

# Re: unnatural languages

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-03/msg01318.html>

---

- *From:* "Brian M. Scott" <b.scott@xxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Thu, 15 Mar 2007 16:33:37 -0400
- 

On 15 Mar 2007 15:28:05 -0400, Herman Rubin  
<hrubin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in  
<news:etc6o5\$392g@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> in sci.lang:

In article <1173929324.317738.63840@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Peter T. Daniels <grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

[...]

Every human being (barring severe brain damage) speaks their native language(s) "reasonably grammatical"ly.

Not in my experience.

Your statement is obviously false as Peter is using the expression, and by now you should certainly be aware of this. What you mean, I expect, is that you encounter many people who don't speak according to rules of formal standard English; if that \*is\* what you mean, say so! Then you'll have to explain why you think this matters, but at least you'll be talking about something instead of playing stupid word games.

[...]

One is unlikely to get the technical vocabulary in the normal course of learning a language. For example, in a paper on efficient methods for multiple precision arithmetic, I got hung up on "Einheit". I could reject many uses of "oneness"; I did not know that it was used in German works on rings for "unit", which has nothing to do with "one", despite the English word being based

Re: unnatural languages

on the Latin for "one".

In fact it *\*does\** have something to do with 'one', though the connection is somewhat attenuated. And this has nothing to do with whether technical language is a language in the usual sense of the word. (It isn't.)

[...]

It seems you are suggesting learning languages in a very similar manner to the whole word method for reading.

No.

[...]

Brian

.