

Analytical Syntax for Teaching English (12)*

—a non-native approach—

Kan KATAYANAGI

September 1982

Chapter X Non-native approach as education

10.3 Foreign language as code:

It has been our contention that if a foreign language is to be learned or taught for any purpose at all, it is better done as if the target language were not a language than if it were an extension of the native speech. By definition, a foreign language to the learners is not a language in the sense that the native language to them is language, even though to a third party the two languages involved are both languages. What we have proposed is thus almost a pragmatic policy rather than a theory and is advocated both for technical efficiency and for educational implications.

'Non-native approach' in its most inhibiting sense implies the teaching of foreign languages with an assumption that the identity of the learners with the language is unattainable not only 'until' but even 'after' the learning is completed, i. e., the "language-ness" of the language so acquired will not be enjoyed by the learners—an apparent linguistic pessimism. In fact, while traditional 'grammar-translation method' makes no commitment of converting the learners into natives of the language learned, the current English teaching in our schools falls far short of what it proclaims to be doing, i. e., teaching 'living' English—one does not intend, while the other only pretends to administer native doses of linguistic experience to the learners.

'Native approach', as the converse or a corollary, may then imply the teaching of a language to non-natives, regardless of who does the teaching, with a prediction that by imitating and absorbing what is supposedly true to the natives, the learners will gain the "nativeness" by degrees towards the eventual assimilation and naturalization to the target language,—a linguistic optimism. It is almost synonymous with 'learning of a second

* Conclusion to the series begun in Vol. 21, 1971 of the present publication,

mother tongue' and demands the whole procedure to be done "naturalistically"—the so-called 'direct method', 'oral-aural-method' and all the rest gladly subscribe to this order, being totally empiristic. The approach, no doubt, is realistic and correct for naturalization of immigrant minorities and perhaps, to a degree, analogically to leisurely younger subjects abroad, both at the expense of the mother tongue of the learners.

The non-native-ness of the approach we have been advocating is, however, different from the indifference of the grammar-translation method or from the negligence of school English where English is perhaps a living kind, but where the pupils are linguistically dead, and is also opposed to the native approaches in not intending a linguistic conversion of the learners nor demanding unconditional surrender to the target language. Instead of the affectation and anticipation that the target language is and will become as natural a language as is the native one already to the learners, we would parenthetically introduce the language as entirely foreign, i. e., as if it is no language at all—something that is irrelevant or even incompatible with the learners' language. It harbors no illusion of the languageness for the target attained so as to prevent apt substitutions of mother tongue experience from sneaking in and to stave off the qualm and obsession, i. e., the haunting awareness of 'inadequacy' and 'affectedness' attending the performance in somebody else's language, not one's own. There will be less chance of frustration due to the suppressed linguistic impetus and of despair due to the unattainable perfection imagined as against the unsuspected identity and intimacy enjoyed in the life in the native language, and no fear of betrayal to mother-tongue-self.

The procedure proposed will not be naturalistic, i. e., it will be always conscious and even artificial but so much the more rational and efficient. In a word, we intend to introduce the learners into an arbitrarily instituted corpus of code which is edited finite, explicit and simple, i. e., ideal as a structure, and free of allusions and implications, exempt of social, cultural or aesthetic overtones as means of communication. It will be more like algebra than arithmetic. This runs flagrantly counter to the current fad, if it is a fad, of teaching a foreign language in its environmental entirety, i. e., in the full context beyond the language itself. There is no doubt, of course, that such will be ideal, effective and even enlightening, provided that we can afford it. If we can spare time for gaining one half of what we can sensibly hope to accomplish, we can choose between two sorts of halves: one, a random but thickly supported empirical

fragments of the raw version of the target language, the other, thinly extended, but an intellectual totality, artificial, self-sufficient and self-explanatory; and we happen to prefer the latter.

We believe that the first business of teaching foreign language is to strike home the foreign-ness of the language confronted, natural or artificial, i. e., to establish the very distinction, and not to undersell the target language. It demands the learners to squarely confront and overcome, but never to be overwhelmed or tamed. The hard-landing practice in our approach will begin more or less with dry skeleton-like communication in digets more of code than of words, then with elements and rules added, the scope of communication will expand in progressional development. The practice in our abstract, distilled version of crystalized English might not discourage the learners though limited as it is because the effort of the learners is always rewarded as long as the prescription is observed, i. e., if something is stated there properly, the learners are assured of it being understood as such, no more or no less. The subjective involvement, the language-ness of it, we can assure, will accrue, and the proper psychological satisfaction will attend without needing recourse to the norms of the target language. (To the learners the difference in the foreign-ness of the two versions of English, one edited and the other raw, will not matter because they cannot themselves compare the two.) The scope of performance in this simulated language will expand toward infinite degree of approximation to the target language, but it is assured to the learners at every stage of the progression that they are fully prepared and ready to face the next stage. The learners, when exposed to the raw language or any other language, may be competent to cope with it, developing upon the experience so far gained in the simulated language. The teaching of foreign language is not to feed the learners' brains with fractions of the raw corpus of the natural language at large, consecutively toward the eventual full coverage, but to create a new system of communication and expand it to the extent desired in its degree of approximation. It is better to be a code system attended by its own feeling than a language with substitute experience, if a foreign language is to be learned at all.

10.4 Mid-structure as reality:

The educational quarters of language seem as yet to remain in the classic one-dimensional understanding of language—the resultant events, spoken or written, is the

only palpable entity of language we can and must stick to, and by tracing the curvature or copying the contour of the surface digets alone, we can attain the dynamics of the language, native or non-native. With the recent development in linguistics, however, we have come to think that language as mental activity is multi-dimensional, even though its projection is a one-dimensional sequence of events taking place in the observable phonetic or orthographic realm. The new tribes of linguistics in a strain of mentalism invented a convention through which the inner procedure antecedent or latent to the surface register can not only be represented but also expressed, described or even operated upon as if the state of affairs beneath the surface were concrete and real—in a word, they made visible the history of each incidence of enacted speech. Meanwhile psychologists elsewhere reportedly tell us, in support of our introspective home-truth, that what is taking place one stage before or below the incarnate speech is no less real than the accomplished expression. Apparent strings of speech digets are invisibly and inaudibly enveloped in the overtones of syntactic impulse and grammatical cohesions fully conscious and directly controlled by the intellect, without which we cannot perform even in our own native language. Our linguistic reality seems to anchor itself to this operational intermediate rather than to the surface final.

We have shown that what we named 'analytical syntax of English' yields an amazingly neat and simple structural facet at the level which we might now call 'mid-structure' as contrasted to 'deep- and surface-structure'. It analyses English in terms of 'syllables', four in kind and five in their sequential collocations or 'sentence patterns'. Further analysis into syllables likewise converges in 'paradigm', a tabulated morphology of syllables in terms of the lower constituents, and to the level of vocabulary items, to be retrieved from the syntactically inventoried and classified memory reservoir named 'lexicon'.

In the process we found that languages are renderable in more or less universal terms at the mid-structure and there they are more comparable with one another, than at the surface. In our case, Tokieda's¹⁾ and Fujiwara's theory of 'speech-syllables' of Japanese language²⁾ compare very well with our analysis of English, making contrastive studies of the two languages most interesting if it is done at the mid-structure. It leads

1) 時枝誠記, 『日本文法(口語篇)』 pp. 230-ff. 岩波全書, 1950

2) 藤原與一, 『日本方言文法の研究』 pp. 241-ff. 岩波書店, 1949

us to think that what strikes the Japanese learners most as foreign and English among the features of the English language must be the mid-structure and the lower grammars subordinate to the syllables. If vocabulary is incidental to a language, to quote a giant linguist, the syntax of the mid-structure is what makes English English and that is exactly the thing the Japanese learners should comprehend and master.

The whole process of teaching here is thus concentrated on, and orientated to the establishment of the mid-structure at any cost—it is as if the vector of the whole scheme is inverted, thus the mid-structure, the sub-conscious but never-failing potent formula, earned reductively in meaningful situations for the natives, is now established and imposed as a prescribed explicit formula in which to express and receive messages, and something to be learned purposefully. Likewise, the learners are here to participate in a productive stream of language rather than to partake of the resultant product of language. It is as if the cause and result are inverted, thus, instead of gaining the underlying syntax of the language by reductive procedure as do the natives, the adult learners are to apply inductively what is given at hand and to expand it through analogy and protraction, or even create anew where no precedence avails. The learners are here encouraged to identify themselves with the affective content and expression through ‘empathy’ rather than surmising and fabricating the substitute content upon the surface representation by ‘sympathy’. The learners are to start from the given whole and, with need and urge toward further precision and broader scope, to develop and invent, if need be, the formula and to incorporate it into their own system of expression. As a principle, this is the very opposite of the age-honored way of teaching and learning, which we named ‘native-approach’, where the learners are given the final particulars each with the inherent native feel, and asked to add, piece by piece, up to the ultimate sum of meaning and feeling. In our version of non-native approach, the learners are always the creators and owners of the new language, not the recipients of an already existing language owned by somebody else, waiting there to be reached.

So, the first of the procedures will be to conceive a version of English far simpler in grammatical details but so much more explicit in its syntax, with or without the aid of super-imposed indices, and then to teach it as such, i. e., through parsing the given expression into syllables or constructing expressions by filling the structure design

rendered in symbols indicating mid-structure lay-out, etc., in both written and spoken phases of communication, until the learners are self-supporting and have out-grown the artificiality of the imposed simulation.

If we can thus introduce the learners into such a realm of rule-governed, consistent and fully explicit version of a language, and if they undergo stages of integrated exercise in performing it, say within four types of speech-syllables in four or five patterns (and their variations including inversion, repetition, deletion, embedding, etc.)—they will find ample scope for realistic expression and gain not only a valid experience in the simulated linguistic environment to make themselves the natives and the authors of that very language, independent of the original language and from its owner-speakers, but also a solid basis for better encounter with any foreign language. The experience gained will be utilitarian and at the same time educational.

A set of examples of teaching material at college freshman level, is given below consisting of a text in six lines (T-1~3) directly cited from a native sample at hand, instead of creating one, with degrees of superimposed indication for aiding the reader, then several versions (H-1~4) with grammatical elements deleted but indicated for each kind: verbs are underlined (or perhaps italicized), a [for the place of a determiner, < for prepositions, /_____ for subordinate conjunctions (including relatives), etc. In the practice, the gaps are filled by the learners upon hearing the text read aloud to them (through tape) by a native speaker, drawing their attention to the clues and keys towards syntax, a particular item at a time or all at once (H-3+4+2).

The other series represented is the parsing practice over the same text. In the primary parsing (P-1), the analysis is done into immediate constituents, i. e., into syllables. Through a few stages, the learners will come down to the final analysis (P-n) where no further analysis can be made, i. e., to the arithmetic level. The arrows (↑) indicate deletion and the reconstructed portion is given on a raised level (or lowered class of the type). The learners are asked to parse to the final surface but usually their attention is directed to the primary analysis to yield the syllabic formation at the mid-structure. When they have earned enough command, they go without parsing except where they find analysis difficult—due to the complexity or ambiguity, and to matters beyond the scope of the syntax so far taught.

As a suggestion, a half-English sentence and a half-Japanese sentence derived from the

same text are presented with parsing transcription (P-n-E and P-n-J).

These two versions of midway language may serve as means of communication if both sides concede and meet in the mid-structure level. (We often wonder why actual communication need be done completely in either one of the languages, or why teach we must a language so exclusively of itself.) Instead of the traditional translation method, learners may be encouraged to read or write an English or Japanese text entering the parsing symbols, or do the same imaginatively when they listen or speak. Structural parallel and consistent difference are then easily recognized and overcome. (In Japanese every noun element is suffixed by a particle which eventually encases the combination into an adverbial element, thus cases, i. e., subject, direct and indirect object, complement, are all evenly represented as adverbial syllables. The predicate verb, or verbal phrase usually occupies the final position, while all the other constituent syllables are freely arranged in stylistic order according to the emphasis—a surprisingly neat structure, unlike English. cf. footnotes p. 22.)

Sample Teaching Material

Original text

Form now plays a much less important part in the language than in Old English, but it is playing a greater rôle than in early Modern English. The simplification of our English, our most precious heritage, was carried a little too far in older English, and it was later found necessary to add more forms, and in the present interesting period of development still more are being created. This will become evident from the study of the Parts of Speech and Accidence presented in this volume.

Curm, G.O. PREFACE v, Parts of Speech and Accidence

T-1 Predicate, finite or auxiliary, italicised or underlined

Form now plays a much less important part in the language than in Old English, but it is playing a greater rôle than in early Modern English. The simplification of our English, our most precious heritage, was carried a little too far in older English, and it was later found necessary to add more forms, and in the present interesting period of development still more are being created. This will become evident from the study of the Parts of Speech and Accidence presented in this volume.

T-2 Verbs underlined, verboids likewise with broken lines

Form now plays a much less important part in the language than in Old English, but it is playing a greater rôle than in early Modern English. The simplification of our English, our most precious heritage, was carried a little too far in older English, and it was later found necessary to add more forms, and in the present interesting period of development still more are being created. This will become evident from the study of the Parts of Speech and Accidence presented in this volume.

H-1 Predicate verbs to be supplied upon hearing

Form now _____ a much less important part in the language than in Old English, but it _____ playing a greater rôle than in early Modern English. The simplification of our English, our most precious heritage, _____ carried a little too far in older English, and it _____ later found necessary to add more forms, and in the present interesting period of development still more _____ being created. This _____ becomes evident from the study of the Parts of Speech and Accidence presented in this volume.

H-2 Verbs to be supplied upon hearing

Form now _____ a much less important part in the language than in Old English, but
 it _____-ing a greater role than in early Modern English.
 The simplification of our English, our most precious heritage, _____ a little too far in older English, and
 It _____ later _____ necessary to _____ more forms, and
 in the present _____-ing period of development still more _____-ing "_____
 This _____+ _____ evident from the study of the Parts of Speech and Accidence "_____ in this volume.

H-3 Determiners to be supplied upon hearing

Form now plays [much less important part in [language than in Old English, but
 it is playing [greater role than in early Modern English.
 [simplification of [English, [most precious heritage, was carried [little too far in older English, and
 it was later found necessary to add more forms, and
 in [present interesting period of development still more are being created.
 This will become evident from [study of [parts of Speech and Accidence presented in [volume.

H-4 Prepositions and subordinate conjunctions to be supplied

Form now plays a much less important part < the language /_____ < Old English, but
 it is playing a greater role /_____ < early Modern English.
 The simplification < our English, our most precious heritage, was carried a little too far < older English, and
 it was later found necessary to add more forms, and
 < the present interesting period < development still more are being created.
 This will become evident < the study < the Parts < Speech and Accidence presented < this volume.

H-3+4 Determiners, prepositions and subordinate conjunctions to be supplied

Form now plays [much less important part < [language /_____ < Old English, but
 it is playing [greater role /_____ < early Modern English.
 [simplification < [English, [most precious heritage, was carried [little too far < older English, and
 it was later found necessary to add more forms, and
 < [present interesting period < development still more are being created.
 This will become evident < [study < [Parts < Speech and Accidence presented < [volume.

H-3+4+2 All syntactical elements to be supplied

Form now _____ [much less important part < [language /_____ < Old English, but
 it _____-ing [greater role /_____ < early modern English.
 [simplification < [English, [most precious heritage, _____ "_____ [little too far < older English, and
 it _____ later "_____ necessary to _____ more forms, and
 < [present _____-ing period < development still more _____-ing "_____
 This _____+ _____ evident < [study < [Parts < Speech and Accidence "_____ < [volume.

P-1 Primary parsing, syllabication into immediate constituents

[Form](now) plays [a much less important part](in the language)(than ↑ in Old English,) but
 [it] is <playing a greater role than ↑ in early Modern English>
 [The simplification of our English],[our most precious heritage], was <carried (a little too far)>(in older English), and
 [it] was <(later)<found necessary>>[to add more forms], and
 (in the present interesting period of development)[still more] are <being created>
 [This] will become <evident>[from the study of the Parts of Speech and Accidence presented in this volume.]

P-n Final parsing, to individual words

[Form] (now) plays [a-much-less-important:[part]] (in [the-language]) (than [that][it] played (in [Old-English]), but
 [it] is <playing> [a-<greater>[role]<than [the-role <that [it] was <playing> (in [early-Modern-English])]]].
 [The-simplification of [our-English]], [our-<most-precious>[heritage]], was <"carried" (a-little-too-far)(in [older-English]), and
 [it] was (later) <"found <necessary"> [to-add [more-forms]], and
 (in [[the-<present><interesting>[period]of [development]]]) [still-more] are <being <"created">].
 [This] willbecome_ <evident> (from [the-study <of [the-Part <of [Speech]]] and <of [Accidence]]><"presented (in [this-volume])>)).

P-n-E Final parsing of enate sentence with major vocabulary items in Japanese

[形動] (現在) plays [a-much-less-重要な[部分]](in[the-言語])(than ↑ (in[古代表語])), but
 [it] is <playing> [a-<greater>[役割]<than ↑ (in [初期-現代英語])].
 [[the-進化]of[現代英語]], [our-<most- 貴重な >[遺産]], was <"carried _">(a-little-too-far) (in[現代英語]).
 [it] was (later) <"found <必要 >> [to-add_ [more-形動]], and
 (in[[the-<現代の ><興味ある[時期]of [遺産]]] [still-more] are <being <"created">.
 [This] will <become <明白 > (from[the-[研究]of[[the 品質] and [研究] <"presented (in[this-事物])>)).

P-n-J Final parsing in Japanese agnate, with major vocabulary items in English

[[Form]は](now)[[the language]が]([much less important]の[part])は playしている。しかし
 ([it]は)[[early Modern English]が]([greater]の[role])は playしつつある。
 ([[our English]の[simplification]], [our most precious]の[heritage])は([older English]が]([a little too far])carryされた。
 ([[present] <interesting> <development>の[period]が]([still more] #) createされたつつある。
 ([it]は) ([more forms]は) addするに[必要]である[later]に findされた。
 ([This]は) ([[this volume] present するに[必要]は] <[Parts of Speech]と[Accidence]の[study]が] ([evident]に) becomeするであろう。

10.5 Non-native approach as a paradox:

Our assertions and proposals so far have been dared with a qualm: are we not defiling the human myth of language either native or non-native? Language, for that matter, is a mental procedure and subjective affair whose mode of existence and operation is not immediately observable and hence every argument thereupon courts for another and remains to be hypothetical and tentative, while the uncertainty, in return, gives every argument an excuse for being assertive. We know empirically at the same time that the affair called language, no matter what the reality encompassed by that term, seems never ideal, finite, nor explicit as we would have it to be—we know it cannot be. With all its uncertainties and shortcomings, we somehow happen to be skillful enough to manage the situation with it, hence the indefinite possibilities of interpretation and explanation conflicting among themselves.

Our interest, meanwhile, has not been in what language is or how it works, but how to teach, not the native, but a foreign language, in our case English in particular, to young Japanese linguistic adults for a variety of unspecified purposes, patent or insinuated. And if we are here to teach it for any purpose at all, we must look for the best way conceivable to do so, where 'best' may mean several things, and we believe, at least, to teach it for educational values is better than simply to teach it as menial or useful skill. We do thus advocate that we should not teach English simply as such but as an example and representative for all foreign languages as contrasted to the native language.

But, why do we teach foreign languages as a part of education? Is such acquirement indispensable for anyone to be fully human, Japanese or non Japanese? How can we do it so that the teaching will serve as a part of education of individuals, regardless of the nationality and the language involved? Human intelligence presupposes language, of course, but is not every language a corpus of loosely organized bundle of historical conventions containing every quantity and variety of unlearnables inherent in that convenience since the days of yore? To master such incoherent substance to any extent and to get a proper impact and to sustain a measure of immunization against any more of that kind of confrontation; is it worth the trouble? Should it be considered educational? We cannot simply approve that any efficient teaching is educationally good teaching, nor can we uphold the idea that some foreign language is superior and ideal enough to render the learning of it educational, nor that something worth knowing is expressed in that language makes the learning of it educational. We must prove though belatedly that the learning of a foreign language itself, no matter which language and how much, is in itself worthy and educational. There is no need, perhaps, of all of us worrying how we can make teaching foreign languages educational, if it is to be administered to those who need it or who want it to be taught for some reasons, and if it were to be given to a relatively small portion of the population. We are compelled, however, to find a plausible justification for imposing a school subject called 'foreign language (English)³⁾ virtually as a compulsory subject of the curriculum throughout the country⁴⁾.

The non-native approach here is, of course, one of the non-native approaches prevalent elsewhere, but our appeal is based on the belief that while acquisition of native language is human and natural, the forced imposition of a foreign language after attainment of linguistic adulthood is a violation upon the linguistic integrity of the individual. The invader-language is irrelevant to and incompatible with the 'aboriginal' language but in all appearances it is inevitable and even indispensable to the prospective citizens of the world to come. When situation arises, to surmount the crisis is certainly better than evading or succumbing. To learn the language abreast will be the best policy and to help it will, no doubt, be most educational. Thus among diverse approaches,

3) 外國語 (英語), originally.

4) In and around 2000 A. D., or two decades hence, the whole population of this country above twelve years of age will have learned smattering school English of a kind—certainly an unprecedented feat in the history of the civilized world.

we happen to select one paradoxical: instead of making access from the surfaced digets upstream to the source of the message; we propose to have the learners undergo the productive phase of language from the 'S' through nodes downstream to the surface string with the focus at the level of mid-structure. And since what makes each language distinct is, in our observation, its syntax far more than its vocabulary or its semantic implications, our attention was directed exclusively to the syntax, especially that at the mid-structure as the most intellectual property of any language to be comprehended and manipulated without subjective ambiguities or affective overtones which prevent rational transactions. The procedure invokes un-naturalistic or unnatural routines and practices but our experiments in the teaching practice have indicated moderate successes over the years. Non-native approach in this sense is technically a strategy of overcoming the idolized perfection of the target language imagined after that of our own language, a hopeful projection, conscious or sub-conscious. (Our personal conviction in the infallibility of language may be very much due to the back-formation we derive from the use of our native language.) The psychological identity with one's native language, established in our childhood, possesses us so firmly that one tends to transfer and substitute the subjective attributes of the native experience in language into that of the newly acquired language, and to build an illusory projection on and around the substituted matters. More often we are haunted with the auto-censor reproaching the inadequacy and affectedness in every performance in the learned speech. There seems to be inhibitive signals running from the deep quarters of the native mind jealously monitoring and suppressing the performance in the invading language, suspiciously measuring the distance and difference. Non-native approach, in this respect, does enhance the dissociation and independence from the mother tongue in favor of self-sufficiency of the language being learned. It weans the individual off the spell of the native tongue against whose gravity no other language is an equal.

Ironically, learning of a second foreign language often brings the learner to the realization that even though the first foreign language is no comparison to the native one, yet it carries a "language-ness" accompanied by a proper feeling in contrast to the "language-less-ness" of the second foreign language. The linguistic relativity rids him of the obsession in the shadow of the mother tongue. We therefore deliberately force the learners to undergo the confrontation with an almost artificial version of the foreign language

in the harshest manner so that the latent recourse to the native language will be dispelled from the onset. The experience will even render the native language itself self-conscious and its speaker, likewise. The initiation is towards linguistic coming-of-age for a normal mono-lingual mentality. Educationally, the purpose of learning a foreign language is not primarily to know and become able to use somebody else's language, no matter how skillfully, but to fully confront the "foreign-ness" of the foreign language, no matter of what kind, our distilled version of English included, and to overcome. Apparently that is the only plausible educational merit worthy of that name—to make the learners language-worthy, language-proof against any encounter with foreign languages, and perhaps with things and people foreign at large.

After all is said, the non-native approach is still a converse of native approaches and the two vectors of approaches are both valid and even complementary to each other. Because of the fact that language is not a single or monoral phenomena, we have overly asserted the non-native approach, knowing only too well that native approaches have been almost too exclusively accepted and practiced, and it sounds here almost an unintended paradox that non-native approach will be substance-less unless native approach is positively at work and proving no less effective in the actual arena of language teaching.

Conclusion

"One might be tempted to define bilingualism as divided linguistic allegiance. Divided allegiance is what strikes the unilingual person as startling, abnormal, almost uncanny in bilingualism." says André Martinet in the preface to Uriel Weinreich's *Languages in Contact*. For a unilingual individual to learn a foreign language is to acquire himself a second personality, even a shift in allegiance,—a startling, abnormal and almost uncanny inner evolution, though in degrees from very minimum to a complete conversion, and only a few consider learning or teaching foreign language as the making of bilinguals. To the majority it is an addition in knowledge and skill.

European tradition seems to accept poli-linguistic community with continuity rather than conflict between and among languages and peoples, hence bilingualism, native or acquired, is there regarded not so much a startling phenomenon. The situation in this country, on the other hand, seems to be alarmingly unrealistic: it appears as if we are

turning the whole nation narrowly introvert again where we should be making ourselves open to languages and peoples around us. We are, we can say at least, doing well in teaching superficial fragments of the allegedly standard and current version of English, but are we not stopping short of educating our youngs properly, or failing in inducing favorable development in the learners' personality and character?

We know that every language is so much a part of its people and culture, so is also English that if it deals with things unrelated to things and feelings English, it is no less English for that, hence our attention on the language itself, i. e., on how something is said rather than what is being said. We also know that there is no natural language that is, as a system of communication, in ideal state as long as it is living and changing, English nor Japanese exempted, and yet no native fails to learn or perform in the language. We have built upon the assumption that for a unilingual adult, a foreign language is almost anti-language, which his deeper self repels and refuses and that what is most foreign of the foreign language confronted is its intellectual constitution, namely the syntax, especially its mid-structure, rather than its surface particulars.

The whole appeal hitherto has been primarily addressed to the compatriot colleagues, contemporary and prospective, who may well accuse the arrogance, and might even suspect the doubtful linguistic and personal allegiance of this authorship for rendering the whole text in such un-English English. It should have been written in the vernacular or withheld until such time when more would have been learned from the native's good examples in usage and style. But we thought it was still better than not to have been written at all.

It is with apology that this is presented in such an untoward, unnatural English in hope of proving that something can be expressed and understood without inheriting the substance from the natives. Onec an conjure up expressions building upon the live experience gained in simulated situations. Broad forgiveness from the readers is implored and anticipated as we believe that the purpose of education in foreign language teaching involves encouraging rather than inhibiting such impatient and premature attempt at expression. Learning of foreign language makes us humble before the infallible unattainable native competence and at the same time it makes us appreciative of the accomplishment attained in others in the learning and it even makes us tolerant of foreigners' unnatural performance in our language.

We, the compatriot teachers of foreign languages, well know that teaching a language as such is not in itself educational, and unless the teaching process is itself linguistically valid as experience, the whole thing is a lost cause. Language teachers, whether of native or non-native language, should be first of all, scientists of language in its most general sense, and even philosophers and educators and, at the same time, agile and competent performers in the language.

It is hoped that some measure of attention be given to our assertion and that this serves in bringing about some basic change in the climate of the country so that the whole diligence invested on foreign language learning should be made more rewarding to the learners and to the teachers themselves as well. If the learning of foreign language is reinstated as earning of intellectual habits and attitude rather than borrowing of linguistic custom, the process of teaching may come to deserve the name of 'education' because it is perhaps the only way we can free ourselves from the tautological dilemma of thinking in terms of our own language, and because we believe that "Non-native language to a normal mentality is, above all, an intellectual incident."

Acknowledgement

The author's special thanks go to Prof. Y. Setoyama, my colleague, specialist bilingual, for her continued monitorship on this uneven non-native expression since its beginning in 1970.

Cordial thanks go to my students in *English Grammar I*, the forgiving, good-natured subjects of my experiments, and to the comradly students in the course *Guided Research for Seniors*, whose participation in the quest has been wholly effective and encouraging as demonstrated in *Point Zero for Foreign Language Teaching*, ed. K. Katayanagi, Keisui-sha Publishing Co., Hiroshima, 1979.

Thanks also go to the authorities of Hiroshima Jogakuin College and the editors of its *Bulletin* for their generosity in allowing such a lengthy exposition in the publication.