

Re: unnatural languages

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-03/msg00089.html>

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 1 Mar 2007 14:33:50 -0800
-

On Mar 1, 10:03 am, phogl...@xxxxxx wrote:

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

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.

Show me where I have ever said anything contradictory to the above.

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

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

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

I don't know you, so I don't know what language you claim not to have
acquired, but it's a safe bet that Finnish is your native language, or

Re: unnatural languages

one of them. Is it your claim that for the entire duration of your language acquisition period — until the age of 10 or so — only two people in the entire world spoke to you in your native language?

If as a child you never got to play with children your own age, or go to school, or engage in any other social activities, then you were very deeply abused and the authorities who did nothing to rescue you should be prosecuted.

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.

You managed to do that with regard to yourself some months ago.

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.

The English for that is "Don't teach your grandmother to suck eggs." (Not that my grandmother ever sucked an egg, but these sayings tend to reflect archaic customs.)

The ignorance of basic linguistics that you have displayed while trying to discuss linguistic matters suggests that your ability to speak on sociolinguistics is no greater than that of anyone else who may have visited someplace but has never had any formal training in sociolinguistics.

You have given no hint of any attempt to isolate factors that may be influencing the linguistic situation in Ireland; you appear to have made social and political judgments based on anecdotal observation,

Re: unnatural languages

Re: unnatural languages

not on scientific investigation of situations on the ground.

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 again I say, produce a contradiction.

I have said nothing different, and nothing the least bit surprising to
anyone who's had, say, a second-year class in a linguistic subfield.

And,
while
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

Re: unnatural languages

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.

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

Re: unnatural languages

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

Re: unnatural languages

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.

Re: unnatural languages

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

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—.

Sure.

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".

Then maybe phoglund should look at a standard English dictionary. M–W 11th Collegiate: aside from the irrelevant def. 1 (as in "real estate" or "real property," the oldest usage), def. 2a is 'not artificial'.

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

Re: unnatural languages

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.

So, where's the response?

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

Re: unnatural languages

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.

Nice to know that you had some knowledge. Now, if you could read

Re: unnatural languages

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.–

Aha. The source of some of your biases begins to appear. You find yourself a member of an oppressed minority — even though all this time you have been masquerading as a Finn.

.