

Sturm, J. (2013). Liaison in L2 French: The effects of instruction. In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 4th Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference*, Aug. 2013. (pp. 157-166). Ames, IA: Iowa State University.

LIAISON IN L2 FRENCH: THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTION

[Jessica L. Sturm](#), Purdue University

This study investigates the effects of instruction on learners' ability to make liaison in L2 French appropriately, by comparing students receiving instruction in phonetics and pronunciation ($N = 11$) with those enrolled in another advanced French course ($N = 11$). Participants were recorded reading a text aloud at the beginning and end of the semester. A group of native speakers of French ($N = 11$) were also recorded for comparison purposes. Results indicate an effect for instruction, particularly on the reduction of forbidden liaisons, and are interpreted in light of Schmidt's (1990; 1992; 1993; 1994; 1995; 2001) and Robinson's (1995; 2003) work on attention and awareness in L2 learning.

INTRODUCTION

Pronunciation is traditionally neglected in the communicative L2 classroom and in L2 acquisition studies (Hannahs, 2007). The present study looks at the effects of instruction on L2 French liaison, or the linking and resyllabification of an orthographically (but not phonetically) consonant-final word followed by a vowel-initial word in certain contexts.

Liaison often provides the cues to distinguish between singular and plural, in phrases such as *leur ami* [lœ.za.mi] (their friend), as opposed to *leurs amis* [lœ.za.mi] (their friends), or *il aime* [i.lɛm] (he likes), versus *ils aiment* [il.zɛm] (they like). Forbidden liaison also allows for a distinction between words like *les héros* [le.e.ʁo] (the heroes) and *les zéros* [le.ze.ʁo] (the zeros).

Durand and Lyche (2008) refer to liaison as a multi-faceted phenomenon; it is obligatory, optional, or forbidden, depending on the syntactic context. Thomas (1998) mentions that liaison is rarely taught due to its complexity (p. 544), yet errors of liaison lead to serious problems. Its intricacy and its importance to nativelike speech in French prompt further investigation into how learners come to acquire it. This study contributes to the investigation by comparing learners who have been instructed in French pronunciation and phonetics for a semester with those enrolled in other advanced language courses, as well as a group of native speakers.

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH

L2 Pronunciation instruction

The neglect of L2 pronunciation instruction does not reduce its importance for learners. Miller (2012) noted that "the speaker needs to physically produce the sounds of the target language with enough accuracy to be understood." Derwing and Munro (2009) explain that intelligibility is crucial for communication and argue that pronunciation is learnable and that students want to learn. Harlow and Muyskens (1994) surveyed 1373 L2 learners, finding that students' number one goal is speaking, and, of fourteen stated goals, pronunciation was fifth.

Hannahs (2007) notes that there has not been a great deal of work done on L2 phonological acquisition in French (p. 51). Of those, only Thomas (2002; 2004) and Howard (2004; 2006) looked at the acquisition of liaison in L2 French. The current data are from a study based on

Lord's (2005) and Saalfeld's (2011) work with L2 Spanish learners in pronunciation courses, with learners of L2 French, focusing on at learners' use of liaison.

Liaison in French

Bybee (2001) defines liaison as “the appearance of a word-final consonant before a vowel-initial word in words that in other contexts end in a vowel.” There are three categories of liaison: obligatory [il.zɛm] (*ils aiment/they like*); optional [de.za.mi.(z)ɛ̃.te.ʁe.sɑ̃] (*des amis intéressants/interesting friends*); and forbidden [ʃe//an] (*chez Anne/at Ann's place*). Liaison is difficult for learners because non-realization of a liaison is the “neutral form” of a word, according to Howard (2006). He notes that the “learner has typically learned not to produce” consonants (p. 385). Eychenne (2011) calls liaison one of the three fundamental problems of French phonology (p. 79); Thomas (2004) found that learners make three times as many liaison errors as native speakers. In short, liaison is not easy for any speaker of French, but is particularly tricky in the L2 classroom. For all the difficulties that liaison presents, Howard (2004) cautions that it cannot be considered a ‘luxury’ for L2 learners to learn.

One particularly difficult aspect of liaison is the role of a class of words that begin with an ‘h,’ which is silent in French. Words that begin orthographically with the consonant ‘h’ begin phonetically with a vowel sound. In one class of orthographic h-words, the unpronounced ‘h’ functions as a consonant, so that phenomena such as liaison are blocked: [le.a.bi.ko] (*les haricots/the beans*). These words are said to begin with an ‘h-*aspiré*’ (aspirated ‘h’). The difficulty, of course, is remembering which words begin with h-*aspiré*, as there is no rule from which aspiration or non-aspiration may be predicted.

Another problematic aspect of liaison for L2 learners is that the optional liaison depends on stylistic variation; in more formal contexts, optional liaisons are made. Students presumably hear a range of speech styles from the instructors and any audio or audio-visual media presented in the classroom. Furthermore, all three types of liaison are governed by a lengthy list of rules that must be memorized (see Methodology section for details).

Attention and awareness in L2 learning

Sturm (2012) found that increased attention and awareness to an aspect of an L2 (specifically, accent marks in L2 French for L1 American English learners) that is not part of the L1 led to better retention. She based her research on Schmidt's (1990; 1992; 1993; 1994; 1995; 2001) and Robinson's (1995; 2003) concepts of attention, awareness, and noticing in L2 acquisition. Briefly stated, increased attention to new material in an L2 is believed to lead to better retention. In regards to the present study, enrollment and attendance in a course focused on pronunciation and phonetics will lead to greater awareness of and attention to targetlike use of liaison, and is hypothesized to lead to more nativelike speech in this regard.

RESEARCH QUESTION

Does instruction improve learners' use of liaison in spoken French?

METHODOLOGY

Participants ($N = 22$) were advanced undergraduate students at a large, public U.S. university. The Phonetics group ($N = 11$) were enrolled in a semester-long phonetics and pronunciation course, taught by the researcher, a native speaker of American English whose French is near-native. They were not paid for their time as the tasks involved in the study were part of the

course curriculum. The Control group ($N = 11$) were enrolled in other advanced courses but not in the phonetics and pronunciation course; they were paid for their time at the completion of the second recording. All participants were native monolingual speakers of American English, as verified by a biographical questionnaire. Two class days were devoted to liaison, and activities included listening, reading, and pronunciation exercises. The text presented liaison in reading activities, allowing students to discover rules through guided post-reading questions.

According to the course text, the following contexts for a latent word-final consonant followed by a word-initial vowel mandate a liaison: an article followed by a noun (*les amis*/the friends [le.za.mi]); an adjective followed by a noun (*bons amis*/good friends [bõ.za.mi]); a subject pronoun followed by a verb (*ils ont*/they have [il.zõ]); a subject pronoun followed by a pronoun, followed by a verb (*ils y vont*/they go there [il.zi.võ]); a verb followed by a pronoun (*allez-y*/go there [a.le.zi]); after a monosyllabic adverb (except *pas*, *mais*, and *trop*, when liaison is optional; *très intelligent*/very intelligent [tʁɛ.zɛ̃.te.li.zã]); after a monosyllabic preposition (*dans un*/ in a(n) [dã.zã]); and in certain fixed expressions.

Liaisons are forbidden, according to the course text, in the following contexts: between two syntactic groups, particularly between a subject and verb or with punctuation; between a singular noun and following adjective (*condition // adaptée*/adapted condition); before and after *et* (and); before *ou* (or); before an ‘aspirated’ h (*h-aspiré*); after interrogative pronouns (*Comment // est*/how is); after a pronoun following a verb (*ont-ils // un livre*/do they have a book); before a proper noun (*chez // Anne*/ at Ann’s place); when a word is given as a quotation; before words beginning with the letters ‘y’ and ‘w’, except *yeux* (eyes); and in certain fixed expressions.

All other contexts in which a latent word-final consonant is followed by a word-initial vowel are considered optional liaisons and are normally pronounced in formal or careful speech. The text suggests lectures and reading aloud as situations in which optional liaisons should be made.

Participants were recorded at the beginning and end of the semester, reading a text (Appendix A), which was provided by one of the authors of the course text. According to Durand and Lyche (2008), ‘reading tasks give us systematic access to much of the phonological information we seek...’ (p. 38). For purposes of comparison, a group of native speakers ($N = 11$) were also recorded

For analysis, the researcher listened to the files and noted when instances of liaison occurred; Durand and Lyche (2008) also used auditory coding for their study of liaison in the *Phonologie du français contemporain* (PFC; Phonology of Contemporary French) corpus. The researcher considered liaison to have occurred when a latent consonant was pronounced before a word-initial vowel, whether or not the consonant had been linked with the following word.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Obligatory liaison

Table 1 below illustrates the obligatory liaisons, their type, and how many were made per group/time.

Table 1

Obligatory liaisons/made per group/time

Obligatory liaison	Type	Natives	Phonetics Time 1	Control Time 1	Phonetics Time 2	Control Time 2
Est-il	verb+pronoun	11	10	9	10	11
est-il	verb+pronoun	11	10	10	10	10
en un	monosyllabic preposition	9	7	6	7	6
les autres	article+noun	11	11	7	10	9
autres aliments	adjective+noun	9	0	0	0	0
les enfants	article+noun	11	10	7	10	9
aux Etats	monosyllabic preposition	11	9	7	10	8
Etats-Unis	fixed expression	11	9	11	10	11
Nous aimons	subject pronoun+verb	11	11	11	11	11
nous avons	subject pronoun+verb	11	9	8	10	9
en août	monosyllabic preposition	11	9	9	9	7
dans une	monosyllabic preposition	11	11	9	11	9

Native speakers made all of the obligatory liaisons, with the exception of *autres aliments* (other foods [ɔ.tʁə.za.li.mɑ̃]), adjective+noun, and *en un* (in a/an [ɑ̃.nɛ̃]), a monosyllabic preposition. None of the learner participants in either group pronounced *autres aliments* with a liaison. The other four types of liaison included in the text are verb + pronoun (*est-il/is it*); articles (*les autres [aliments]/the other [foods]; les enfants/the children*); the fixed expression *Etats-Unis/United States*; and subject pronoun + verb (*nous aimons/we like; nous avons [bu]/we drank*). Most participants made each of these liaisons. In the phonetics group, most participants pronounced the same obligatory liaisons at both testing times (participants 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 11). Of the other five participants, three improved by pronouncing more obligatory liaisons; while only two pronounced fewer liaisons. Among those who improved, the liaisons that were pronounced on the first recording were pronounced again on the second, as well as at least one that they had missed the first time. Participant 13 pronounced four additional obligatory liaisons. In the control group, four learners made the same number of liaisons at each recording, but not the same liaisons. For example, participant 28 pronounced nine of the twelve obligatory liaisons at each recording: at the first recording, all except *En un*, *autres aliments*, and *les enfants*; at the second,

s/he pronounced *En un* with a liaison but omitted the liaison in *aux Etats*. Only two of the control group pronounced exactly the same liaisons at both recordings. Five of the control group participants improved during the semester, while two pronounced fewer obligatory liaisons at the second recording than at the first.

Forbidden liaisons

Table 2 below illustrates the forbidden liaisons, their type, and how many were made per group/time.

Table 2

Forbidden liaisons/made per group/time

Forbidden liaison	Type	Natives	Phonetics, Time 1	Control, Time 1	Phonetics, Time 2	Control, Time 2
<i>pain accompagne</i>	across two syntactic groups	0	3	3	0	0
<i>des haricots</i>	<i>h-aspiré</i>	1	10	6	7	9
<i>comment imaginer</i>	interrogative pronoun	0	0	0	2	0
<i>hamburgers</i>	<i>h-aspiré</i>	1	10	7	8	8

Participants made three types of forbidden liaisons: across two syntactic groups (*pain accompagne*/ bread accompanies [**pa.na.kõ.paj*]); *h-aspiré* (*des haricots*/of the beans [*de.za.ri.ko*] and *les hamburgers*/the hamburgers [**le.zam.byʁ.gɛʁ*]); and an interrogative pronoun (*comment imaginer*/how to imagine or how could one imagine [**ko.mã.ti.ma.zi.ne*]). Among the native speakers, only the two *h-aspiré* liaisons were made, by the same speaker. In the phonetics group, most participants pronounced the liaison on both *h-aspiré* words, although fewer learners did so on the second recording. Three participants in the phonetics group pronounced *pain accompagne* with a liaison on the first recording; none did so on the second. Only two participants (in the phonetics group) pronounced *comment imaginer* with a liaison and only on the post-test.

In the control group, three participants pronounced *pain accompagne* with a liaison, only on the pre-test. More control group participants pronounced the *h-aspiré* words with a liaison on the second recording than on the first. Taken with the phonetics group's performance, this suggests that instruction had an effect on *h-aspiré* words, as the phonetics group, as a whole, improved, while the control group regressed.

Optional liaison

As optional liaisons are, by definition, neither obligatory nor forbidden, measuring their presence or absence has no bearing on learners' intelligibility. Therefore this paper will not address pronunciation of optional liaison.

DISCUSSION

Obligatory liaison

While these results do not definitively suggest an effect of instruction, there are four phenomena worth discussion. First, two native speakers and all of the learner participants failed to make a liaison with *autres aliments*. This liaison is an adjective preceding a noun, which is a frequently heard type of liaison and often cited in the literature, e.g., *petit ami* (little friend/boyfriend [pə.ti.ta.mi]). However, *enchaînement* (resyllabification of a pronounced word-final consonant) occurs with the singular form of the adjective + noun, *autre aliment*, and participants may have thought that was the proper pronunciation for *autres aliments* as well: [*ɔt.ʁa.li.mɑ̃]. Native speakers are evidently not in agreement, as two of the eleven recorded failed to make the liaison.

Second, only nine of the eleven native speakers made a liaison with *en un*, which begins with a monosyllabic preposition. However, many number words (*onze* [11] or *huit* [eight], for example) block liaison. It may have been that the native speakers were orienting to the word *un* as the number one, rather than an article.

Third, the phonetics group, as a group, improved or stayed the same for each obligatory liaison from first to second recording. Finally, the phonetics group was more consistent in their pronunciation; nine of eleven phonetics group participants pronounced all of the obligatory liaisons they had pronounced the first time at the second recording. This was not the case for the control group, as illustrated by the discussion of participant 28.

It is tempting, but simplistic, to assume that instruction is the only reason for more consistency among the phonetics group. Saalfeld (2011) found a ceiling effect for her Spanish phonetics students in the acquisition of Spanish stress. She suggested that learners who had chosen to take an elective phonetics course were already working on their pronunciation and, consequently, were better before taking the class. The participants in the phonetics group in the current study were in the same situation as Saalfeld's (2011); they chose to take a phonetics and pronunciation class among electives in their French major and minor.

Considering Schmidt's (1990; 1992; 1993; 1994; 1995; 2001) and Robinson's (1995; 2003) work in attention, awareness, and noticing in L2 acquisition, it may also be that learners in the phonetics group were paying more attention to where they made liaisons, particularly after a semester of pronunciation instruction. In other words, instruction had an effect on the phonetics group's pronunciation of liaison by bringing liaison to students' attention. It is likely that it is both interest (indicated by enrollment in the class) and attention to the text that led to more consistent pronunciation of obligatory liaison by the phonetics group.

Additionally, it must be acknowledged that the phonetics group was more invested in doing well on the recordings, which were part of their grade. On the other hand, the control group received no benefit from doing well on either recording. As a result, they may have approached the task with a different mindset than their peers who had enrolled in the course.

Forbidden liaison

The liaisons with *h-aspiré* are especially interesting as one of the native speakers pronounced them. *H-aspiré* is difficult for non-native speakers who may be unsure which words begin with an *h-aspiré*. The topic of *h-aspiré* was covered in class and the textbook provides a selection of words beginning with the phenomenon, yet participants in the phonetics group did not improve across the semester. '*Haricots*' and '*hamburgers*' are fairly frequent words, especially in L2

language courses, where food is a popular topic, suggesting that students should know whether or not these words take a liaison. Yet most learners were erroneous in their pronunciation, at least according to the rules described in the textbook. Their overuse of liaison in this context could be ascribed to an overgeneralization of the obligatory liaison between articles and nouns.

However, one native speaker made a liaison with both *h-aspiré* words, which baffled the researcher until she was assured by a native-speaking colleague that “this is becoming the norm” (J.S. Miller, personal communication, 11 January 2012). This revelation begs the question, did learners pronounce the liaison in *des haricots* and *les hamburgers* because they didn’t know not to, because they heard their instructors pronounce it, or (admittedly less likely) because they are on top of changing norms? The definitive answer is beyond the scope of this paper, but it indicates the amount of work left to be done on this topic.

Pedagogical implications

The results of this research support the call for early pronunciation/phonetics intervention in L2 classrooms. Given the difficulty presented by *h-aspiré* words, and the complexity of liaison, instruction from the beginning could help learners mentally organize when to make and not to make a liaison. Of necessity, this early pedagogical intervention would include *enchaînement* as well, as it is both part of the liaison process, and, when separate, a related phenomenon.

FINAL CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the phonetics group was more consistent in their ability to pronounce obligatory liaisons, from the beginning to the end of the semester. This does not necessarily suggest an effect of instruction, but indicates that learners in the phonetics group were more invested in their performance on the recordings. It can also be argued that learners in the phonetics group were paying more attention to their pronunciation on both recordings, particularly the second, as it was part of their final exam. As discussed by Schmidt (1990; 1992; 1993; 1994; 1995; 2001) and Robinson (1995; 2003) and as Sturm (2012) found, increased attention leads to better retention and performance in L2 learning. The phonetics group also pronounced fewer forbidden liaisons on the second recording, while the control group pronounced more. This suggests that pronunciation instruction led to better knowledge of when not to pronounce a liaison. Looking at both obligatory and forbidden liaison, the results of this study suggest that instruction leads to better use of liaison than no instruction, if for no other reason than that instruction calls learners’ attention to this complex and challenging aspect of French phonetics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Jessica Sertling Miller for reading an early draft of this paper and the anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful feedback. All errors that remain are mine.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Jessica L. Sturm is Assistant Professor of French and Applied Linguistics at Purdue University. She received her Ph.D. in French and Second Language Acquisition/Teacher Education from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 2008. Her research and teaching interests include second language phonology, the use of film in the language classroom, and classroom second language acquisition, including technology in the L2 classroom.

REFERENCES

- Bassetti, B. (2006). Orthographic input and phonological representations in learners of Chinese as a foreign language. *Written Language and Literacy*, 9, 1, 95-114.
- Borgwaldt, S.R., Hellwig, F.M., & de Groot, A.M.B. (2004) Word-initial entropy in five languages. *Written Language and Literacy*, 7(2) 165-184.
- Borgwaldt, S.R., Hellwig, F.M., & de Groot, A.M.B. (2005). Onset entropy matters – Letter-to-phoneme mappings in seven languages. *Reading and Writing*, 18, 211-229.
- Bybee, J. (2001). Frequency effects on French liaison. In J. L. Bybee, & P. Hopper, (Eds.) *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*, (pp. 337-359). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2009). Putting accent in its place: Rethinking obstacles to communication. *Language Teaching*, 42, 476-490.
- Durand, J., & Lyche, C. (2008). French liaison in light of corpus data. *French Language Studies*, 18, 33-66.
- Eychenne, J. (2011) La liaison en français et la théorie de l'optimalité. *Langue française*, 169, March, 79-101.
- Hannahs, S.J. (2007). French phonology and L2 acquisition. In D. Ayoun (Ed.), *French applied linguistics*, (pp. 50-74). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Harlow, L.L., & Muyskens, J.A. (1994). Priorities for Intermediate-Level Language Instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 2, 141-154.
- Howard, M. (2004). Sociolinguistic variation and second language acquisition: A preliminary study of advanced learners of French. *SKY Journal of Linguistics*, 17, 143-165.
- Howard, M. (2006). Variation in advanced French interlanguage: A comparison of three (socio) linguistic variables. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 62, 3, 379-400.
- Lord, G. (2005). (How) Can we teach foreign language pronunciation? On the effects of a Spanish phonetics course. *Hispania*, 88, 257-267.
- Miller, J.S. (2012). Teaching French pronunciation with phonetics in a college-level beginner French course. *NECTFL Review*, 69: 47-68.
- Robinson, P. (1995). Attention, memory, and the 'noticing' hypothesis. *Language Learning*, 45, 2, 283-331.
- Robinson, P. (2003) Attention and memory during SLA. In C.J. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.) *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 631-678). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Saalfeld, A. (2011). Acquisition of L2 phonology in advanced learners: Does instruction make a difference? In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 2nd Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference*, Sept. 2010. (pp. 144-152), Ames, IA: Iowa State University.
- Schmidt, R.W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.
- Schmidt, R. (1992). Psychological mechanisms underlying second language fluency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 357-385.
- Schmidt, R. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 206-226.
- Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. *AILA Review*, 11, 11-26.

- Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 1-63). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sturm, J.L. (2012). Attention, awareness, and accent marks in L2 French. *Language Awareness*. Available online 18 June 2012. (print edition forthcoming).
- Thomas, A. (1998). La liaison et son enseignement: Des modèles orthoépiques à la réalité linguistique. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 54, 4, 543-552.
- Thomas, A. (2002). La variation phonétique en français langue seconde au niveau universitaire avancé. *AILE*, 17, 1-14.
- Thomas, A. (2004). Phonetic norm versus usage in advanced French as a second language. *IRAL*, 42, 365-382.

Appendix A. Text Recorded by Participants.

Letters involved in obligatory liaisons are **bold**; those in optional liaisons are underlined and those in forbidden liaisons are **underlined bold**

*Pourquoi le pain est-il aussi important pour les Français ? Tout simplement parce qu'ils ne peuvent pas envisager une journée, ou même un repas, sans pain. Mais le pain est-il si nécessaire pour manger ? **En** un mot oui, parce qu'il rehausse les autres aliments.*

Pour le petit-déjeuner, rien de meilleur qu'une tartine de pain n avec du beurre et de la confiture. A midi, le pain n accompagne les salades s et surtout soutient le fromage. Entre les deux, il absorbe la sauce de la viande et des s haricots. A quatre heures, tous les enfants s aiment manger du pain et du chocolat t en sortant de l'école. Pour le dîner, de la soupe et du pain suffisent souvent pour un repas s équilibré.

Même aux Etats-Unis, le pain fait partie de la vie. Comment t imaginer n sandwich au beurre de cacahuètes sans pain ? Et les s hamburgers ?

Phrases :

*Nous aimons le goût du jus que nous avons bu à Honolulu **en** août.*

La vieille cliente achète des fruits pour Louis. Elle les mange avec lui à minuit dans une ruelle.

Translation:

Why is bread so important to the French? Simply because they cannot imagine a day, or even a meal, without bread. But is bread so necessary for eating? In a word, yes, because it enhances other foods.

For breakfast, there is nothing better than a slice of bread with butter and jam. At noon, bread accompanies salads and, above all, supports cheese. Between the two, it absorbs the sauce from the meat and beans. At four o'clock, all children love to eat bread with chocolate when leaving school. For dinner, some soup and bread often suffice for a balanced meal.

Even in the United States, bread is part of life. How could one imagine a peanut-butter sandwich without bread? Or hamburgers?

Sentences:

We like the taste of the juice we drank in Honolulu in August.

The old lady client buys fruit for Louis. She eats them with him at midnight in a passageway.