

Re: unnatural languages

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-03/msg00010.html>

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 28 Feb 2007 16:32:23 -0800
-

On Feb 28, 12:47 pm, phogl...@xxxxxx wrote:

On 28 helmi, 18:48, "Peter T. Daniels" <gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 28, 10:01 am, phogl...@xxxxxx wrote:

On 28 helmi, 15:04, "Peter T. Daniels"
<gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 28, 4:29 am, phogl...@xxxxxx
wrote:

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

On Feb 27,
9:54 am,
phogl...@xxxxxx
wrote:

Peter
T.
Daniels
wrote:

On
Feb
27,
9:04
am,
phogl...@xxxxxx
wrote:

Re: unnatural languages

How
many
people
do
you
need
for
a
community?

Two?

So,
an
Esperanto-speaking
household
(parents
and
children
does
constitute
a
community?

Does such a
thing exist?

Yes. How else could there
be people who perceive
themselves as native
speakers?

Self-deception is a very, very easy thing.

Esperantists marrying each other and bringing their children
up in
Esperanto are not a new phenomenon. Surely the children of

Re: unnatural languages

such
marriages will end up speaking Esperanto (or, to
accommodate you, some
Esperanto-related creoloid variety) as their native language?

Not if their playmates and classmates don't.

How many times do we have to tell you that it is not the parents, but
the peer group that determines a child's language?

So, you are moving goalposts again.

Don't lie. I have never said anything different.

First, you suggested two people
were enough for a community.

Two people certainly isn't enough for an infant to acquire a language!

Go learn some psycholinguistics.

Now you are speaking about the peer group
and classmates, and suddenly the household is not enough for you.

There's no "suddenly" about it.

And,
while
we
are
at
it:
in
Belfast,
there
is
an
Irish-speaking
neighborhood
("Shaw's

Re: unnatural languages

Road
Gaeltacht")
which
was
deliberately
developed
as
a
close-knit
community,
and
where
there
are
three
generations
of
Irish
speakers
by
now.
Is
Irish
a
natural
and
real
language
there,
or
is
it
not?–

I
wouldn't
know.

Nice
that
you
admit
it.

Re: unnatural languages

What
relationship
does
that
dialect
have
with
the
main
dialects
that
are
hundreds
of
generations
old?

They
try
to
keep
in
touch
with
the
genuine
dialects
of
Donegal.
You
are
supposed
to
spend
your
summer
holidays
over
there.
The
dialect
of
Ranafast
is
the
most
holy
one,
because

Re: unnatural languages

it
is
the
native
dialect
of
the
revered
writers
Seosamh
Mac
Grianna
and
Séamus
Ó
Grianna.–

So you
admit that
it's an
ideology
thing rather
than a
practical–daily–
use thing.

I told you that they
consciously created a
close–knit community,
where
they could live in Irish and
have all their social contacts
in Irish.
Then I told you that they
make a conscious effort to
keep in touch
with Donegal dialects.

I have know idea what "try to keep in touch"
or "make a conscious
effort to keep in touch" means.

Re: unnatural languages

Yet you are yourself making use of terms like "native language" or "real language" which are essentially big, menacing words without agreed definition.

Idiot. No one doesn't know what "native language" means. A native language is one that is acquired by an infant without any conscious "learning" or "teaching."

So, if parents speak Esperanto to their children, the children will acquire Esperanto as their native language. Agreed.

No, the child might create an Esperanto creole from the imperfect (i.e., pidgin) input from the abusive parents.

Hopefully it is not forbidden from playing with children who will introduce it to a real language.

And in English, if not in Finnish, "real" is the opposite of "artificial."

Well, in my personal English idiolect, "real" is the opposite of "ideal", "imaginary", or "unreal"; and "natural" is the opposite of "artificial".

Then you would do better to conform your personal English idiolect to the general norm.

But let me specify: people take holidays in the Gaeltacht, they send their children to Gaeltacht summer schools and so on.

A week or three does not constitute immersion.

How come this assertion does not surprise me?

Because it's a self-evident truth.

Re: unnatural languages

Re: unnatural languages

Which part here suggests that it is not about practical daily use? Are ideological commitment and practical daily use mutually exclusive?—

Usually.

Well, I have bad news for you. The practical daily use of a minority language in an environment where a majority language is perceived as norm is frequently looked upon as an ideologically motivated act, by the speakers of both languages. If you speak Irish openly in Ireland, there are people who will construe it as a nationalistic demonstration, even if you were a native speaker with Gaeltacht credentials.—

Bullshit. In case you'd forgotten, Ireland has been a "nation" —a Free State from 1916 — for nearly a century. There is no "nationalisticism" in Ireland.

Well, as I stated, I have been involved with the Irish language for a mere fourteen years, sociolinguistic aspects and language attitudes included. And as I stated, my humble knowledge is certainly no match to the divine gnosis you acquired during your one-week stay in Ireland.

I actually knew that Ireland was a nation before I went there.

Why don't you tell us about Swedish in Finland?

Because I reckon you are, in your infinite wisdom, better equipped to tell us about it — if I uttered anything, you would be calling me idiot and my statements bullshit.—

Re: unnatural languages

Re: unnatural languages

Prejudiced, anyway.

I suppose now you'll retort that some of your best friends are Sweded?

.