To Walter Winckler, Word Wizard

Challenging Chomsky

The Generative Garden Game

Rudolf P. Botha

Basil Blackwell

61 | 12893

641ER, 560, C54B, B2

Copyright©Rudolf P. Botha 1989

First published 1989

Basil Blackwell Ltd
108 Cowley Road, Oxford, OX4 1JF, UK

Basil Blackwell Inc.
432 Park Avenue South, Suite 1503
New York, NY 10016, USA

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Except in the United States of America, this book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Botha, Rudolf P.
Challenging Chomsky: the generative garden game.
1. Linguistics. Theories of Chomsky, Noam, 1928–
I. Title
410'.92'4

ISBN 0-631-16621-1

Univ.-Bibliothek
Regensburg

6458905

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Botha, Rudolf P.
Challenging Chomsky: the generative garden game/
Rudolf P. Botha.
p. cm.
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
ISBN 0-631-16621-1
1. Chomsky, Noam. 2. Linguistics. 3. Generative grammar.
I. Title.
P85.C47B6 1989
415–dc19

Phototypeset in 11 on 13 pt Sabon
by Dobbie Typesetting Limited, Plymouth, Devon
Printed in Great Britain by
T. J. Press Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

This setting of human beings to kill one another in public, for entertainment, is by far the nastiest blood-sport ever invented.

Michael Grant, *Gladiators*, p. 8

'I was hoping that you, at least, would understand the appeal of the thing [i.e., the pitting of man against man in a maze]', he said at length. 'However . . . ' He paused again. 'To be honest,' he went on slowly, 'I'm not sure I wholly understand – myself – the deep attraction of the Game . . . I suppose the Game gives us the feeling of getting close to the roots of our profession . . . getting down to the fundamentals. . . . '

Jon Manchip White, *The Garden Game*, p. 102

The perceived need to outdo Chomsky has led him to be the most attacked linguist in history.

Newmeyer, 'Has there been a "Chomskyan revolution" in linguistics?'

Chomsky has rarely been defeated in argument on his own ground . . .

Gardner, *The Mind's New Science*, p. 214

The first essay [in *Rules and Representations*] and indeed much of the book provides us with critical examples illustrating the subtly controlled aggressive component of Chomsky's rhetoric and style . . .

Brame, 'Universal word induction vs Move α'

Bloodsports, it is generally believed, are on the wane. But not so The Generative Garden Game.

Anonymous

2.2.4 Primary linguistic data vs data about child grammars 23
2.2.5 The child's being exposed to evidence about its language vs the child's learning the language 23
2.3 The genetic component in the acquisition of knowledge of language 25
2.3.1 Initial state vs (relatively) stable steady state 25
2.3.2 Innateness vs specificity 27
2.3.3 Distinct language faculty vs general(ized) learning mechanisms 29
2.3.4 (Idealized) uniformity vs (real) variation in the species 31
2.3.5 Genetically determined factors vs factors operative at birth 32
2.3.6 Genetic vs epigenetic 33
2.3.7 Fundamental principles vs open parameters 34
2.4 The process of language acquisition 35
2.4.1 Growth/maturation vs learning 35
2.4.2 (Language) growth vs hypothesis-formation or abductive learning 37
2.4.3 Instructive theories of learning vs selective theories of learning 39
2.4.4 Parameter fixing vs rule acquisition 40
2.4.5 Rationalism vs empiricism 41
2.4.6 Rationalism vs constructivism 44
2.5 The nature of knowledge of language 47
2.5.1 Knowledge of language vs the capacity to use a language 47
2.5.2 Behaviour as evidence vs behaviour as a criterion 49
2.5.3 Knowledge of language vs the creative aspect of language (use) 51
2.5.4 Having a mental structure vs lacking a mental structure 52
2.5.5 Conscious knowledge vs unconscious knowledge 55
2.5.6 Knowing a language vs knowing how to ride a bicycle 57
2.5.7 Grounded/justified knowledge vs a priori knowledge vs caused knowledge 58
2.5.8 'Supplying good reasons' vs 'constituting triggering experience' 61

2.5.9 Knowledge of language vs knowledge of arithmetic 63
2.5.10 The intuitive/pretheoretic notion of language vs the technical concept of language 64
2.5.11 The ideal speaker–listener vs an ordinary speaker–listener 65
2.5.12 Mixed language vs pure language 67
2.5.13 E(xternalized) language vs I(nternalized) language 68
2.5.14 I(nternalized) language vs P(latonic) language 73
2.5.15 Grammatical competence vs pragmatic competence 74
2.5.16 The computational system vs the conceptual system/the system of conceptual structure(s) 76
2.5.17 Human language vs symbolic systems taught to apes 79
2.5.18 The component specific to the language vs the component contributed by the initial state 81
2.5.19 (The) core vs (the) periphery 82
2.5.20 Marked (rules/structures) vs unmarked (rules/structures) 84
2.5.21 An abstract rule system vs a system of fixed parameters 88

2.6 Language use 91
2.6.1 (Linguistic) competence vs (linguistic) performance 91
2.6.2 Cartesian problems vs Wittgensteinian problems 94
2.6.3 Ascription-of-rule-following by a person in ordinary life vs ascription-of-rule-following by a scientist 97
2.6.4 Dispositional vs causal vs descriptive vs normative 100
2.6.5 The rule-system theory vs the principles-and-parameters theory of language use 102

2.7 The nature of mind in general 104
2.7.1 Mind vs body 105
2.7.2 Physical structures of the brain vs abstract structures of the mind 107
2.7.3 Modularity vs uniformity 109
2.7.4 Modularity vs innateness 113
2.7.5 External autonomy vs internal autonomy 116

2.7.6 The form/structure of a mental faculty/entity vs the function of a mental faculty/entity 121

3 The Terrain of Theory 125

3.1 The theory of grammar/the theory of language/the general-linguistic theory 126
3.1.1 A theory of grammar vs a generative grammar of a particular language 126
3.1.2 A theory of grammar vs a theory of language use 127
3.1.3 Linguistic theory vs the field of linguistics 129
3.2 Linguistic universals 130
3.2.1 Linguistic universals vs statements postulating a property common to all languages 130
3.2.2 Claims about biologically necessary properties of language vs claims about logically/conceptually necessary properties of language 131
3.2.3 Linguistic universals vs cross-linguistic generalizations 133
3.2.4 Subcomponents of rule systems vs subsystems of principles 135
3.3 (Generative) grammars 137
3.3.1 A descriptive/linguistic grammar vs a mental/internalized grammar 137
3.3.2 A generative grammar vs a traditional/pedagogical grammar 139
3.3.3 The generation of sentences vs the production and interpretation of sentences 140
3.3.4 Sentence generation vs parameter fixing and element licensing 143

4 The Marshes of Method 145

4.1 Problems, aims and idealizations 146
4.1.1 Problems vs mysteries 146
4.1.2 Depth of insight vs gross coverage of data 148
4.1.3 (Deep) explanatory principles vs (superficial) empirical generalizations 150
4.1.4 Idealization vs inventorization 152

4.2 Description and explanation 155
4.2.1 Realism vs non-realism 156
4.2.2 Psychological reality vs truth 159
4.2.3 Hypotheses describing behaviour vs rules constituting part of the structure of AS 164
4.2.4 Abstract description/characterization vs concrete description/characterization 165
4.2.5 Descriptive adequacy/descriptively adequate vs explanatory adequacy/explanatorily adequate 169
4.2.6 Rationalism vs empiricism 170

4.3 Empirical status 174
4.3.1 Empirical vs a priori 174
4.3.2 Naive falsificationism vs sophisticated falsificationism 176
4.3.3 Empirical vs notational 178

4.4 Justification 179
4.4.1 Evidence vs demonstration 179
4.4.2 Direct methods/tests vs indirect argumentation 181
4.4.3 Internal (linguistic) evidence vs external (linguistic) evidence 182
4.4.4 Evidence from a single language vs evidence from a diversity of languages 187
4.4.5 Evidence from genetically related languages vs evidence from genetically unrelated languages 188

4.5 Simplicity 189
4.5.1 Conceptual simplicity vs messy systems 190
4.5.2 Simplicity of principles and rules vs (apparent) complexity of phenomena and structures 191
4.5.3 Simplicity of principles and theories vs complexity of argument 192
4.5.4 Conceptual simplicity vs notational simplicity 193

5 Locus in the Landscape of Learning 196

5.1 Linguistics vs philosophy 197
5.2 Linguistics vs mathematics 198
5.3 Linguistics vs psychology 199
5.4 Linguistics vs the brain sciences 200
5.5 Linguistics vs the natural sciences 201

Afterthoughts 206
Notes 208
Bibliography 227
Index 236

Acknowledgements

Without the generous assistance of various colleagues and friends I would not have been able to complete this study, an early version of which was informally distributed as *The Generative Garden Game* (Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics 16). My thanks go in particular to the following:

To Walter Winckler and Cecile le Roux, who read the entire manuscript more than once, inventively suggesting numerous improvements in the content and presentation of both the more serious sections and the playful parts.

To Professors Jean Aitchison, Keith Allan, Dwight Bolinger, Bob Dixon, Roger Lass, Peter Matthews, Gary Prideaux, Henk Schultink, Pieter Seuren, Bob Stockwell and Arnold Zwicky for comments that gave me a clearer idea of what I am trying to do here and, more important, should have been trying to do.

To Christine Anthonissen, Riekie Harm, Hildegard van Zweel and Elaine Leek (on the publishing side), who rendered valuable editorial assistance in weeding out technical flaws.

To Mrs L. Gildenhuys, who skilfully typed and retyped the manuscript, not once losing her patience in the protracted process.

And I would like to thank all these good people for not trying too hard to persuade me to leave my tale untold.

R.P.B.

The author and publishers are grateful to Noam Chomsky who generously granted permission to quote from his published works; also for permission to quote from N. Chomsky, *The Generative Enterprise. A Discussion with R. Huybregts and H. van Riemsdijk* (Foris Publications, 1982).

Contents

Acknowledgements xiii
Forewarning xv

1 The Lie of the Land 1

1.1 Generative grammar vs non-generative grammar 1
1.2 Chomskyan generative grammar vs non-Chomskyan generative grammar 3
1.3 Chomskyan linguistics vs Chomsky's linguistics 5
1.4 Chomsky's linguistics vs radical Chomsky-like linguistics 6
1.5 Generative grammar vs transformational grammar 8

2 The Maze of Mentalism 12

2.1 The problem of language acquisition 13
2.1.1 The logical problem of language acquisition vs the psychological problem of language acquisition 13
2.1.2 Plato's problem vs Orwell's problem 15
2.1.3 A genetic or innate component vs an experiential component in language acquisition 16
2.2 The nature of the linguistic experience or evidence 18
2.2.1 The poverty of the stimulus vs the degeneracy of the stimulus 19
2.2.2 The simplified data offered by mothers and caretakers to children vs the actual data-base for language acquisition 20
2.2.3 The data available to the child learning a language vs the data available to the linguist studying the language 21