

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-07/msg01264.html>

- *From:* analyst41@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Sun, 27 Jul 2008 15:44:20 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jul 27, 3:51 pm, "Peter T. Daniels" <gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jul 27, 2:42 pm, analys...@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Jul 27, 11:40 am, "Peter T. Daniels" <gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jul 27, 10:41 am, analys...@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Jul 27, 9:24 am, "Peter T. Daniels"
<gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jul 27, 8:52 am,
analys...@xxxxxxxxxxxx
wrote:

On Jul 26,
4:46 pm,
"Peter T.
Daniels"
<gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
Jul
26,

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

2:07
pm,
analys...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx
wrote:

On
Jul
26,
12:38
pm,
"Peter
T.
Daniels"
<gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
Jul
26,
9:26
am,
analys...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx
wrote:

You
are
of
course
colossally
wrong
because
I
am
conscious
of
all
three
languages
I
speak
and
in
the
case
of
English
–
I
speak
two
varieties

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

–
one
to
Westerners
and
another
to
South
Asians.

You
do
not
know
the
truth
about
yourself.
Your
language
is
only
under
your
conscious
control
when
you
are
planning
in
advance
what
you
intend
to
say,
and
such
occasions
are
very
rare.

Wrong
again:

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

Imagine
the
following
occasions:

(1)
buying
groceries

(2)
talking
to

a
small
child

(3)
helping
a
poor-speaker
of

English
with
directions

(4)
talking
to

inner
city
kids

(5)
giving
some
information

over
the
phone
(name,
CC
number
etc.)

(6)
a
classroom
lecture

(7)
acting
in
a

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

broadway
play
(8)
Making
a
wedding
vow
(taken
from
Dylan)

Is
the
speaker's
inner
awareness
of
his
language
and
his
language
itself
going
to
be
the
same
in
all
cases
(of
course
once
he
is
"in
stride"
in
each
situation
he
might
speak
appropriately
without
being
aware
of

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

it)?

Only
(1),
(2),
and
probably
(4)
(I
can
only
imagine
your
attitude
toward
"inner
city
kids")
are
ordinary
conversation.
If
by
"lecture"
you
mean
reading
your
prepared
text,
then
none
of
(5),
(6),
(7),
or
(8)
is
"speaking"
at
all;
they
are
reciting
prepared,
written
information;
they

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

are
a
uses
of
written
language.
So
yes,
if
you
discover
that
you
are
engaging
with
a
limited-English-speaker,
you
monitor
your
words
in
advance,
but
you
probably
don't
know
how
to
mesh
your
attempts
at
simplification
with
their
native
language,
so
you
might
well
do
worse
than
if
you
didn't
simply

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

 speak
 a
 little
 more
 slowly.

Missed my
point
completely
– I wasn't
merely
trying point
out we
change our
vocabulary
and
complexity
of
grammatical
constructs
to suit
the
occasion,
we also
change the
clarity of
articulation
under
different
circumstances.

AND "WE" DO NOT DO
THAT CONSCIOUSLY.
WE DO THAT
UNCONSCIOUSLY.

I recently
heard
somebody
ask for what
sounded to
me as
"mulverets"
and the deli
owner

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

understood
him and
gave him
Marlboro
lights.

Joe Pesci in
"My Cousin
Vinny"
might have
blithely
gone on to
create a
"sound
change" for
"youths"
until
challenged
by the judge
– "whats a
yoot"? and
he gets back
with a
beautifully
articulated
"Youdhz".

No, he did not "create a
sound change." He said it in
his perfectly
ordinary New York regional
accent (the notion of a
"Brooklyn accent"
is a Hollywood myth.)

Fred Gwynne, as the judge,
pretended not to understand
the word,
making a sociolinguistic
point: that regional dialect is
a marker of
solidarity and difference.

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

So get back
to my
version of
socio-linguistics
(I give not
two hoots
what that
old coot
Labov has
said or not
said) –

In England you could be
prosecuted for libel. If you
"don't care," why
did you invoke him earlier?

upper class
speakers
mostly
move in
mileus
where
"upper
class" i.e.,
"standard"
articulation
is expected
and
unconsciously
enforced by
peer
expectations.
They are
thus able to
resist or
even
perhaps
even
reverse
reductive
language
changes
constantly
emanating
from the
masses.

At least you have finally got
the "unconsciously" bit, but
you are
completely wrong about
"resist" and "reverse." (Plus
you continue
bullshitting about
"reductive.") When Caroline
Kennedy Schlossberg
first (re)entered the public
scene five or so years ago
-- with an
appearance at the Kennedy
Center Honors -- her
accent was pure old-
style upper-class New
York. Since then she has
become quite active in
politics (including as a
spokesperson for Hillary
Clinton), and her
accent has become a quite
ordinary General American
with a tinge of
New York.

Lower class
folks, even
if they had
been taught
proper
articulation
in
school
gradually
either forget
it or reserve
it only for
solemn
occasions
because
they mostly
move in
circles
where
proper
articulation

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

is not
required
and is
perhaps
even
derided by
their
peers.

This is a bizarre mixture of
class superiority bullshit,
your own
fantasies about language,
and a correct observation:
that different
styles are appropriate in
different contexts.– Hide
quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

Let me put it in a way so as not evoke your
characteristic petulance..

You like that word. But clearly you don't know what it
means.

different styles (defined by the nature of
vocabulary, complexity of
the subset of grammatical possibilities used,
strictness of adherence to
grammatical rules, clarity of articulation and
perhaps others) are
appropriate in different contexts.

There is no such thing as "strictness of adherence to
grammatical
rules." All speaking is fully "rule-governed," and different
"rules" (which are nothing like what you read in Miss

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

Fidditch's
grammar–book, or even in Panini) apply in different
situations.

You are being a poor pupil. I tried to teach you about the degeneration of Prakrit with an example of "wrong" grammar (using the plural for "eyes" and "feet"). Deviant grammar starts out by being wrong, but can eventually gain dialect status through usage (ebonics, reggae) so that it becomes correct grammar for its dialect and in the case of Prakrit, collapsing the dual into the plural became correct usage for the modern Northern Indian languages via the various Apabhramshas.

You are not in a position to "teach" anyone anything. There is no such thing as "wrong" grammar.

Something doesn't become true by assertion only. Patanjali explicitly rejected as substandard Sanskrit usages like "aksini me darshaniyani" ("my eyes are beautiful", but using the plural). It is bad/substandard/deviant Sanskrit grammar, but it must have become correct grammar sometime before Hindi etc. emerged fully.

And "Me can't believe you finally send de album!" is bad/wrong/substandard English, but I guess it is correct Reggae.

Here is a more extensive example from Jamaican creole

start quote:

"Juomo an him faada live pan wan faam ina Afrika. Fram di ada die plies komin laik el faiya. Di die dem jos a get ata an ata". (Juomo and his father live on a farm in Africa. Of late the days have been very hot). "Wan die wen di son wel at, Juomo wish se wan kloud kuda jos kova di son, bot no iivn wan dege dege kloud ina di skai". (One really hot day, Juomo wished that some cloud would cover the face of the sun, but not even the slightest cloud appeared in the sky.) "Rien neva faal fi nof wiik nou. Di riva suun jrai out, di graas broun an di doti tof" (For many weeks there was no rainfall. The river soon dried up. The grass turned brown and the bare earth was scorched and cracked.) An him faada kou dem a maaga out an aal a di fuud chrii dem suun ded aaf". (And his father's cows all lost weight heavily and all of the fruit trees soon died.)

end quote.

There is no such thing as "deviant grammar."

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

Re: The monumental stupidity of PIE theorists further illustrated

I have given you examples, and if you still insist there is no such thing, then what can I do?

There is language change, perpetual and undetectable except by wide-ranging sociolinguistic data collection.– Hide quoted text –

Is that a job–security slogan for linguistics professors?

– Show quoted text –