

# Re: unnatural languages

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-03/msg00048.html>

---

- *From:* [phoglund@xxxxxx](mailto:phoglund@xxxxxx)
  - *Date:* 1 Mar 2007 07:03:09 -0800
- 

On 1 maalis, 02:32, "Peter T. Daniels" <[gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Feb 28, 12:47 pm, [phogl...@xxxxxx](mailto:phogl...@xxxxxx) wrote:

On 28 helmi, 18:48, "Peter T. Daniels" <[gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Feb 28, 10:01 am, [phogl...@xxxxxx](mailto:phogl...@xxxxxx) wrote:

On 28 helmi, 15:04, "Peter T. Daniels"  
<[gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Feb 28, 4:29 am,  
[phogl...@xxxxxx](mailto:phogl...@xxxxxx) wrote:

Peter T.  
Daniels  
wrote:

On  
Feb  
27,  
9:54  
am,  
[phogl...@xxxxxx](mailto:phogl...@xxxxxx)  
wrote:

Peter  
T.

Re: unnatural languages

Daniels  
wrote:

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

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?

Re: unnatural languages

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 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.

YOU accuse ME of lying. Now we have a new definition for chutzpa.

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

Re: unnatural languages

Re: unnatural languages

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

I never acquired a language, then. Nice to know.

Go learn some psycholinguistics.

You are entirely ignorant of Irish sociolinguistics, but make weighty pronouncements on the matter anyway. After that I do not really believe that you were in any position to say anything relevant about psycholinguistics, either. To put the matter quite bluntly, Peter: I do not really believe that you are fit or equipped to say anything about linguistics or related fields. By your manners, or lack thereof, you have entirely forfeited your credibility as a professional.

I am ready to admit that I know little about linguistic theory – I am a practical man and was always more interested in acquiring particular languages and finding innovative ways to teach them. So, you did have some credibility as long as we were debating things that you could be more knowledgeable about than myself. But your ridiculous and arrogant attempt to actually contest my firsthand knowledge of the sociolinguistics of Irish society went simply too far. Here in Finland we say that you should not teach your dad to, uh, fornicate, i.e. not teach a person something that he or she obviously knows better than you do. By trying to teach ME Irish sociolinguistics you definitely crossed the last border.

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.

Don't try to intimidate me. I know that you contradicted yourself, and there is no explaining away it. Of course you won't admit it. You never admit any blunder.

And,  
while

Re: unnatural languages

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

Re: unnatural languages

Nice  
that  
you  
admit  
it.

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.

Re: unnatural languages

Re: unnatural languages

The  
dialect  
of  
Ranafast  
is  
the  
most  
holy  
one,  
because  
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

Re: unnatural languages

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.

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 imprfect  
(i.e., pidgin) input from the abusive parents.

Re: unnatural languages

Well, let us put it that way. If the creole is mutually intelligible with other Esperanto-based creoles which have been created in a similar way, and if it is mutually intelligible with the "conference Esperanto", too, and if its speakers can make intelligent use of printed media in standard Esperanto, then we can say that the creole and those other varieties are dialects of the same language for all intents and purposes—.

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.

I do not think Peter Daniels is in any way better equipped than me to define "the general norm". I think Peter Daniels's personal quirks do not constitute "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.

Somehow, other people's self evident truths are never accepted as such by you. I think I am going to respond in kind.

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.

## Re: unnatural languages

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.

Nice to know that you had some knowledge. Now, if you could read books, it might be a good idea to read some standard works about Irish history and society. "The Oxford Illustrated History of Ireland" is a good read for a person of your sort: it even has lots of nice coloured pictures if you find the texts too long, challenging, and replete with hard words.

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.–

Prejudiced, anyway.

It is no prejudice to presume that you persist in your earlier abusive style.

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

I don't know about Swedes, but I presume "Swede" means in your deficient and flawed terminology a Finnish citizen who is a native speaker of Swedish. The correct term is Finno-Swede, based on the native terms "finlandssvensk" and "suomenruotsalainen". My father is a native speaker of Swedish, originally from a village in Ostrobothnia where Swedish, or a related dialect, is the community language. I acquired my university degree at Åbo Akademi University, where Swedish is the teaching medium. And I speak Swedish to my girl-friend. I readily admit that I am biased – in favour of the Swedish-speakers. In the upcoming elections, I am going to vote (it is no secret) for Stefan Wallin, the leader of the political party of the Swedish-speaking minority.

.