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## What constitutes a language?

- Chambers \& Trudgill (1998) ask instead: what's a dialect? We...accept the notion that all speakers are speakers of at least one dialect - that standard English, for example, is just as much a dialect as any other form of English - and that it does not make any kind of sense to suppose that any one dialect is in any way linguistically superior to any other.
- Candidate for definition: a language is a collection of mutually intelligible dialects
- But, there are two potential problems:
- Mutually intelligible "dialects" may be conventionally viewed as different "languages" (e.g., Norwegian, Swedish, Danish)
- Intelligibility is not a categorical property, and mutual intelligibility is not necessarily a transitive or even symmetric relationship


## European dialect continua



Max Weinreich (1894-1969):
Map I-I. European dialect continua
(Chambers \& Trudgill, 1998)
"A language is a dialect with an army and navy"

## Investigating intelligibility \& dialect "distance"

- Example (Gooskens et al., 2018): do a cloze test in

European languages with speakers of different languages

## Investigating intelligibility \& dialect "distance"

Table 2. Intelligibility scores (\% correct) on cloze tests in the Germanic language area.

|  | Speaker |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Listener | DA | DU | EN | GE | SW | Mean |
| DA |  | 13.3 | $\mathbf{9 2 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 . 8}$ | 56.7 | 52.5 |
|  |  | $(13.3)$ |  |  | $(43.8)$ | $(34.7)$ |
| DU | 10.5 |  | $\mathbf{9 4 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 0}$ | 10.4 | 47.5 |
|  | $(9.9)$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 3}$ |  |  | $(10.4)$ | $(10.2)$ |
| EN | $\mathbf{7 . 9}$ | $(9.9)$ |  | $\mathbf{2 7 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 3}$ | 13.6 |
|  | $\mathbf{1 6 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 . 7}$ | $(9.5)$ | $(8.7)$ | $(8.9)$ |
| GE | $(12.5)$ | $(25.5)$ |  |  | $\mathbf{1 0 . 0}$ | 35.9 |
|  | 62.5 | 13.0 | $\mathbf{8 9 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 . 0}$ | $(10.0)$ | $(16.0)$ |
| SW | $(56.0)$ | $(13.0)$ |  | $(13.1)$ |  | 50.5 |
|  | 24.4 | 16.9 | 90.4 | 46.9 | 21.4 | $(29.2)$ |
| Mean | $(23.0)$ | $(15.4)$ |  | $(11.3)$ | $(21.3)$ | 40.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes: In parentheses, the results for listeners with minimal exposure. Scores indicated in bold are significantly different (asymmetrical) within a language pair at the .01 level (Bonferroni's test, see Appendix 2).


Figure 4. Germanic language tree.

## Investigating intelligibility \& dialect "distance"

Table 3. Results of cloze tests in the Romance language area.

|  | Speaker |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Listener | FR | IT | PT | RO | SP | Total |
| FR |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{2 4 . 2} \\ (22.9) \end{gathered}$ | 23.5 | 11.0 | 31.5 | $\begin{gathered} 22.6 \\ (22.9) \end{gathered}$ |
| IT | $\begin{gathered} 46.3 \\ (18.6) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 33.5 \\ (23.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.6 \\ & (8.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65.7 \\ (56.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36.6 \\ (29.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| PT | 34.3 | $\begin{gathered} 49.4 \\ (44.1) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 14.7 \\ (14.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77.4 \\ (62.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47.2 \\ & (40.3) \end{aligned}$ |
| RO | 47.1 | $\begin{gathered} 57.7 \\ (47.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.9 \\ (20.7) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 54.0 \\ (46.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44.9 \\ (38.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| SP | 28.2 | $\begin{gathered} 45.7 \\ (38.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37.2 \\ (35.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.6 \\ (13.7) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 32.2 \\ (29.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | $\begin{gathered} 39.0 \\ (18.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44.3 \\ (38.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29.3 \\ (26.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.5 \\ (12.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57.2 \\ (54.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36.7 \\ (32.0) \end{gathered}$ |

Notes: For further explanation, see Table 2. For Bonferroni's tests of significance, see Appendix 3.


Figure 5. Romance language tree.
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## Investigating intelligibility \& dialect "distance"

Table 4. Results of cloze tests in the Slavic language area.

|  | Speaker |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Listener | BU | CR | CZ | PO | SK | SL | Total |
| BU |  | 29.1 | 10.6 | 7.1 | 16.0 | 20.6 | 16.7 |
|  |  | $(29.2)$ | $(10.8)$ | $(7.1)$ | $(16.0)$ | $(20.2)$ | $(16.7)$ |
| CR | 19.7 |  | 18.1 | 9.5 | 23.0 | 43.7 | 22.8 |
|  | $(19.7)$ |  | $(18.1)$ | $(9.5)$ | $(23.0)$ | $(41.3)$ | $(22.3)$ |
| CZ | 13.4 | 19.4 |  | 35.4 | 92.7 | 15.7 | 35.3 |
|  | $(13.4)$ | $(19.9)$ |  | $(34.3)$ | $(87.5)$ | $(16.7)$ | $(34.4)$ |
| PO | 13.7 | 14.4 | 26.6 |  | 40.7 | 13.4 | 21.8 |
|  | $(13.7)$ | $(14.6)$ | $(24.0)$ |  | $(40.6)$ | $(13.4)$ | $(21.3)$ |
| SK | 10.1 | 25.9 | 95.0 | 50.7 |  | 15.1 | 39.4 |
|  | $(10.1)$ | $(24.5)$ |  | $(48.7)$ |  | $(16.0)$ | $(24.8)$ |
|  | 18.0 | $\mathbf{7 9 . 4}$ | 18.0 | 12.8 | 18.8 |  | 29.4 |
|  | $(18.6)$ | $\mathbf{( 7 1 . 8 )}$ | $(18.1)$ | $(12.6)$ | $(18.8)$ |  | $(28.0)$ |
|  | 15.0 | 33.6 | 33.7 | 23.1 | 38.2 | 21.7 | 27.6 |
|  | Total | $(15.1)$ | $(32.0)$ | $(17.8)$ | $(22.4)$ | $(37.2)$ | $(21.5)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes: For further explanation, see Table 2. For Bonferroni's tests of significance, see Appendix 4.

(Gooskens et al., 2018)

## Documenting the world's languages

- Some of the key resources in language documentation:
- Dictionaries
- Grammars (descriptions of a language's grammar, written by someone with linguistics training)
- Corpora (collections of naturalistically produced language)
- Organizing the documentation of the world's languages is a massive data management challenge
- One well-known, long-standing project: Ethnologue
- But: not an open resource!
- Key ongoing open effort: Cross-Linguistic Linked Data project, including:
- Glottolog (an open Ethnologue replacement)
- Grambank (open inventory of linguistic features)
- and many more!


## Some raw facts

- Ethnologue and Glottolog document over 7,000 languages across the world!
- But 50-90\% of the languages in the world are estimated to be likely to disappear by the end of this century.
- The vast majority of languages are spoken by a very small population
- Many of these languages do not necessarily have a written form


## How do we identify language relationships?

- We'll cover this now with an in-class handout.
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## Structured variation in the world's languages

- Languages vary dramatically across the world in structure

| English: | Japanese: |
| :--- | :---: |
| I bought the bed | beddo -o ka-tta |
|  | (pro) bed -ACC buy-PAST |

Oneida (Baker, 1996):
Wa' -ke -nakt -a -hnínu -'
FACT-1sS -bed - $\emptyset$-buy -PUNC

- Yet there are strong (universal?) generalizations

Grammatical categories: Heads \& hierarchy:


## Structured variation in the world's languages

- Languages vary dramatically across the world in structure

\author{

English: <br> I bought the bed <br> Japanese: <br> | beddo -o |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| (pro) bed | -ACC buy-PAST |

}

Oneida (Baker, 1996):
Wa' -ke -nakt -a -hnínu -'
FACT -1sS -bed - $\emptyset$-buy -PUNC

- Yet there are strong (universal?) generalizations
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## Structured variation in the world's languages

- Languages vary dramatically across the world in structure

English:<br>I bought the bed<br>Japanese:<br>beddo -o ka-tta<br>(pro) bed -ACC buy-PAST
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Idiosyncrasy:
【kick the bucket】
$\neq$
$\llbracket k i c k \rrbracket(\iota(\lambda x . \llbracket b u c k e t \rrbracket(x)))$

- GOAL: develop theories of language understanding, production, and acquisition that can account for


## Linguistic diversity across the world

- There are 6000-7000 languages in the world
- The 100 languages with the most native speakers comprise only $85 \%$ of the world's population

Mandarin; 14.4\% of the world's native speakers
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## A bit about language typology

- Languages are systematic in different ways
- Those differences are called features
- For example, Japanese and English vary in many features that these sentences exemplify...what are they?

| English: | Japanese: |
| :--- | :--- |
| I beddo -o ka-tta |  |

- Large databases based on grammars of the world's languages have collated these features, and there turn out to be many interesting correlations.
- One influential resource: the World Atlas of Language Structures (WALS; wals.info)


[^0]:    Idiosyncrasy:
    【kick the bucket】

    $$
    \begin{gathered}
    \neq \\
    \llbracket \text { kick } \rrbracket(\iota(\lambda x . \llbracket b u c k e t \rrbracket(x)))
    \end{gathered}
    $$

