

## What Our English Majors Are Still Failing To Learn: *Addressee-friendly* English discourse

*Affectionately dedicated to a true comrade-in-arms,  
in our perennial pedagogical battle with the less-fortunate results of  
Japanese secondary-level English-education,*

**Professor Eiichi Yamamoto**

A. Stephen Gibbs  
A・S・ギブズ

Should what follows serve to improve the English-language education presently provided by this Faculty, I shall feel very fortunate to have been allowed to advance these suggestions. If below I seem to be attempting to ‘teach my grandmother to suck eggs<sup>1)</sup>, I still have to question whether what I go on to mention is presently being inculcated, and systematically re-inculcated, by my (now former) colleagues, as indispensable components of our students’ awareness of the linguistic culture characterizing their principal target-language. And the two matters that, below, will repeatedly come up are those of (i) degree of **Addressee-friendliness** demonstrated, and (ii) **gracefulness/gracelessness** in language-deployment.<sup>2)</sup> When considered in the light of communicative success, neither is a matter that is in the least trivial.

Our yearly intake of students is for the most part intelligent, helpfully forthright about what they require of their teachers, towards those teachers warm and friendly, and therefore easy to establish rapport with. They are also characteristically inventive in use of PowerPoint, and, once they have reached the second half of their undergraduate years, have already learned how to research and organize essays and presentations.

Nevertheless, they are weakest in two respects that are surely far from unimportant. What I want first to draw attention to is the fact that that their **English extended prose discourse** is, in most cases, simply *wretched*. I have taught Japanese to exchange students, who, after a mere three (or even but two) years of Japanese-language education, produce Japanese prose that is pretty much flawless. In the cases of most of our English majors, however, the equivalent cannot be claimed. And yet few of those learners choose to enroll in the non-compulsory

advanced writing-courses that they are offered. Most of our English-language students seem to lack even the slightest inkling that evidence of correctness in English-language use could constitute a subtly-powerful representation of the acceptability of their company-of-employ, under the logo of which a business-letter or mail framed by one of them may arrive. So allow me next to suggest some specific areas that, for our English majors, at present appear distinctly problematic.

### **A) Collocation and register**

When this Faculty was first set up, and a Foundation Seminar for all freshman students proposed, it had been suggested that the syllabus for such a seminar as offered to English majors should include required purchase, and training in automatic use, of the *Longman Language Activator*<sup>3)</sup>. This amazing lexeme-organizer provides its user with corpus-derived, authentic examples that offer ample hints as to contextual appropriateness.

This recommendation has, alas, not been so incorporated; and consequently most of our students possess but a pretty minimal awareness of the importance of ascertaining appropriateness of either register or collocation, and will characteristically, and quite insouciantly, create such word-strings as *I'm hopin' you're gonna graciously reconsider your most respected decision*<sup>4)</sup>.

### **B) Diligently-thorough dictionary-use**

During my secondary-level education, I was required to learn French, Latin, and German; and one of the matters that my secondary-school instructors uniformly insisted that we were responsible for doing was using our plural full-sized dictionaries (first language → target language, but also target-language → first language) in order to check the exact nature of every target-language content-word that we either translated or employed in order to translate. By contrast, year upon year, our English majors regularly assume that surely they already know how appropriately to use all English verbs and all English nouns, this resulting in such word-strings as *\*I fascinate advertisement which appeal sexy hairs [sic]*<sup>5)</sup>.

### **C) Phrase-internal vs. phrase-external relative clauses**

Not only will almost all of our English-language majors unthinkingly employ the relative pronoun */who/* for **any** personal antecedent, and */which/* for **everything else**; almost every year, I have had students taking writing-courses from me come to inform me that, back in school, they had been assured that doing so was perfectly acceptable. Well, there are countless

users of English out there for whom this is still far from being the case. And, just as applies to **collocation** and **register**, knowing the rules of the **grammar** of one's target-language, and therefore being able to follow them should one wish, or need, to generate an impression of **graceful**, adult, and **Addressee-friendly** impeccability when using that language, is likewise a capacity that is indispensable.

This same majority, moreover, fails to use commas where these are necessary, in order to prevent one's Addressee from being caused uselessly to wonder whether or not s/he has mistaken the constitution of the context in question – causing her/him to do which is hardly **Addressee-friendly**. After all, example (a), following, suggests that its Addresser mystifyingly has plural mothers, while (b) does not:

- a) \*My mother who lives in Chiba was coming to visit me.
- b) My mother, who lives in Chiba, was coming to visit me.

What our English-language students evidently need to be told is, first of all, that **nouns** are merely parts-of-speech, while **noun-phrases** are building-blocks employed (along with a verb-phrase and one or more preposition-phrases) in generating clauses<sup>6</sup>, and then that a **noun-phrase can** comprise an entire relative clause. In (b) above, the subject-case noun-phrase (appropriately) begins with /my/ and ends with /mother/; in (a), however, the subject-case noun-phrase likewise begins with /my/, but inappropriately ends instead with /Chiba/.

Rather than employ terminology that attempts to define how the information of the relative clause in question is supposed to be functioning, I have long found it far more effective to train learners to think in terms of **syntactical structure**; for this it is that constitutes the basic criterion by which appropriate handling of relative clauses can be decided upon, and makes it clear not only **that** comma-use is (or is not) appropriate, but also just **why** this so should be. In (b) above, for most of our English-language students it initially does **not** go without saying that the relative clause is essentially a parenthetical, and therefore **acceptably-delible, insertion into** its main clause; and comma-use makes this syntactical relation entirely clear.

Thus, an auxiliary but useful criterion can be found in **delibility** that is innocent of **resultant damage to communicative success**: (c) following makes sense, while (d) of course does not; and therefore comma-use, as seen in (e), is inappropriate:

- c) I prefer the present that you gave me to the one that she chose for me.
- d) \*I prefer the present to the one.
- e) \*I prefer the present, which you gave me, to the one, which she chose for me.

Potential damage to communicative success does not solely concern **distinguishing** between plural items-of-content having (as in (c), above) a shared head-noun description. For one **very**

basic pragmatic rule of any language the pragmatics of which is, like that of English, characterized by **low context-dependence** is as follows. One's Addressee will always **want to be assisted in understanding why some item-of-content is now being expressed by her/his Addresser**. For instance, while (g), following, is entirely satisfactory, although (f), following, is grammatically faultless, considered pragmatically this utterance is definitely inadequate:

f) ? A man stopped to help me gather together my scattered purchases.

g) A man who happened to be passing stopped to help me gather together my scattered purchases.

Again, potential damage to communicative success can result instead from sheer paucity of information: for example, (h), following, fails to meet its Addresser's probable communicative needs, while (i) evidently does meet these:

h) I need to find a husband.

i) I need to find a husband who can manage my company's accounts, and is willing to cook, share housekeeping, and take full part in childcare.

Wherever a relative clause cannot be deleted without consequent damage to communicative success, that relative clause is (as exemplified by all of (c), (g), and (i) above) **part of** the noun-phrase that primarily expresses the antecedent of the relative pronoun in question. Consequently, I have found it pedagogically effective to employ instead the term '**phrase-internal**' and, in order to distinguish the kind of relative clause that is appropriately delible (as exemplified in (b) above), its antonym, '**phrase-external**'.

Let me now turn to **appropriate choice of relative pronoun**. The criteria relevant here are (1) any kind of **syntactic separation** (or **gap**) between antecedent and relative pronoun, and (2) distinction between **identity-based personal** antecedents and **identity-less** and yet personal antecedents.

(1) A relevant **syntactic separation** can have either of just two syntactical causes: the first is appropriate use of a **comma** after the antecedent, as is always necessary in the case of **phrase-external** relative clauses; and the second is the presence of a word-string that includes both a **preposition** and the relative pronoun of a **phrase-internal** relative clause. Granted, such positioning of a preposition does generate a formal impression; nevertheless, the more extended a relative clause may be, the greater the degree of **Addressee-friendliness** provided by such a positioning of a preposition: with regard to **Addressee-friendly** speed of comprehension, please compare the respective effects of (j) and (k), following (and, of course, neither is **grammatically** imperfect):

j) Tonight you and I are going to dine at the restaurant **that** for the last half-year I have been just longing, and hoping to save up enough pocket-money, to take you **to**.

k) Tonight you and I are going to dine at the restaurant **to which** for the last half-year I have been just longing, and hoping to save up enough pocket-money, to take you.

This is to say that, if neither an indispensable comma nor a preposition[-inclusive word string] intervenes between antecedent head-noun description and relative pronoun, the appropriate choice of pronoun for non-personal antecedents is always */which/*. (And I suggest to our students – at least as a mnemonic device that is fictive but effective – that, since (like */who [m]/*) */which/* is fundamentally an **interrogative** pronoun, while */that/* is no such thing, the former has become favored for use in contexts that comprise **post-antecedental gaps** because its original interrogativity still retains residual power to urge one's Addressee to pause and verify the relevant antecedent head-noun description<sup>7</sup>. . .

(2) What, however, I intend to express by an **identity-based** personal antecedent item is one that **could** have a **name**, supplied by a **proper** noun. The question of whether or not this is possible should be simultaneously combined with a second criterion: whether or not the antecedent item is appropriately given grammatical **determination**.

l) (i) The man **who**[m] she has married is (ii) **someone** [that] I happen to know rather well.

In example (l), the item-of-content expressed by noun-phrase (i) is obviously identity-based (*i.e.*, he cannot but have a proper-noun name), and therefore */who [m]/* is the choice more appropriate. On the other hand, noun-phrase (ii) expresses no more than a social relation between the Addresser and the subject-case item, and thus the latter must inevitably lack individual identity, and cannot have any identifiable name.

m) (i) **The** man [that] she marries will be a very lucky guy.

In the case of (m), what indicate that */that/* is the appropriate choice are judgments with regard to **both** criteria: not only does noun-phrase (i) begin with indispensable **determination**; nor can the item-of-content that this expresses have (as yet) a name, and so must remain inevitably identity-less. Consequently, */that/* is the appropriate choice. And the same applies to noun-phrase (i) as seen in example (n), following:

n) Ichirō may be (i) **the** best baseball player **that** Japan has ever produced.

On the other hand, */who [m]/* is the appropriate choice when, as in example (g), repeated immediately below, the antecedent item must indeed have individual identity, and yet cannot

appropriately be expressed by employing determination:

- g) A man **who** happened to be passing stopped to help me gather together my scattered purchases.

One small exception to the rule for phrase-internal-clauses that applies to those having **non-personal, singular-numbered, and distal-deictically-determined** antecedents to their relative pronouns concerns avoiding almost immediate repetition of the lexeme */that/*. For example, **?/that idea that you have mentioned finally/**, and constructions similar, must strike the mind of any competent and engaged Addressee as being **gracelessly** cacophonous; in such a case, alone, is choice instead of */which/* as relative pronoun, acceptable, resulting in **/that idea which you have mentioned finally/**.

Finally, our students regularly omit essential parts of relative clauses (particularly dangling prepositions consequent to use of */that/* in phrase-internal relative clauses), thereby producing childish ill-formation. And it appears that the only means by which to cure this problem is gently but firmly to train learners preliminarily to construct the relative clause just **as a simple sentence**: in the case of either (j) or (k), repeated below,

- j) Tonight you and I are going to dine at the restaurant that for the last half-year I have been just longing, and hoping to save up enough pocket-money, to take you to.
- k) Tonight you and I are going to dine at the restaurant to which for the last half-year I have been just longing, and hoping to save up enough pocket-money, to take you.

such a simple sentence would be

- j-k) For the last half-year I have been just longing, and hoping to save up enough pocket-money, to take you to a [certain] restaurant.

They are then recommended to employ this simple sentence as a stash from which to gradually construct, phrase by phrase, the relative clause that they need to use, striking out, one after another, those elements that they have already incorporated to that clause:

- j-k) For the last half-year I have been just longing, and hoping to save up enough pocket-money, to take you to a ~~[certain]~~ restaurant.

↓

that/which

- j-k) ~~For the last half-year I have been just longing, and hoping to save up enough pocket-money, to take you to a [certain] restaurant.~~

↓

j) that **for the last half-year I have been just longing, and hoping to save up enough pocket-money, to take you**

k) which **for the last half-year I have been just longing, and hoping to save up enough pocket-money, to take you**

j-k) ~~For the last half-year I have been just longing, and hoping to save up enough pocket-money, to take you to a~~[certain]~~restaurant.~~



j) that for the last half-year I have been just longing, and hoping to save up enough pocket-money, to take you **to**

k) **to** which for the last half-year I have been just longing, and hoping to save up enough pocket-money, to take you

#### D) Expression of genitive-case items: identity-based Possessors *vs.* identity-less Possessors

Another grammatical error commonly to be found in our students' English utterances concerns the rules that determine how genitive-case items-of-content are correctly to be expressed:

o) \*This advertisement's impact fails to impress me.

p) \*These chairs' legs are unstable.

q) \*The voice **of Pavarroti** still inspires me.

r) \*The advice **of our teachers** was ignored by most of us.

In the cases of both (o) and (p), their respective (underlined) genitive-case items-of-content could not be allotted proper-noun names, and therefore cannot be distinguished as having unique **identities**; and, in such instances, use of /~'s//~s'/ is not acceptable. In the cases of both (q) and (r), their respective (underlined) genitive-case items-of-content most certainly have proper-noun names (although, in (r), the name relevant is not actually employed), and therefore the preposition-phrase formation /of ~/ is not appropriate, the four better-formed alternatives being of course as follows:

o<sup>1</sup>) The impact **of this advertisement** is weak.

p<sup>1</sup>) The legs **of these chairs** are unstable.

q<sup>1</sup>) Pavarroti's voice still inspires me.

r<sup>1</sup>) Our teachers' advice was ignored by most of us.

Learners also need to be reminded that there are, of course, exceptions – apparent or real. Should the noun-phrase expressing a genitive-case item-of-content either contain a **phrase-**

**internal** relative clause (see (s), following) or a redaction of such (see (t), following), or else be followed by one that is **phrase-external** (see (u), following), the only acceptable choice is that of a **preposition-phrase**, usually containing /of/ (but occasionally, instead, /to/, as in */the key to my room/*, or */the answer to your problems/*):

s) \*Even the teachers for whom we had greatest respect's advice was ignored by most of us.

t) \*Even the teachers with greatest clout among us's advice was ignored by most of us.

u) \*Even Ms. Harding's, who was unanimously respected, advice was ignored by most of us.

⇓

s<sup>1</sup>) Even the advice **of the teachers for whom we had greatest respect** was ignored by most of us.

t<sup>1</sup>) Even the advice **of the teachers with greatest clout among us** was ignored by most of us.

u<sup>1</sup>) Even the advice **of Ms. Harding, who was unanimously respected**, was ignored by most of us.

Again, while physically-major planets (as well as all continents, nation-states, cities and other urban conformations whether large or tiny, single mountains, and regions such as USA states and British counties – but neither rivers nor oceans, major **or** minor) have gained proper-noun names, and are therefore treated as having individual identities, neither the sun nor the moon have, in Anglophone cultures, acquired proper-noun names; nevertheless, not only both of */Saturn's rings/* and */the rings of Saturn/*, but also both of */the sun's rays/* and */the rays of the sun/*, both of */the moon's light/* and */the light of the moon/*, both of */America's legal system/* and */the legal system of America/*, both of */Everest's summit/* and */the summit of Everest/*, both of */California's beaches/* and */the beaches of California/*, and both of */Osaka's drinking-water/* and */the drinking-water of Osaka/* are equally acceptable – although the first of each such pairings seems more suited to informal registers.

A third noteworthy exception concerns **periods of time** that are **unique relative to time of utterance**. Here, we should first pause to recall that all **true** proper nouns are **non-count nouns**, and then to recollect that such periods of time are consistently expressed using noun-phrases that as head nouns have count-noun **general** nouns employed form-switched to **non-count** form. Possibly not only because they, like individual identities, are indeed uniquely (if relatively) identifiable, but also because they are therefore expressed with such head nouns, the



only acceptable expression of such temporal periods as genitive-case items-of-content is with /~'s/; what, however, slightly complicates expression of this rule is that */this/* is employed not as a determiner, but simply as an adjective that (used un-rheme-phrase-stressed) distinguishes a period of time comprised by a larger period of **contemporary** time from such periods as must be distinguished by using */last ~/, /next ~/, /~ week/* or */~ fortnight/*.

this year's profits ↔ \*the profits **of** this year

last Christmas's snowfall ↔ \*the snowfall **of** last Christmas

next New Year's Eve ↔ \*the eve **of** next New Year

today's weather ↔ \*the weather of today<sup>8)</sup>

all tomorrow's parties ↔ \*all [of]the parties **of** tomorrow

Thursday-fortnight's round of appointments ↔ \*the round of appointments of Thursday-fortnight (*etc.*)

but

\*yesteryear's dreams ↔ the dreams **of** yesteryear<sup>9)</sup>

The final point of which our students usually enter our care unaware is a rule concerning the etymology of proper-noun head nouns ending in /s/, and being used in genitive-case noun-phrases. If such a noun should originate in either Ancient Greek or Latin, as in the following example, /~'/ alone is properly employed, and with no increase in syllable-number:

Socrates' dialectic ↔ \*Socrates's dialect

Suetonius' scandalous account ↔ \*Suetonius's scandalous account

If, however, the ancestor of the proper noun employed should belong to the lexicon of a Romance, Germanic or Scandinavian language, /~s's/ – with increase of syllable-number by one – becomes what is required:

Dr. Bates's method ↔ \*Dr. Bates' method

### E) Choice of verb-phrase for clauses concerning future states or changes

By and large, when **ever** our English majors need to express some occurrence subsequent to a given point in time, they can be relied upon to employ */will ~/* if that point is time-of-utterance (and */would ~/* should that point be already previous to time-of-utterance<sup>10)</sup>):

v) **A** [*competent user of English*]: How **are** you **going to spend** your summer vacation?

**B**[*English major*]: ? I **will** go to Bali.

The trouble with B's answer is that, although A has, by employing */be going to ~/*, requested information concerning a **premeditated plan** over which B has **complete control**, B's automatic

misuse instead of */will/* gives a weird impression that s/he either lacks any autonomous control whatever over her/his own conduct, or else that s/he has suddenly made up her/his mind, upon being confronted with A's question (much as is evidenced by the following proposal:

w) I don't seem to have much cash on me; so **I'll** just pop into this ATM, and get some out.)

Appropriate use of */will ~/* makes of the content of the relevant clause **not** any **declaration** of a **premeditated plan**, but merely a **prediction**, concerning the inevitable **working of a nature** over which **no one and nothing** can have any control whatsoever<sup>11)</sup>; in (w), however, the same implication of **spontaneous and instantaneous decision** would not be conveyed by use of */be going to ~/*; and even D's response in (x) following, with its unusual rheme-phrase-stress placement upon not the initial main verb but instead its auxiliary verb, gains its **hyperbolic** force specifically from the resultant implication that D knows the workings of her/his own **nature**, and can therefore make an accurate **prediction** concerning relevant results of those workings:

**C:** But you **mustn't** go and do **thát!**

**D:** I certainly **will** do it – and I'll make a **húge succéss** of it!

And this implication of **inevitability** (as opposed to **premeditation**) is what motivates Addressers to employ this particular use of rheme-phrase-stressed */will ~/*: who could ever, say, dissuade snow from falling? Just as snow cannot but fall, D having made up her/his mind, this decision has, her/his utterance suggests, even become an immutable part of D's **nature**, and nothing that C may argue can now affect D's future conduct.<sup>12)</sup>

#### **F) Fundamentally-coordinating conjunctions exceptionally used at the start of sentences**

Our English majors characteristically employ such positioning quite indiscriminately, thus through over-use wasting a valuable rhetorical index of discursive importance. No means of applying special emphasis can, however, be over-employed without making such an Addresser seem childishly **graceless**. Use of */and/* and */but/* as sentence-**adverbs** is unmistakably best saved for a paragraph-final (preferably emphatically-**simple**) sentence that either further clinches a preceding train of argument, or else overthrows others' previous conclusions.

#### **G) Rheme vs. theme in discursive organization: end-focus<sup>13)</sup>**

The very biggest lacuna in our undergraduates' (and also graduates', and even some of our otherwise-learned colleagues') English education is lack of proper awareness of how to deploy

the English language in a manner that is appropriate and graceful. So doing requires never flouting the pragmatic principle of **end-focus**<sup>14)</sup>. And, if nothing else of this essay is retained by my esteemed reader, this (with that of section (K), below) is that content which I would gravely beg that reader to consistently transmit to those learners entrusted to her/his care.

Ignorance of, or careless negligence concerning, this principle always results in a style of presentation that cannot but strike competent Addressees as being curiously flawed, blemished by implications distracting because irrelevant, and meagre in pragmatic **impact**. But let me first suggest how '**rheme**' and '**theme**', as a pair of technical terms, should respectively be interpreted by a teacher of EFL/ESL.

Segments of **theme** must be presented to our English majors as word-strings conveying items of information that are already available to competent and engaged Addressees, from whatever source-of-cognition. (Such sources are predominantly (i) **direct perception**, (ii) the content of **some Addresser's discourse**, [both = **old information**] and (iii) information constitutive of semantic **schemata** to which content-words have become pre-allotted [= **given information**<sup>15)</sup>].) In the case of a linguistic culture pragmatically characterized by a low degree of context-dependence (as of course is that of English), but with the exception of deliberately-blunt utterance, theme-segments are characteristically **extensive** – a phenomenon that is further augmented whenever there is being demonstrated appreciation of one's Addressee's personal value by means of going out of one's way not to cut corners as to effortful utterance.<sup>16)</sup>

While segments of theme never need to (or, much better, never **should**) be rendered conspicuous, quite the opposite is true of segments of **rheme**. For such segments may best be regarded as communicating either content that is not available to the Addresser from any source-of-cognition other than the Addresser's present utterance, or else content that is indeed already so available, but is now to be considered by that Addressee from a fresh cognitive angle. And such content most definitely needs to be rendered conspicuous – **as long**, however, as it **truly** merits rheme-handling. And, when learners should find themselves in any degree of doubt as to this matter, the safer choice is, almost always, that of treatment as **theme**.<sup>17)</sup>

It actually proves effective to train learners to use what must be a **dull**-coloured font (or a marker-pen, in the case of a hard-copy of a draft – which learners should of course be exhorted always to employ, since so much of what is amiss can mysteriously escape notice on a VDU-screen) with which to go through their initial drafts, identifying and colouring segments of **theme**, by judging whether or not each discursive segment communicates either '**old information**' or else '**given information**', and then going back again, and checking that what still

remains **un**-highlighted really does express either ‘**new information**’ or else ‘**re-presented information**’.

Here, **not** having the student-writer instead brightly highlighting segments of rheme may seem counter-intuitive – or do so until one considers that unwritten yet forceful pragmatic rule which should remind all Addressers that, if an element of either ‘**given information**’ or else ‘**old information**’ cannot justifiably be ‘**re-presented**’, handling it as **rheme**-material risks unacceptably insulting one’s Addressee’s native intelligence – or at least making her/him question (if temporarily, nevertheless unwarrantedly) the accuracy of her/his present grasp of the given context.<sup>18)</sup>

In short, an important rule-of-thumb is ‘If in doubt, present the segment in question as **theme**’: competent Addressers characteristically strive to **pare down** their segments of **rheme**. Thus, for a student-writer revising a draft of a paper or presentation, it generally produces better judgments should that writer be asking herself/himself, ‘**Can** I reasonably make this segment **theme**?’ than it does if s/he is instead merely wondering, ‘Does this **really deserve** to be made **rheme**?’

Here, the relevant, and **iron** pragmatic rule decrees that, wherever possible, every **clause** must end with a segment of rheme, every **clause-cluster**<sup>19)</sup> and every **complex sentence** end with a clause the information of which is most important; and every **paragraph** should be ended with a rheme-rich sentence. In short, obedience to the rule of **end-focus must** be observed. For, should this not be brought about, what will result is **graceless**, bathetic discourse, characterized by ‘bright beginnings, but woefully-dull endings<sup>20)</sup>’. (And, should my reader require further proof of how fundamental this pragmatic rule actually is, I ask her/him to refer to note 21, to be found at the end of this essay.<sup>21)</sup>)

With regard to our English majors, however, we do need to take into account two matters. One is that, in this pragmatic area, and with the exception of choice between /～は/ and /～が/, and the (somewhat-less-strict) requirement of avoiding too much repetition of content-words, competent use of their native language does not particularly necessitate this sort of awareness. And the other is the fact that almost every 説明書 intended for senior high school students of English, and accorded government-approval, flagrantly flouts this rule in most of its examples, and of course provides no explanation of this fundamental pragmatic law itself. Consequently, every complex sentence presented as ‘exemplar’ will be found, entirely **un**exemplarily, to **end** with a subordinate clause; and every clause containing an adverb that neither concerns the information of that clause as a whole (such as *unfortunately*), nor is an adverb of frequency, but instead relates directly to the given verb-phrase, will likewise be discovered to **end** with that

adverb<sup>22</sup>).

The major result of this element of miseducation is that our poor students come to us understandably laboring under an illusion that it is placement at the **beginning** of a clause or a sentence that indicates content-importance – the really-clever ones even attempting to cite, as ‘evidence’, **subject/predicate inversion**. And, concerning **this** topic, we might do well to note that, characteristically, it never occurs to our learners voluntarily to **employ** such inverted clause-structures. Having investigated the same group of government-approved 說明書 in order to discover why this should be, I was less than surprised to find that subject/predicate inversion was merely **listed**, among five or so varieties of 特殊構文, but either – and usually – without one shred of accompanying information as to its implicit communicative effect, and therefore why anyone would be inspired to employ it, or else the faulty (if luckily rare) assertion that its effect is to emphasize **the element that has been given inverted placement**.

This, it ought to go without saying, is **completely erroneous**. What inversion actually does, at least in modern prose, is to signal an element of rheme-content **that has been left implicit**. Regarding this point, let us next compare the communicative effect of the following pair of examples:

y<sup>1</sup>) I don't believe him to be malicious.

y<sup>2</sup>) Malicious I don't believe him to be.<sup>23)</sup>

Here, while no competent and engaged Addressee is, in **responding** appropriately **to** the pragmatic effect of (y<sup>1</sup>)<sup>24)</sup>, going to wonder what the Addresser may believe **instead**, this is precisely what the Addressee of (y<sup>2</sup>) is being implicitly directed to do. Granted, **/malicious/** may or may not, according to greater context, happen likewise to express rheme-content; but that is irrelevant to the point here in question: the sentence has been made to **end** with the negating word-string, thus emphasizing that negation, as (y<sup>1</sup>) does not, and thereby suggesting to any competent and engaged Addressee that s/he should ask her/himself what **other** (probably derogatory) adjective, *etc.*, her/his Addresser **would** indeed employ – were the latter to specify. And this view is supported by (y<sup>3</sup>)<sup>25)</sup>, even though from both of these negation has been removed:

y<sup>3</sup>) ? Stupid I believe him to be.

y<sup>4</sup>) Stupid I **do** believe him to be.<sup>25)</sup>

While there is nothing grammatically amiss with (y<sup>3</sup>), it nevertheless ‘feels’ ill-formed, or lame (hence the initial mark-of-interrogation); (y<sup>4</sup>) relevantly differs from it only in comprising a **rheme-phrase-stressed auxiliary verb** (which is, of course, a marked usage); this inclusion clearly indexes rheme-content, and thus this utterance has a communicative effect that mirrors

that of (y<sup>2</sup>), preceding. For any competent and engaged Addressee will find her/himself implicitly instructed to speculate as to what the Addresser of (y<sup>4</sup>) is discreetly leaving unuttered. In the linguistic culture of a low-context-dependent language such as is our English majors' target-tongue, which kind of language always runs the risk of erring towards over-explanatory long-windedness, rhetorical devices that allow an Addresser to form **complete sentences**, and yet **leave important information unuttered**, are necessarily few, and therefore precious<sup>26)</sup>. This is indubitably why inversion should have survived into Modern English; it is also what our English majors need to have explained to them; and this can be done most simply and yet effectively thoroughly by familiarizing our learners with the concepts of **rheme**, **theme**, and **end-focus**.

#### H) Due wariness concerning overuse of Addressee-unfriendly compound sentence-structure<sup>27)</sup>

Having duly taken it to heart that, in competent adult discourse, the **simple sentence** is essentially an **emphatic device**, and therefore – like other forms of hyperbole – never to be employed indiscriminately, our English majors (until told not to, and crucially told **why** not to – see below in this section) next characteristically resort to linking many of their adjacent simple sentences into crudely-coordinated **compound** sentences – apparently assuming that one's recommendation as to shunning functionless employment of simple sentence-form will thereby have been impeccably followed. Regrettably, whether the given matter be a sequence of plural simple sentences, or instead a couplet or chain of plural coordinated main clauses, the consequence is alike that (as W.S. Gilbert put a similar matter) 'When everyone is somebody, then no one is anybody': when every clause is made a main clause, none of them is endowed with much importance.

In order effectively to forfend this happening, students must simultaneously be made aware of the following vital fact. One of the major roles that a competent and engaged Addressee expects her/his Addresser to undertake to perform is **editorial**: just as such an Addressee will expect her Addresser to clarify, through obedience to the rule of **end-focus**, s/he will also require her/his Addresser to employ the potential hierarchy afforded by **sentence-structure** (in combination with **clause-ordering** according to that same rule) in order to make of each complex sentence a collection of appropriately-formed word-strings that, as a whole, creates a finely-nuanced indication of mutual relative importance among its items-of-content. And the simple basis of such a hierarchy can, of course, be crudely summarized as follows:

**main** clause[s]>

**major subordinate** clause[s]modifying >

**minor** subordinate clause[s]modifying >

**participial phrases** modifying elements of any of the above >

**extremely-subordinated clauses** modifying those participial phrases

While for my learned reader this will surely go without saying, the same is not true of our English majors, who in their initial written drafts for composition-classes betray, and during such classes subsequently report, the dismaying fact that they have so far given to this matter no more thought than they have to end-focus.

Of course, just occasionally **compound** coordination of plural main clauses may offer the only sentence-structure that proves viable<sup>28)</sup>. The sole way, however, in which this structure can index distinctions of relative importance is through one of its main clauses being positioned as sentence-**final**; and doing that can, not infrequently, clash with the demands of some sort of rheme/theme-**un**related **logical ordering** (such as temporal, or spatial), which have to be given precedence. Otherwise, every main clause comprised by a compound sentence is presented merely as one just as important as any of its fellows, and thus a compound sentence differs from a sequence of simple sentences only in that it does not give **quite** so childishly graceless an impression. And so the best advice that, on this point, we can offer our student-writers – and then of it subsequently ceaselessly remind them – is, ‘Examine the content of each of the plural main clauses forming any compound sentence that you have initially drafted: when you do so, you are most likely to notice that just one of these contains **the larger/largest quantity of rheme-content**, and this will be the one that you should arrange your sentence so as to make it the **sole** main clause that is positioned **previous to** a period, a question-mark, an exclamation-mark, or a semicolon (and, all other things being equal, **closest to** that punctuation-mark – **end-focus** again).<sup>29)</sup>

Doing this is both **Addressee-friendly**, and can also lend the sequence of discourse in question an air of having been competently – and even gracefully – written.

### I) The double function of adverbial discourse-markers

As a secondary schoolchild, I was repeatedly instructed never to begin a clause with a meta-discursive adverbial discourse-marker such as */however/*, */furthermore/*, */in addition/*, and */nevertheless/*<sup>30)</sup>; what I was never once told, however, was why one should instead place such a marker (sandwiched between commas) **not too far from the beginning** of that clause. This optimal placing obviously relates to the primary function of such a discourse-marker: that of

acting as a **signpost** that obligingly assists the Addressee in anticipating the general drift of the ensuing discourse. (So, what's new?)

It was not, however, until my fifth decade (I blush to confess) that I realized what was, for me, indeed new: the real, and therefore no less important, reason for which these adverbial discourse-markers should not be placed clause-initially. And this is because they also have a potentially-attention-attracting, and thus **emphatic**, function that remains utterly inert unless such a marker is embedded **within** the clause in question. Below, I have space remaining for no more than a few examples, the first member of each pair of which is a junior English major's actual production, followed for comparison by an improved version<sup>31)</sup>:

***anaphoric emphasis:***

z<sup>1)</sup> ? **However**, he passed away in 1993 when the great Hanshin earthquake broke out two years ago.

z<sup>2)</sup> He passed away, **however**, in 1993, two years after the great Hanshin earthquake occurred.

aa<sup>1)</sup> ? Apparently it is an effective idea; **however**, there are some advantages and disadvantages of this program.

aa<sup>2)</sup> This appears to be an effective solution; this program does, **however**, have both advantages and disadvantages.

ab<sup>1)</sup> \***However**, this problem could be solved by monitoring and cooperating in societies.

ab<sup>2)</sup> This problem could, **however**, be solved by social monitoring and cooperation.

***cataphoric emphasis:***

ac<sup>1)</sup> ? The purpose of [a satellite "new town"] is making a small city around a metropolis; however, Japanese counterparts were introduced to assure residences as the number of nuclear family in urban areas was increasing.

ac<sup>2)</sup> The purpose of [a satellite "new town"] was to create a narrow suburban ring around a metropolis; Japanese counterparts were, **however**, introduced in order to provide enough residences to accommodate an increase in the number of nuclear families seeking to establish their own homes in urban areas.

***ill-placement:***

ad<sup>1)</sup> \*As a result, the area has been developing economically, what the negative factors **however** it brought to us tends to be overlooked.

ad<sup>2)</sup> In result, while the area was developing economically, the nature of the nega-



tive factors this has visited upon us did, **however**, tend to get overlooked.

**lexical mis-choice:**

ae<sup>1</sup>) \***Yet**, there are some ways in order to improve this situation.

ae<sup>2</sup>) There are, **however**, certain ways of improving this situation.

**J) Functionless repetition of content-words**

This is one simple cause of what the pragmatics of adult English discourse deems a style that is unacceptable, because **graceless**. For repetition of a **content-word** is perhaps the second-most primitive form of **emphasis** in discourse (the first being, in written utterance, use of italic font, and, in oral utterance, employment of exceptional vocal volume). As we have already several times noted above, methods of rhetorical emphasis such as end-placement<sup>32</sup>), use of inclusion within a main-clause<sup>33</sup>), and placement of adverbial discourse-markers<sup>34</sup>), should not be squandered upon any discursive element that fails to merit such treatment; and the same applies to repetition of content-words. Although our students will in a paper or presentation reiterate key terms *ad nauseam*, they do also, if questioned, with evident embarrassment admit that they would certainly not do this if uttering in their natal tongue; and yet they seem to assume that it is acceptable when using English (or perhaps they instead are still finding negotiation of the intricacies of pronominalization, verb-substitution, paraphrase, and hypernymy – like the bother involved in creating complex sentences – just too much trouble.).

Unfortunately, the linguistic culture of their target-language is, if it is compared with that of Japanese, characterized by a far greater intolerance of such repetition in contexts in which it is evidently functionless. This is another matter that (as one needs to explain) concerns appropriate **care** for one's Addressee's **ease of comprehension**: every functionless repetition of a content-word causes the pre-conscious mind of a competent and engaged Addressee automatically to ask, '**Why** is this item being repeated? Is it receiving **emphasis**? Or is it being **re-presented**<sup>35</sup>?' And, since repeatedly discovering that the answer to both of the latter two questions is negative has an effect that is repellently jarring, carelessly inducing such a reaction scarcely contributes to successful communication.

Consequently, our Japan-raised English-learners really do need to be made aware that, as soon as a content-word has been initially used, and **unless** the item-of-content expressed by the relevant phrase is being "**re-presented**", the item-of-content of every **noun**-phrase given, as head noun, that same noun, and of every **verb**-phrase given, as main verb, that same verb, is now **theme**, and therefore should not by any means be rendered conspicuous. It appears that such learners then need to be – somewhat firmly – reminded that they have only two accept-

able options: one is **substitution** (in the case of noun-phrases, pronominalization; in the case of verb-phrases, use of */do so OR this OR that/, /be so OR this OR that/, etc.*); and the other is to employ a thesaurus, in order to choose a reasonably-close **synonym**<sup>36</sup>, or else to come up with a **hypernym**.

Most of the Chinese students that I have encountered in either undergraduate-classes or Graduate School have gained a level of competence in oral production of English that has again and again caused me to enquire whether or not they have experienced extended residence in an Anglophone country. The somewhat-astonishing answer has always been that they have not. So I am still wondering why, with the exception of those that have indeed had such experience at a more impressionable age, or else possess one Anglophone parent, our English juniors and seniors, who have of course all undergone their *n*-months of Study Abroad, should still demonstrate such an abysmal level of oral production<sup>37</sup>.

(Does ‘abysmal’ seem too harsh? If so, please read on.)

#### **K) Rheme vs. theme in oral production**

Even students who have come to grasp these paired concepts remain afflicted with oral habits that cause them to leave unapplied what they know: that any segment of theme should be uttered at their lower pitch, without primary stresses, somewhat indistinctly, with reduced vowels, and, when it begins a phrase, **fast**. Basically, such segments are swiftly **muttered** – if to a degree that differs considerably according to variety of (first-language) English.

As with functionless repetition of content-words, carelessly pronouncing, at the speaker’s **upper** pitch, and with **full rheme-phrase-stress**, content-words that, though they are being **inevitably** repeated (because substitution is not possible, or would result in misinterpretation), are in fact being employed to express **theme**-content is another example of failure to **edit** one’s utterance in a manner that aids **Addressee-concentration**<sup>38</sup>. And particularly **Addressee-unfriendly** is the apparently country-wide ‘tic’ of uttering both clause-initial and also clause-final English **pronouns** with a wholly-inappropriate **primary stress**, and at the speaker’s **upper** pitch. This, too, is repellently-jarring; and is so because it causes the pre-conscious mind of any competent and engaged Addressee automatically to anticipate a **contrastive** utterance – such as the following:

af) **Shé** likes **ténnis**, while **hé** prefers **rúgby**.

– but only – and increasingly irritatingly – to find that, in fact, this guess was incorrect.

Constant inappropriate treatment of theme as rheme sends the Addressee signals that are

unsuitable because confusing, then become a nuisance, and eventually induce a sort of numbed indifference to her/his Addresser's discourse.

### L) **Liaison**

Only recently did I happen, to my extreme astonishment, to discover that this country's Ministry of Education [*sic*], Science and Culture apparently **forbids** (or at least discourages) the teaching of English liaison at secondary-school level<sup>39</sup>. I utterly fail to understand why this should be; could, for example, the **French** language be properly taught under this same ludicrous prohibition?

The initial result of this policy is, of course, so-called *katakana*-English; learners afflicted with this are actually to be honored for at least valiantly attempting to produce their chunks as smooth streams of syllables. In so doing, and left uninstructed as to how this is actually managed by competent speakers of English, they can but basically apply the method of their native tongue, only one of the syllables employed by which terminates in (or rather, is itself) a consonant, and they – and, more importantly, their Japan-raised teachers – therefore have to insert superfluous vowels into places in which such are inappropriate, and fail to use glottal stops where use of such is normal. And the second result is that, once our learners have become weaned of **this** habit, and have learned to pronounce at least **discrete words** without any longer 'kana-izing' them, since they are still left unaware of how to manage awkward links (contiguous vowels, and clashes or clusters of consonants), their enunciation becomes distractingly choppy (and their pronunciation of */clothes/* remains indistinguishable from that of either */cloze/* or else */closes/*).

Such enunciation is distracting because the pre-conscious mind of any competent Addressee automatically **anticipates** that liaison will be applied, as the norm in oral utterance; and any cessation in its application is, equally automatically, registered as intended as **emphatic**; for that is how competent Addressers actually employ deliberate abandonment of liaison. Once that pre-conscious has encountered enough instances of functionless absence of liaison to conclude that this is but the unwitting result of incompetence, the owner of that mind is very likely already to have become alienated from engaging further with the discourse of so slipshod an Addresser.

### M) **Stress-placement in content-words**

Finally, all too many of our English majors are presently failing to acquire sufficient awareness of, or perhaps failing to train themselves to pay prompt attention to, the rules that do determine, and fairly consistently, **stress-placement** in **polysyllabic content-words**.

To mention a mere four types of major problem in this area, although our students of English can be reminded, and ‘until the cows come home’, that, in the case of **compound-nouns**, the rheme-phrase-stress always falls on the primary-stressed syllable of the specifying **initial** noun, nevertheless they will consistently produce what may be exemplified by *\*/business-wóman/* (this pattern is truly-distressingly prevalent); they seem unaware that rheme-stress-placement is often an index of part-of-speech – */adúlt/*, say, being an adjective, while */ádult/* is a noun; usually, they have still not grasped that the same largely applies respectively to most disyllabic adjectives and most disyllabic nouns; and, perhaps worst, they are oblivious of the three basic means of calculating rheme-phrase-stress placement in polysyllabic content-words: (1) if the content-word has at least three syllables, the **antepenultimate** syllable of which contains a short vowel followed by a single consonant, its primary stress will, by and large, fall on that syllable; (2) if the **penultimate** syllable of such a content-word comprises a diphthong or a long vowel, and/or a consonant cluster (such as */nd/*, */rk/* or */mb/*) the rheme-phrase-stress will have become ‘drawn’ to that thus-lengthened syllable (and words of Italian or Spanish origin often have that placement, irrespective of whether or not their anglicized pronunciation makes the relevant syllable short; *e.g.*, */allégro/*); and (3) (with the exception of */ménú/*), if the word has a French origin, it will have entered the English lexicon with its finally-placed rheme-phrase-stress still intact. Our English majors, however, happily regale one with, for instance, *\*/celebrítý/*, *\*/vérandal/*, and *\*/cígar/*<sup>40</sup>.

So, there remains a lot of work still to team up in order to concertedly address, **given that** this Faculty truly intends eventually to send out a majority of its English-language graduates that will reliably and effortlessly produce **Addressee-friendly** and **graceful** discourse, whether written or oral, and with this impress their Anglophone Addressees, and hold the latter’s willing attention for as long as they need so to do.

*I should like to take this opportunity most warmly to thank Professor Sei’ichi Morisaki for inviting me to contribute to this issue, and (in alphabetical order) Professor Toshi Ishihara, Dean Osamu Takeuchi, Professor Tomoko Yashima, and Professor Kiyomi Yoshizawa, for their considerable kindness to me during my years of tenure as a member of this Faculty. I am also grateful for having been prevented, by all of fourteen of my former colleagues, from accepting more than part-time work for this university; for I now have something new and rewarding to which to devote two-thirds of my energies.*

### Notes

- 1) 釈迦に説法する
- 2) Before I proceed, I should plainly state that, with regard to our English majors' lack of achievement, I hold in entire contempt any tedious claim that a 'Japanese English' should be globally acknowledged as constituting a legitimate English dialect, for it is not a **second** language, regularly used **between** people born and raised in Japan, and constantly **growing, in its own way**. The late, and brilliantly ground-breaking, Cambridge scholar Dr. Carmen Blacker spoke fairly-fluent Japanese, **but with a drawing very-upper-middle-class English pronunciation of its vowels**, and to this also applied the **prosody of English**; and the result was ... simply embarrassingly comic. Our English-language graduates are supposed to be turned out having become highly-competent experts in deploying their primary target-language; that, while under our care, they still insouciantly mangle that language does suggest that the curriculum this Faculty presently offers them needs yet further, and this time sufficiently-radical, improvement.
- 3) And this should be acquired in paperback format, rather than the Casio electronic version, because a double-page spread offers far more opportunities for serendipitous finds than does the tiny screen of an electronic dictionary: such finds are a valuable part of the 'activation' referred to by the title of this invaluable work of reference.
- 4) Many of our English majors appear to be under an unfortunate illusion that liberal use of such highly informal and colloquial abridgements as */wannal/*, */gonnal/*, */cannal/*, */lotta/* and */kinda/* will somehow endow their English prose, written for whatever purpose, with an air of greater authenticity. It can only be ultimately a kindness to them firmly to correct so egregious a misprision.
- 5) One wants to observe. *That may, or may not, be nice for those advertisements themselves.*
- 6) All too many of the English-language textbooks approved by the Ministry of Education, *etc.*, (doesn't it make you laugh?) entirely misleadingly use the terms / 名詞 / and / 名詞句 / as though they were interchangeable.
- 7) 嘘も方便, or, *The end may justify the means?*
- 8) Let us note that use of */of ~/* is not by any means limited to the Possessive Determination characteristic of genitive-case noun-phrases; one of its many other meanings is 'that characterize[s] ~'; and, when used in this sense – as in the entirely well-formed */[the] women of today/* – this prepositional construction is the only one that is acceptable.
- 9) This not ill-formed; but */yesteryear/* appears not to be **gracefully** employed in genitive case. See also the preceding note.
- 10) And they of course will [mis]use these constructions even in subordinate clauses that begin with such conjunctions as */when/* and */if/*.
- 11) And, consequently, 意志未来 is simply a pedagogically-pernicious misnomer.
- 12) For a summary of my own view of what our learners seem never to have organized in their minds as a coherent set of choices as to formation of verbs-phrases concerning what is, at time-of-utterance, yet to come about, please see Gibbs, A. Stephen (2003). 'An Effective Method of Teaching the Expression of Future Matters in English: Part One' 『関西大学外国語教育研究』第6号
- 13) By British scholars this is more often termed '**end-weight**'. Myself, I prefer this; for it is not a matter

- of to **what** the Addressee gives attention, but, rather, the **degree of** attention that s/he accords to different parts of a given sentence. Northern Americans do, however, outnumber us Brits, Ozzies, and Kiwis.
- 14) This curious lack of awareness becomes revealed chiefly in chapter-drafts contributed to our annual CNN-based textbooks, in examquestions created for our annual entrance-examinations, and in English-language summaries of Japanese-language papers to be published in learned journals.
- 15) Unless, that is, it is also '**re-presented information**'; see below, in section (G).
- 16) The same phenomenon likewise characterizes Japanese utterances produced in contexts in which use of the status-related registers needs to be enhanced; such utterances are characteristically made longer than is usual in either merely formal or blunt utterance.
- 17) What this entails in the case of discursive organization is a matter that I am about to discuss; what it also involves in the case of oral production I proceed briefly to consider in section (K), below.
- 18) And the fatiguing effect, upon competent Addressees, of the oral production of an Addresser who unwittingly disobeys this rule is a matter to which I shall return, likewise in section (K), and n. 38, below.
- 19) By this I mean any one main clause placed within a compound sentence that comprises plural such clauses, plus whatever subordinate clause[s] may be satellite to that one main clause.
- 20) 竜頭蛇尾：線香花火
- 21) Whenever I would (as for many years I was required to do) skim down the pages of such publications as *Time* and *The London Review of Books* in order to locate articles and essays that could be made suitable for use in English-language entrance-examination question-papers, every now and then my merely-normally-alert pre-conscious mind would in my head set off a (metaphorical) dismay-signal. The cause of that signal would almost always turn out to be a word-string in which the principle of **end-focus had been ignored** (and, perhaps for lack of spare time, no editor had caught and reorganized that word-string before the publication in question went to press). I am here citing this frequent experience not, of course, so as to make any unjustifiable claim to exceptional verbal intelligence: all I intend to point out is that, although my lumbering **conscious** did not at first notice what was wrong, my more nimble **preconscious** mind registered such errors **instantly**; what **this** means is that, although I had, during my entire formal education, never once received any overt instruction at all as to this point, every piece of well-written prose that I had ever encountered must have contributed 'a little something more' to a gradual acquisition of an alert preconscious awareness of the governance asserted by this principle over the [English/German/Dutch-]language-using part of the brain. And what this in turn must surely evidence is that great degree to which obedience to this pragmatic principle is fundamental to generating English prose that will strike competent Addressees as being adult, and **graceful**, and therefore communicatively effective – all of which means **Addressee-friendly**.
- 22) Such is, of course, a **marked** choice as to adverb-placement, properly employed only to provide answers to questions – implicit or explicit – containing interrogative adverbials such as */how/, /in what way/, /to what extent/, and /when/*.
- 23) A better contrivance of end-focus would be */That he is malicious I do not believe/*; but such a sentence-structure will not occur to most of our English majors, who are notably unwilling/unable to

generate noun-phrase-clauses [名詞節].

- 24) Spontaneous Addressee-curiosity is, of course, a matter different – and, here, irrelevant.
- 25) Or */That he is stupid I do indeed believe/*; but see the previous note-but-one.
- 26) At time of going to press, I have been able otherwise to identify, as filling the same function, only the tropes of **rhetorical questions deliberately left unanswered**, **irony**, and **litotes**.
- 27) In that this matter likewise concerns relative **degree of informational importance**, it is closely related to rheme *vs.* theme.
- 28) The most obvious example is that of contrastive sentences, such as */Love is a game, but marriage is hard work/*.
- 29) Our brighter students sometimes ask what may be the difference between use of a period and employment of a semi-colon. Once one has familiarized them with the ideas expressed in both (G) and (H), above, one can answer that (i) a semi-colon indexes relevance of the content that succeeds it, to that which precedes it (as a period does not. And a colon properly performs a function quite different: what succeeds a colon should exemplify or adumbrate the proposition that precedes it); and (ii) it is a way of organizing a single complex sentence that, for whatever reason, just has to contain **plural main clauses**.
- 30) Students at all levels may need to be reminded, and not just once, that **none** of such lexemes can be employed as a conjunction.
- 31) Nor do I have space in which to discuss those criteria that affect the difference between the respective effects of **anaphoric** *vs.* **cataphoric** emphasis.
- 32) See section (G), above.
- 33) See section (H), above.
- 34) See section (I), above.
- 35) As defined in section (G), above.
- 36) This is a skill that, of course, they also need in producing non-plagiaristic paraphrasing.
- 37) I am extremely sorry, and ashamed, to have to say that, of the English-language address given at our very first graduation ceremony by the top English student in her year, I had to struggle to understand even half of what she was saying – and she was in fact my own seminar-student, and had studied liaison with me.
- 38) Some of our more senior colleagues may recall a former member of this Faculty whose English discourse was extraordinarily good – particularly for a person who had not been able to spend much time in Anglophone countries; and yet – perhaps for that very reason – his oral production was, I am unhappy to have to say, actually **fatiguing** to listen to for any extended period of time, because it was enunciated almost entirely as **rheme**.
- 39) But does so inconsistently; for example, raising the vowel-position for */the/* when it is used before an initial (true) vowel is a prime example of English liaison; so what, pray, are the native speakers used in the annual recordings for the National Center Test supposed to do? Raise the vowel-position but separate with a moment of silence the determiner from the following lexeme?
- 40) With its initial consonant inappropriately pronounced [ʃ].