

Re: unnatural languages

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

- *From:* phoglund@xxxxxx
 - *Date:* 1 Mar 2007 07:03:09 -0800
-

On 1 maalis, 02:32, "Peter T. Daniels" <gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

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.

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

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

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.

.