

'Compelling'.

David Crystal, author of *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*, 3rd Edition.

# THE LANGUAGE MYTH

*Why language is not an instinct*



**Vyvyan Evans**

# The Language Myth

Why Language Is Not an Instinct

VYVYAN EVANS



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

**CAMBRIDGE**  
**UNIVERSITY PRESS**

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107043961](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107043961)

© Vyvyan Evans 2014

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2014

Reprinted 2015

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data*

Evans, Vyvyan.

The language myth : why language is not an instinct / Vyvyan Evans.

pages cm

ISBN 978-1-107-04396-1 (Hardback) – ISBN 978-1-107-61975-3 (Paperback)

1. Linguistic universals. 2. Cognitive grammar. 3. Innateness hypothesis (Linguistics) 4. Language and languages–Philosophy. 5. Psycholinguistics. I. Title.

P204.E88 2014

401–dc23 2014014932

ISBN 978-1-107-04396-1 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-107-61975-3 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

---

Every effort has been made in preparing this book to provide accurate and up-to-date information which is in accord with accepted standards and practice at the time of publication. Although case histories are drawn from actual cases, every effort has been made to disguise the identities of the individuals involved. Nevertheless, the authors, editors and publishers can make no warranties that the information contained herein is totally free from error, not least because clinical standards are constantly changing through research and regulation. The authors, editors and publishers therefore disclaim all liability for direct or consequential damages resulting from the use of material contained in this book. Readers are strongly advised to pay careful attention to information provided by the manufacturer of any drugs or equipment that they plan to use.

## The Language Myth

Language is central to our lives, the cultural tool that arguably sets us apart from other species. Some scientists have argued that language is innate, a type of unique human 'instinct' pre-programmed in us from birth. In this book, Vyvyan Evans argues that this received wisdom is, in fact, a myth.

Debunking the notion of a language 'instinct', Evans demonstrates that language is related to other animal forms of communication; that languages exhibit staggering diversity; that we learn our mother tongue drawing on general properties and abilities of the human mind, rather than an inborn 'universal' grammar; that language is not autonomous but is closely related to other aspects of our mental lives; and that, ultimately, language and the mind reflect and draw upon the way we interact with others in the world.

Compellingly written and drawing on cutting-edge research, *The Language Myth* sets out a forceful alternative to the received wisdom, showing how language and the mind really work.

**Vyvyan Evans** is Professor of Linguistics in the School of Linguistics and English Language at Bangor University.

For Andrea Tyler

The great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie, deliberate, contrived and dishonest, but the myth, persistent, persuasive and unrealistic.

*John F. Kennedy*

## Acknowledgements

I have wanted to write this book since I was a graduate student. But some things are better for the time it takes to grow, experience and learn. The specific impetus for this book was a challenge made to me by Stéphanie Pourcel, on Brighton pier, of all places. Her challenge, a number of years ago now, was to explain why the language-as-instinct thesis, the thesis associated with Noam Chomsky and his followers, is wrong. This book is my response to that challenge. I hope it does that job. More than that, I hope it fulfils the greater task of explaining how I think language works, how language relates to the mind, and what this reveals about what it means to be human.

A large number of colleagues have supported the research and the writing that has gone into this book. For logistical support, specific advice or simply responding to queries, I gratefully acknowledge Ben Bergen, Andy Clark, Ewa Dąbrowska, Adele Goldberg, George Lakoff, Ineke Mennen, Thora Tenbrink, Mike Tomasello, Mark Turner and Mike Wheeler. For detailed feedback on chapters, I am extremely indebted to Ben Ambridge, Mihailo Antović, Bastien Boutonnet, Vivien Mast, Svetoslava Antonova-Baumann and Alan Wallington. I am particularly indebted to Paul Ibbotson: Paul went *way* beyond the call of duty, and fearlessly read quite literally an entire draft of the book. His very extensive comments have shaped my presentation of various aspects of the book's content. I hope he approves of how I have responded to, and incorporated, his advice. I am also grateful for the immensely detailed and helpful advice provided by a number of anonymous reviewers for Cambridge University Press.

Finally, I gratefully acknowledge the support and care I have received from my editor at Cambridge University Press, Andrew Winnard. Andrew is a paragon of sound judgement and

efficiency, and has provided extremely helpful advice on many aspects of the book. I hope to have done justice to the support he has afforded me.

This book is dedicated to my former Ph.D. supervisor, colleague, co-author and dear friend, Andrea Tyler. For a number of years, Ande and I have been intellectual co-conspirators in the language-as-use thesis – the thesis I present in the pages that follow. I hope she approves of what I have done in my part of the conspiracy.



# Contents

## *Acknowledgements*      x

<b>1</b>	<b>Language and mind rethought</b>	<b>1</b>
	Taking stock of language	5
	Myths and realities	13
	A straw man?	19
	Lessons from evolution	22
<b>2</b>	<b>Is human language unrelated to animal communication systems?</b>	<b>27</b>
	From busy bees to startling starlings	29
	Communication in the wild	35
	Talking animals	39
	Design features for language	45
	But wherefore 'design features'?	47
	All in the mind of the beholder	57
	Of chimps and men	60
<b>3</b>	<b>Are there language universals?</b>	<b>64</b>
	Linguistic diversity: a whistle-stop tour	65
	Universal Grammar meets (linguistic) reality	67
	Lessons from linguistic typology	77
	So, how and why does language change?	79
	The myth of Proto-world	88
	Adieu, Universal Grammar	93
<b>4</b>	<b>Is language innate?</b>	<b>95</b>
	An instinct for language?	98
	Arguments for the language instinct	101

Lessons from neurobiology	106
Lessons from language learning	109
So how <i>do</i> children learn language?	118
Towards a theory of language learning	123
Learning what to say ... from what isn't said	126
But couldn't language emerge all at once?	128
It's all about language use!	131
 <b>5 Is language a distinct module in the mind?</b>	 133
On grammar genes and chatterboxes	135
The chatterbox fallacy	142
Alas, poor Darwin	148
So, what's the alternative to modularity?	156
What's all the fuss anyway?	159
 <b>6 Is there a universal Mentalese?</b>	 161
Mentalese and the computational mind	163
Wherefore meaning?	168
Fodor's retort	175
Intelligent bodies, embodied minds	178
Metaphors we live by	180
Embodiment effects in the brain	183
So, where does this leave us?	189
 <b>7 Is thought independent of language?</b>	 192
Who's afraid of the big bad Whorf?	195
The rise of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis	196
Born to colour the world?	198
The neo-Whorfian critique	204
Lessons from Rossel Island	206
Colour through the eyes of a child	212
Pinker's broadside	213
Greek Blues	215
All about sex	217

On time and space	221
What is linguistic relativity anyway?	226
<b>8 Language and mind regained</b>	<b>229</b>
Cultural intelligence and the ratchet effect	230
The human interaction engine	235
The rise of language	240
What does our mental grammar look like?	242
Universal scenes of experience	250
Why are there so many languages?	252
One final reflection . . .	256
<i>Notes</i>	259
<i>References</i>	274
<i>Index</i>	301

# 1 Language and mind rethought

This is a book about language, and about its relationship with thought and the mind. It is also a book about how we acquire language, and why different languages are so diverse in their sound systems, vocabularies and grammars. Language is central to our lives, and is arguably the cultural tool that sets humans, us, apart from any other species. And on some accounts, language is *the* symbolic behaviour that allowed human singularities – art, religion and science – to occur.<sup>1</sup> In her Nobel Prize acceptance speech, the celebrated African-American writer, Toni Morrison, put things this way: “We die. That may be the meaning of life. But we do language. That may be the measure of our lives.”<sup>2</sup> Language is clearly a big deal.

This book addresses a controversy that has raged in the behavioural and brain sciences since the middle of the last century: is language innate, something we are born with? Or does language emerge from use, based on more general mental skills and abilities? The dominant view, until recently, has been the former: we come into the world hard-wired with the rudiments of language. But this view now looks to be on increasingly shaky ground.

But what might it mean to claim that language is innate? Clearly our species, *Homo sapiens*, is biologically pre-prepared to acquire language in a way no other species is: we have evolved the articulatory capabilities to produce a complex set of distinct and discrete sound units – and these sound units vary from language to language; we have the musculature to control and facilitate the production of these sounds; we have the memory capabilities to produce and recall sequences of sounds in order to facilitate well-formed strings of sounds, making grammatically well-formed sentences; and we have complex statistical processing abilities allowing us both to perceive and to recognise sequences of

sounds. Crucially, we recognise fellow humans as being intentional agents, and, hence, are predisposed to interpret their sound sequences as meaningful. And, most significant of all, any given speech community has *agreed* a bewilderingly complex set of linguistic conventions – a language is nothing more than a set of linguistic conventions – allowing us to transmit and comprehend complex ideas: in English we agree that the sound units that make up the word *cat* represent the idea that is associated with the sound segments that in French are signalled orthographically as *chat*, or in Hindi as *billi*.

Conventional wisdom has maintained, over and above this physiological pre-preparedness for language, that we are born with a set of grammatical rules (universal knowledge structures), stored somewhere in our minds, that allow us to acquire grammar almost effortlessly. The idea is that the grammar that underlies all of the 7,000 or so of the world's languages is essentially the same. In short, our species has evolved a specialised grammar module, embedded in our brains, and genetically encoded. And this provides us with the ability to acquire language in the first place: our grammar faculty is in place at birth.

This idea is often referred to as Universal Grammar: all human languages, no matter the variety we happen to end up speaking, are essentially the same. Whether someone learns English, Japanese, Swahili, Tongan or whatever, when you get down to it, they are all alike. Sure, each of these languages has different vocabularies. And each language makes use of a different, although partially overlapping, set of sounds. But underneath it all, the essential ingredient of language – our grammar – is pre-programmed in the human genome: we are all born to produce language because of our common genetic heritage, our Universal Grammar. Just as all of us grow distinctively human organs – brains, livers, hearts and kidneys – so too we develop language: a consequence of our grammar organ, which grows in the human brain, and which no other species possesses. And it is this innately specified knowledge of grammar that underpins our ability to develop and acquire language – any language – in the first place.

This book, and the range of ideas I cover, are presented from the perspective of linguistics – the scientific study of language – my home discipline. While linguistics covers many more areas and sub-disciplines than are represented here, I've chosen the range of topics on show, in the chapters to follow, for a very specific reason. The majority of the evidence, viewed with objective eyes, now appears to show that language is not innate in the way just outlined.

In a nutshell, I aim to convince you of the following: language *doesn't* arise from innately programmed knowledge of human grammar, a so-called 'Universal Grammar'. I will argue that language reflects and builds upon general properties and abilities of the human mind – specifically our species-specific cultural intelligence; it reflects human pro-social inclinations for inter-subjective communication. I will seek to persuade you that when we acquire language in infancy, we do so by acquiring the language of our parents and caregivers, painstakingly, and by making many mistakes in the process. Language is not something that emerges automatically, and effortlessly. It arises primarily from the language input we are exposed to, from which we construct our mother tongue. Moreover, human infants, I will show, are not empty vessels that come empty-handed to the language learning process. We come ready-equipped with a battery of various general learning mechanisms that make us adept at acquiring our mother tongue(s).

But why should this discussion matter at all? Why should we care? The study of language, for perhaps obvious reasons, is central to a great many other disciplines; after all, if language is the hallmark of what it means to be human, if it is the measure of our lives, then this stands to reason. And because of the centrality of language to all else, it is crucial our understanding of it is accurate. It is also critical that we understand how language relates to other aspects of mental function and social life. And perhaps more than this: language is an index of our very humanity. What would Shakespeare be without his ability to invent, and re-invent the human psyche through language? Language is more

than the paradigm example of cultural behaviour, one that sets us apart from any other species on the planet. We all have a vested interest in it: it makes us who we are, and allows us to explore ourselves: our emotional highs and lows. We should all care about language, even when we take it for granted, for without it we are barely human.

And here is the *really* important part. While I, and a great many other professional linguists, now think the old view is wrong, nevertheless, the old view – Universal Grammar: the eponymous ‘language myth’ – still lingers; despite being *completely* wrong, it is alive and kicking. I have written this book to demonstrate exactly why the old view is a myth; and to show what the reality is. This book is thus a users’ manual for all language users, and for all thinking people. And, it is also, I hope, a reasonably accessible overview of the way language really works.

This book surveys discoveries from a broad array of disciplines; these include linguistics, psychology, philosophy, neurobiology, primatology, ethology and cognitive anthropology. And these discoveries – which have emerged since the mid-1980s – have thrown into relief long-held assumptions about the nature and structure of language, as well as the mind, and the way we acquire our native tongue(s). In this book, I present the emerging reality.



Linguistics is a relatively new discipline compared to others, especially compared to long-established subjects such as philosophy and rhetoric, or even more recent sciences such as astronomy and medicine. Its founding father is often taken to be the eminent Swiss linguist, Ferdinand de Saussure, whose *Course in General Linguistics* (2013) was published posthumously in 1916. The Zeitgeist for much of the second half of the twentieth century, however, was an extreme form of rationalism, which assumed that language is an instinct, something wholly unrelated to any other form of non-human communication. This language myth assumed that all human languages are governed by a single set of

universals buried in the recesses of the human mind, with which we are born.

The reasons for taking this sort of perspective were based on a number of assumptions about the nature of language, in most cases before actual detailed research had been carried out. But today, we now know a vast amount about the diversity exhibited by the languages of the world – although acknowledging that we still only know something about a fraction of the world's 7,000 or so languages. We also know a vast amount about how children acquire language, much more than we did when the *language-as-instinct thesis*, as I shall call the language myth, was formulated, originally in the 1950s and 1960s. Indeed, the preponderance of evidence now leads a great many linguists, myself included, to the incontrovertible conclusion that language reflects, in important ways, more general, and generalizable, properties of mind. And, importantly, we learn language from our parents and caregivers, through painstaking practice and use. This, for ease, I refer to as the *language-as-use thesis*. In contrast, the *language-as-instinct thesis*, I will seek to persuade you, is a myth; and, it is made up of a number of component sub-myths.

## Taking stock of language

Before moving on, let's get a preliminary sense of what language is for, and how it is organised. Language is integral to our lives. We use it to buy groceries in the supermarket, to get a job, to hire or fire an employee, to buy train tickets, and to compose an email. We use it to make a telephone call, to flirt, to invite someone out on a date, to propose marriage, to get married, to quarrel, and to make up afterwards. Language allows us to make friends, and enemies, to pass the time of day, and so on. In our everyday lives, we produce and comprehend language with such apparent ease that we take it for granted. Yet the ease with which we use language belies a level of complexity of immense proportions. You might not know a preposition from an adverb, or the



difference between the passive voice and the indicative, nor what the double object construction is. You might also be at a loss if I asked you how to conjugate the copula in English, or what perfective aspect is. Yet like around 400 million other native speakers of English around the world, you and I deploy the copula and successfully conjugate it countless times every day. In other words, our knowledge of language is implicit rather than explicit. While you might not be able to explain to a foreigner, should they ask, how to conjugate the copula without the aid of a book of English grammar, you can do it with your hands tied behind your back. Each of us carries around in our heads a 'mental grammar' far more impressive than any written grammar. In short, you or I don't have to know that the verb *be* is the copula to know how to use it.

Another sobering fact about spoken – and indeed signed – language is this: unlike other forms of cultural behaviour, it is blind to demographics, socioeconomics and ethnic difference.<sup>3</sup> I, you and every other cognitively normal human being in the world uses (or comes to use) language with the apparent ease that we take for granted. Put another way, it doesn't matter whether you are rich or poor, black or white or what the colour of your eyes are. You are destined to acquire at least one language – although the majority of the world's nearly 7 billion people grow up speaking two or more languages. In this, the pattern of monolingualism amongst English-speaking populations is not the norm. And, by around 4 years of age, each normally developing human child is a linguistic genius. Nevertheless, we carry on 'learning' our mother tongue, throughout our lives. This is the case not least because the language we speak changes and evolves, often in quite short periods of time.

In virtually all of the situations in which we find ourselves in our daily lives, language allows quick and effective expression, and provides a well-developed means of encoding and transmitting complex and subtle ideas. Language does this by fulfilling two key functions, functions that underpin linguistic communication.

The first is that language enables us to express our wishes, feelings, likes, dislikes and ideas. This language achieves by encoding