

Re: Why does some culture's language become replaced but others don't?

Re: Why does some culture's language become replaced but others don't?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-07/msg00318.html>

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 10 Jul 2008 04:22:06 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jul 10, 6:39 am, Adam Funk <a24...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 2008-07-09, Peter T. Daniels wrote:

Seriously, don't you think what you read influences your speech? At the very least, you must have a larger vocabulary as a result.

????? What does vocabulary size have to do with linguistic phenomena?????

Are you trolling?

From a generative perspective (if nothing else) increasing the set of terminals increases the range of different utterances that you can produce. So the language is "bigger".

What does that mean??

Since when is "number of utterances," as opposed to the structure of utterances, or rather models of the structure of utterances, of interest to generativists?

Why do you hold this ideological view (which goes against common sense as well as my experience and that of others I know) that reading doesn't "broaden your horizons" encyclopedically and linguistically?

Encyclopeically, certainly. Linguistically, you're being ridiculous.

Re: Why does some culture's language become replaced but others don't?

Apart from the generative argument, broadening the information that you can think about and discuss must broaden your range of utterances.

?? Literacy alters syntactic structuring??

Or is reading a complete waste of time?

So you subscribe to the absurd pre-scientific view that preliterate societies are intellectually inferior?

.