Mental grammar and language diversity

Background reading:

• *CL* Ch 1, sec 3

1. Setting the stage: Some review

- A main focus of this course will be investigating the properties of a language system that a speaker has acquired naturally (not through instruction)
- What is grammar?
 - What people "should" say or write?
 Prescriptive grammar
 - Useful for learning a foreign language, or learning a particular style (formal writing, ...)
 - NOT the focus of most research in linguistics

1. Setting the stage: Some review

- What is grammar?
 - What people do say and understand:
 Descriptive grammar
 - Linguistic competence ("What we know when we know a language"):

 Montal grammar
 - Mental grammar
- Linguistics typically focuses on descriptive and mental grammars of native speakers
 - Native speaker: Someone who acquires a language from exposure, as a small child

 If you are a native speaker of English, does your mental grammar judge this example to be grammatical? (Does this "sound normal" to you, or does it "sound funny"?)

Feeding your cat is different to feeding your dog.

 This structure is judged ungrammatical by most speakers of <u>American</u> English (it "sounds wrong")

Feeding your cat is different to feeding your dog.

- This came from a blog called catsofaustralia.com
- I myself first heard the expression *different to* from an Australian (linguist) housemate
- So—
 Which is <u>correct</u>, American English or Australian English?

- ??? But (you may say), that's not a fair question! The two kinds of English are just different
 - An American English speaker has a mental grammar that allows different than [yes, really, for most of us] or different from, but not different to
 - An Australian English speaker has a mental grammar that does allow *different to*
- Both American English and Australian English speakers have mental grammars; they're simply different

This is a key idea in linguistics.

- This point can be extended to the language variety (sometimes called *dialect*) of any speech community
 - No language variety "has no grammar"
 - No language variety is any less (or more!) logical
 - Every mental grammar is systematic
- The speakers of any language variety can use their mental grammar to make grammaticality judgments about whether words, sentences, etc., are acceptable in that variety

- What is a "standard" or "prestige" language variety?
 One that got lucky! (historically, socially, politically)
 - Which group was **in power** when dictionaries, style guides, curricula, etc., were made?
 - Which group did other people **want to imitate** or sound like in order to gain certain social or political advantages?
 - These are the factors that typically determine which variety (dialect) is considered the "correct" or "desirable" one in a society

- Is it useful to be able to speak and write so-called "standard" or "mainstream" American English?
 - In many cases, **yes** there are social implications of using, or not using, this variety
- Does that mean that mainstream American English is intrinsically, linguistically better?
 - Not at all!
 - Remember our discussion of Australian English?
 In the same way, non-"standard" varieties of English simply have a different mental grammar

- For any variety of any language, we can analyze it and determine its linguistic properties
- You may have emotional reactions to different varieties of your language, based on your own background and experience—you may like some and dislike others—that's human nature. BUT!!!
 - All varieties have a mental grammar
 - All varieties can contribute to our understanding of the range of possible human languages
 - All varieties deserve respect; **none are "wrong"**

3. Varieties of English in this course

- Many of the language data from English that we discuss in this course will be from "mainstream" American English
 - This is because this is the variety that is at least familiar as a second language or second dialect to most of the class
- Later in the course, we will look again at language varieties and how they are related to social factors and speaker identity