have that language, it is not a language, and so on... In a word, it seems to say, "teach it, if you must, by stealth." This is a paradox.

We are a peculiar people, we admit, but what we confront here is nevertheless human as a problem demanding a human solution; and perhaps what solution we might finally find here may be applicable to someone like us, now or in future, though not to the Westerners. Who knows, however? Westerners themselves might come across some day, an utterly un-acceptable language. (Men hear, they say of late, in the crepuscle of sciences, variety of uncanny coded messages in the air, in the skies.) Perhaps the Westerners may be awakened to the reality they have overlooked hitherto in what took place in themselves in the process of mastering foreign languages with which they are so accustomed since the days of yore.

So we are trying, in this country, to wean ourselves off from the native-approach of foreign language teaching and learning. Non-native approach may be too abstract and abrupt for a westerner, lay or specialized, as a technique or approach to learn

any foreign language or to teach their own to foreigners, to such obstinate ones like us. But consider, can any of them learn Japanese, for instance, in the way he learns a cognate language, say Spanish? Would he listen to a Japanese informant for explanations? Would he start learning it as if he were a speechless Japanese child at the age of six? Wouldn't he rather look to an explanation, description or pedagogy by a compatriot who has mastered that language and to depend on the explanations that stand his reason than a native's?

How can we wean the English teaching in Japan off from 'adopted-mother' tongue teaching techniques and principles, in which teachers are supposedly all native speakers who can teach the language as mothers do their children (the scientific fact is that mothers do not teach, but children learn of themselves) or as school teachers teach how to write or speak as a refinement over the already acquired native competence of the learners (the reality is that the learners here are those already linguistically established children, not the first graders but the seventh.)

We are not proposing an all-out revolution in protest against the unrealistic or ineffective English teaching (which incidentally, is, called 'English Education', an ardent misnomer...), but a change in the policy and attitude, i.e., to establish a pedagogy of foreign language teaching on more scientific principles at least and to reconsider it as a matter of applied science. The proposed non-native approach does not look to the 'native intuition' as do the transformational grammar, but to the universal reason for its verification and efficiency. By a thoroughly schematic representation of a structure of a language, natural or artificial, and by stipulating the mode of its operations, not so much on native explanations, as on an appeal to reason and consistency, we believe that a language could be tailored into something intellectually acceptable and operatable to anyone regardless of his native language and mentality, his linguistic allegiance. It is not a process of naturalization of a speaker of a language into another, nor a process of assimilation of a culture into another. It is a process of gaining or endowing a new system of idiomatic recourse which happens to be a natural language to somebody else but the learners, curtailed and edited to fit the logical inductions of the learners. In a way, it is how to learn a foreign language as foreign language, not as a native language.

The western concept of 'linguistic relativity' is as valid as our sense of 'linguistic absolutism' and each has its own pedagogy and curriculum for teaching non-native languages. And since we have our way of solving our problems, we think it might present a new insight into general linguistic pedagogy which has not known ours. Our approach might complement, though it may be more fit to our purpose and situation, perhaps. We know that the native-approach has been a failure in our country, and we do not know yet if the non-native approach is also a failure, if not a success.

The point of unification of these two principles may be found in a person in whom our pedagogy has accomplished what it should to its full. On appearance he may perform as natives do with proper feeling and freedom although he has attained it through an unnatural, non-native way all the way through up to that final perfection. Another point of unification for the two principles may be found in the logical convergence of the basic structures of languages. So long as language remains to be human convention and behavior, we need not, for a while, anticipate something entirely different and anti-human, that is, anti-logical. The mode of our thinking and code of expression cannot be too far apart and varied among languages as long as men are, and shall remain, rational creatures. So the linguistic differences are rather a matter close to the surface of man's linguistic-cognitive activity. The difference between languages is in inverse function of the similarity between and, in spite of the apparent artificiality of the proposed syntax and its corollary, the learners may find practice too unnatural or anti-intellectual a maneuver. The language-ness may accrue without waiting the completion of the learning. We may be doing it perhaps with an unconscious transformation towards the surface of the submerged structure, the so-called linguistic universal, the basic patterns of structure and expression of human intellect and of feeling⁶⁾.

6) to be continued.