



**HAL**  
open science

# Chomsky on the Evolution of the Language Faculty: Presentation and Perspectives for Further Research

Anne C. Reboul

► **To cite this version:**

Anne C. Reboul. Chomsky on the Evolution of the Language Faculty: Presentation and Perspectives for Further Research. A companion to Chomsky, pp.474-485, 2021. hal-03336983

**HAL Id: hal-03336983**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03336983>**

Submitted on 10 Sep 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



# A Companion to Chomsky

REVISED PROOFS



## Blackwell Companions to Philosophy

This outstanding student reference series offers a comprehensive and authoritative survey of philosophy as a whole. Written by today's leading philosophers, each volume provides lucid and engaging coverage of the key figures, terms, topics, and problems of the field. Taken together, the volumes provide the ideal basis for course use, representing an unparalleled work of reference for students and specialists alike.

1. The Blackwell Companion to Philosophy, Second Edition  
*Edited by Nicholas Bunnin and Eric Tsui-James*
2. A Companion to Ethics  
*Edited by Peter Singer*
3. A Companion to Aesthetics, Second Edition  
*Edited by Stephen Davies, Kathleen Marie Higgins, Robert Hopkins, Robert Stecker, and David E. Cooper*
4. A Companion to Epistemology, Second Edition  
*Edited by Jonathan Dancy, Ernest Sosa, and Matthias Steup*
5. A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy (two-volume set), Second Edition  
*Edited by Robert E. Goodin and Philip Pettit*
6. A Companion to Philosophy of Mind  
*Edited by Samuel Guttenplan*
7. A Companion to Metaphysics, Second Edition  
*Edited by Jaegwon Kim, Ernest Sosa, and Gary S. Rosenkrantz*
8. A Companion to Philosophy of Law and Legal Theory, Second Edition  
*Edited by Dennis Patterson*
9. A Companion to Philosophy of Religion, Second Edition  
*Edited by Charles Taliaferro, Paul Draper, and Philip L. Quinn*
10. A Companion to the Philosophy of Language, Second Edition (two-volume set)  
*Edited by Bob Hale and Crispin Wright*
11. A Companion to World Philosophies  
*Edited by Eliot Deutsch and Ron Bontekoe*
12. A Companion to Continental Philosophy  
*Edited by Simon Critchley and William Schroeder*
13. A Companion to Feminist Philosophy  
*Edited by Alison M. Jaggar and Iris Marion Young*
14. A Companion to Cognitive Science  
*Edited by William Bechtel and George Graham*
15. A Companion to Bioethics, Second Edition  
*Edited by Helga Kuhse and Peter Singer*
16. A Companion to the Philosophers  
*Edited by Robert L. Arrington*
17. A Companion to Business Ethics  
*Edited by Robert E. Frederick*
18. A Companion to the Philosophy of Science  
*Edited by W. H. Newton-Smith*
19. A Companion to Environmental Philosophy  
*Edited by Dale Jamieson*
20. A Companion to Analytic Philosophy  
*Edited by A. P. Martinich and David Sosa*
21. A Companion to Genetics  
*Edited by Justine Burley and John Harris*
22. A Companion to Philosophical Logic  
*Edited by Dale Jacquette*
23. A Companion to Early Modern Philosophy  
*Edited by Steven Nadler*
24. A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages  
*Edited by Jorge J. E. Gracia and Timothy B. Noone*
25. A Companion to African-American Philosophy  
*Edited by Tommy L. Lott and John P. Pittman*
26. A Companion to Applied Ethics  
*Edited by R. G. Frey and Christopher Heath Wellman*
27. A Companion to the Philosophy of Education  
*Edited by Randall Curren*
28. A Companion to African Philosophy  
*Edited by Kwasi Wiredu*
29. A Companion to Heidegger  
*Edited by Hubert L. Dreyfus and Mark A. Wrathall*
30. A Companion to Rationalism  
*Edited by Alan Nelson*
31. A Companion to Pragmatism  
*Edited by John R. Shook and Joseph Margolis*
32. A Companion to Ancient Philosophy  
*Edited by Mary Louise Gill and Pierre Pellegrin*
33. A Companion to Nietzsche  
*Edited by Keith Ansell Pearson*
34. A Companion to Socrates  
*Edited by Sara Ahbel-Rappe and Rachana Kamtekar*
35. A Companion to Phenomenology and Existentialism  
*Edited by Hubert L. Dreyfus and Mark A. Wrathall*
36. A Companion to Kant  
*Edited by Graham Bird*
37. A Companion to Plato  
*Edited by Hugh H. Benson*
38. A Companion to Descartes  
*Edited by Janet Broughton and John Carriero*
39. A Companion to the Philosophy of Biology  
*Edited by Sahotra Sarkar and Anya Plutynski*
40. A Companion to Hume  
*Edited by Elizabeth S. Radcliffe*
41. A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography  
*Edited by Aviezer Tucker*
42. A Companion to Aristotle  
*Edited by Georgios Anagnostopoulos*
43. A Companion to the Philosophy of Technology  
*Edited by Jan-Kyrre Berg Olsen, Stig Andur Pedersen, and Vincent F. Hendricks*
44. A Companion to Latin American Philosophy  
*Edited by Susana Nuccetelli, Ofelia Schutte, and Otávio Bueno*
45. A Companion to the Philosophy of Literature  
*Edited by Garry L. Hagberg and Walter Jost*
46. A Companion to the Philosophy of Action  
*Edited by Timothy O'Connor and Constantine Sandis*
47. A Companion to Relativism  
*Edited by Steven D. Hales*
48. A Companion to Hegel  
*Edited by Stephen Houlgate and Michael Baur*
49. A Companion to Schopenhauer  
*Edited by Bart Vandenabeele*
50. A Companion to Buddhist Philosophy  
*Edited by Steven M. Emmanuel*
51. A Companion to Foucault  
*Edited by Christopher Falzon, Timothy O'Leary, and Jana Sawicki*

52. A Companion to the Philosophy of Time  
*Edited by Heather Dyke and Adrian Bardon*
53. A Companion to Donald Davidson  
*Edited by Ernest Lepore and Kirk Ludwig*
54. A Companion to Rawls  
*Edited by Jon Mandle and David Reidy*
55. A Companion to W.V.O Quine  
*Edited by Gilbert Harman and Ernest Lepore*
56. A Companion to Derrida  
*Edited by Zeynep Direk and Leonard Lawlor*
57. A Companion to David Lewis  
*Edited by Barry Loewer and Jonathan Schaffer*
58. A Companion to Kierkegaard  
*Edited by Jon Stewart*
59. A Companion to Locke  
*Edited by Matthew Stuart*
60. The Blackwell Companion to Hermeneutics  
*Edited by Niall Keane and Chris Lawn*
61. A Companion to Ayn Rand  
*Edited by Allan Gotthelf and Gregory Salmieri*
62. The Blackwell Companion to Naturalism  
*Edited by Kelly James Clark*
63. A Companion to Mill  
*Edited by Christopher Macleod and Dale E. Miller*
64. A Companion to Experimental Philosophy  
*Edited by Justin Sytsma and Wesley Buckwalter*
65. A Companion to Applied Philosophy  
*Edited by Kasper Lippert-Rasmussen, Kimberley Brownlee, and David Coady*
66. A Companion to Wittgenstein  
*Edited by Hans-Johann Glock and John Hyman*
67. A Companion to Simone de Beauvoir  
*Edited by Laura Hengehold and Nancy Bauer*
68. A Concise Companion to Confucius  
*Edited by Paul R. Goldin*
69. The Blackwell Companion to Substance Dualism  
*Edited by Jonathan J. Loose, Angus J. L. Menzies, and J. P. Moreland*
70. A Companion to Nineteenth-Century Philosophy  
*Edited by John Shand*
71. A Companion to Atheism and Philosophy  
*Edited by Graham Oppy*
72. A Companion to Adorno  
*Edited by Peter E. Gordon, Espen Hammer, and Max Pensky*
73. A Companion to Rorty  
*Edited by Alan Malachowski*
74. A Companion to Chomsky  
*Edited by Nicholas Allott, Terje Lohndal, and Georges Rey*
75. A Companion to Spinoza  
*Edited by Yitzhak Melamed*



REVISED PROOFS





# A Companion to Chomsky

*Edited by*  
Nicholas Allott  
Terje Lohndal  
Georges Rey

**WILEY** Blackwell



This edition first published 2021  
© 2021 John Wiley & Sons, Inc

All rights reserved. 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, except as permitted by law. Advice on how to obtain permission to reuse material from this title is available at <http://www.wiley.com/go/permissions>.

The right of Nicholas Allott, Terje Lohndal, and Georges Rey to be identified as the authors of the editorial material in this work has been asserted in accordance with law.

*Registered Office*

John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA

*Editorial Office*

111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA

For details of our global editorial offices, customer services, and more information about Wiley products visit us at [www.wiley.com](http://www.wiley.com).

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats and by print-on-demand. Some content that appears in standard print versions of this book may not be available in other formats.

*Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty*

While the publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this work, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this work and specifically disclaim all warranties, including without limitation any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives, written sales materials or promotional statements for this work. The fact that an organization, website, or product is referred to in this work as a citation and/or potential source of further information does not mean that the publisher and authors endorse the information or services the organization, website, or product may provide or recommendations it may make. This work is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a specialist where appropriate. Further, readers should be aware that websites listed in this work may have changed or disappeared between when this work was written and when it is read. Neither the publisher nor authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Names: Allott, Nicholas, editor. | Lohndal, Terje, editor. | Rey, Georges, 1945- editor.

Title: A companion to Chomsky / edited by Nicholas Allott, Terje Lohndal, & Georges Rey.

Description: Hoboken, NJ : Wiley Blackwell, 2021. | Series: Blackwell companions to philosophy | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2020043389 (print) | LCCN 2020043390 (ebook) | ISBN 9781119598701 (hardback) | ISBN 9781119598725 (adobe pdf) | ISBN 9781119598688 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Chomsky, Noam—Criticism and interpretation.

Classification: LCC P85.C47 C656 2021 (print) | LCC P85.C47 (ebook) | DDC 410.92—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020043389>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020043390>

Cover Design: Wiley

Cover Image: © Leo Canabarro

Set in 10/12pt PhotinaMTStd by SPi Global, Chennai, India

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

# Contents

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <i>Notes on Contributors</i>   | xi         |
| 1 Synoptic Introduction<br><i>Nicholas Allott, Terje Lohndal, and Georges Rey</i>  | 1          |
| 2 Biographical Sketch<br><i>Nicholas Allott, Terje Lohndal, and Georges Rey</i>  | 18         |
| <b>Part I Historical Development of Linguistics</b>  | <b>23</b>  |
| 3 From the Origins of Government and Binding to the Current State of Minimalism<br><i>Artemis Alexiadou and Terje Lohndal</i>                          | 25         |
| 4 The Enduring Discoveries of Generative Syntax<br><i>Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and James Griffiths</i>  | 52         |
| 5 The Chomsky Hierarchy<br><i>Tim Hunter</i>   | 74         |
| 6 Naturalism, Internalism, and Nativism: <What> The Legacy of <i>The Sound Pattern of English</i> <Should Be><br><i>Charles Reiss and Venó Volenec</i> | 96         |
| 7 Language as a Branch of Psychology: Chomsky and Cognitive Science<br><i>Lila Gleitman</i>  | 109        |
| <b>Part II Contemporary Issues in Syntax</b>   | <b>123</b> |
| 8 The Architecture of the Computation<br><i>David Adger</i>  | 125        |
| 9 Merge and Features: The Engine of Syntax<br><i>Peter Svenonius</i>   | 140        |
| 10 On Chomsky's Legacy in the Study of Linguistic Diversity<br><i>Mark Baker</i>   | 158        |
| 11 Parameters and Linguistic Variation<br><i>Michelle Sheehan</i>  | 172        |

## CONTENTS

|   |  |            |
|---|--|------------|
| 12  | Constraints on Grammatical Dependencies<br><i>Gereon Müller</i>  | 190        |
| 13  | Chomsky's Influence on Historical Linguistics: From Universal Grammar<br>to Third Factors<br><i>Elly van Gelderen</i>                            | 210        |
| 14  | Second Language Acquisition<br><i>Roumyana Slabakova</i>   | 222        |
| 15  | Multilingualism and Chomsky's Generative Grammar<br><i>Tanja Kupisch, Sergio Miguel Pereira Soares, Eloi Puig-Mayenco,<br/>and Jason Rothman</i> | 232        |
| <b>Part III Comparisons with Other Frameworks</b>               |  | <b>243</b> |
| 16  | The View from Declarative Syntax<br><i>Peter Sells</i>   | 245        |
| 17  | How Statistical Learning Can Play Well with Universal Grammar<br><i>Lisa S. Pearl</i>  | 267        |
| 18  | Chomsky and Usage-Based Linguistics<br><i>Frederick J. Newmeyer</i>  | 287        |
| <b>Part IV Processing and Acquisition</b>                       |  | <b>305</b> |
| 19  | Sentence Processing and Syntactic Theory<br><i>Dave Kush and Brian Dillon</i>  | 307        |
| 20  | Neuroscience and Syntax<br><i>Emiliano Zaccarella and Patrick C. Trettenbrein</i>  | 325        |
| 21  | Universal Grammar and Language Acquisition<br><i>Stephen Crain and Rosalind Thornton</i>   | 348        |
| 22  | Chomsky and Signed Languages<br><i>Diane Lillo-Martin</i>  | 364        |
| 23  | Atypical Acquisition<br><i>Neil Smith and Ianthi Tsimpli</i>   | 377        |
| <b>Part V Semantics, Pragmatics, and Philosophy of Language</b> |  | <b>391</b> |
| 24  | Chomsky and the Analytical Tradition<br><i>John Collins</i>  | 393        |
| 25  | Chomsky on Meaning and Reference<br><i>Paul Pietroski</i>  | 404        |
| 26  | Chomsky on Semantics<br><i>Michael Glanzberg</i>   | 416        |



## CONTENTS

|   |   |            |
|---|---|------------|
| 27  | Chomsky and Pragmatics<br><i>Nicholas Allott and Deirdre Wilson</i>   | 433        |
| <b>Part VI Cognitive Science and Philosophy of Mind</b>     |   | <b>449</b> |
| 28  | Nativism<br><i>Georges Rey</i>  | 451        |
| 29  | The Deep Forces That Shape Language and the Poverty of the Stimulus<br><i>Stephen Crain, Iain Giblin, and Rosalind Thornton</i> | 460        |
| 30  | Chomsky on the Evolution of the Language Faculty: Presentation and Perspectives for Further Research<br><i>Anne Reboul</i>      | 474        |
| 31  | Chomsky and Intentionality<br><i>John Collins and Georges Rey</i>   | 486        |
| 32  | The Mind–Body Relation: Problem, Mystery, or What?<br><i>Joseph Levine</i>  | 501        |
| <b>Part VII Methodological and Other Explanatory Issues</b> |   | <b>513</b> |
| 33  | Chomsky’s “Galilean” Explanatory Style<br><i>Nicholas Allott, Terje Lohndal, and Georges Rey</i>                                | 515        |
| 34  | Chomsky and Fodor on Modularity<br><i>Nicholas Allott and Neil Smith</i>  | 527        |
| 35  | Linguistic Judgments as Evidence<br><i>Steven Gross</i>   | 542        |
| 36  | Chomsky’s Problem/Mystery Distinction<br><i>John Collins</i>  | 555        |
| 37  | Knowledge, Morality, and Hope: The Social Thought of Noam Chomsky<br><i>Joshua Cohen and Joel Rogers</i>                        | 565        |
| <b>Part VIII Reflections</b>                                |   | <b>579</b> |
| 38  | Reflections<br><i>Noam Chomsky</i>  | 581        |
|   | Index   | 592        |



REVISED PROOFS





## Notes on Contributors

**David Adger** is Professor of Linguistics at Queen Mary University of London. He is the author of a number of monographs and articles on syntactic theory and its connections with other aspects of language. He was coeditor of the journal *Syntax* for seven years, and is coeditor of *Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*, which he founded in 2001. He was President of the Linguistics Association of Great Britain from 2015 to 2020. His latest book is *Language Unlimited: The Science Behind Our Most Creative Power* (OUP).

**Artemis Alexiadou** is a Professor of English Linguistics at the Humboldt University in Berlin and Vice-Director of the Leibniz-Centre General Linguistics (ZAS). She has published on the syntax of noun phrases and nominalization, transitivity alternations, word order variation, Case and the EPP, and language mixing.

**Nicholas Allott** is a Senior Lecturer in English language at the University of Oslo. He works on pragmatics; inference and rationality in communication; word meaning and lexical modulation; legal language and interpretation; and the philosophy of linguistics, particularly cognitively realistic approaches such as generative grammar and relevance theory. His publications include *Chomsky: Ideas and Ideals* (3rd ed. 2016) and *The Responsibility of Intellectuals: Reflections by Noam Chomsky and others after 50 years* (2019).

**Mark Baker** is a Distinguished Professor of Linguistics and Cognitive Science at Rutgers University, having received his PhD in Linguistics in 1985 from MIT. He specializes in the syntax and morphology of less-studied languages, particularly those of the Americas, Africa, and Asia, seeking to bring together generative-style theories, data collected from fieldwork, and typological comparison in a way that illuminates all three. He has written five research monographs and one book for a popular audience, *The Atoms of Language* (2001).

**Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng** is a Professor of Linguistics at Leiden University. Her primary research interests are comparative syntax, and the interfaces (syntax and semantics, and syntax and phonology). Recent publications include “Wh-question or wh-declarative? Prosody makes the difference” (with Yang and Gryllia) in *Speech Communication*; and “(In)direct reference in the phonology-syntax interface under phase theory” (with Bonet, Downing, and Mascaró) in *Linguistic Inquiry*.

**Joshua Cohen** is on the Faculty at Apple University; Distinguished Senior Fellow in Law, Philosophy, and Political Science at University of California, Berkeley; and co-editor of *Boston Review*. He is co-author, with Joel Rogers, of *On Democracy* (1983) and *Associations and Democracy* (1995), and author of *Philosophy, Politics, Democracy* (2009); *The Arc*

## NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

*of the Moral Universe* (2010); and *Rousseau: A Free Community of Equals* (2011). He is also co-editor of the *Norton Introduction to Philosophy* (second edition, 2018).

**John Collins** is a Professor of Philosophy at the University of East Anglia. He mainly researches in the philosophy of language and the foundations of generative linguistics. He is the author of three monographs: *Chomsky: A Guide for the Perplexed* (2008), *The Unity of Linguistic Meaning* (2011), and *Linguistic Pragmatism and Weather Reporting* (2020).

**Stephen Crain** is a Distinguished Professor of Linguistics at Macquarie University, Australia. His framework for research is the biolinguistic approach to language, and he investigates the relationship between logic and child language from a crosslinguistic perspective.

**Brian Dillon** is an Associate Professor in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. He is a psycholinguist whose primary research interest is in real-time sentence processing. His research seeks to better understand how comprehenders use syntactic information during language comprehension, using both cross-linguistic experimental investigation and computational modeling.

**Elly van Gelderen** is a Syntactician interested in language change. She teaches at Arizona State University. Her work shows how regular syntactic change (grammaticalization and the linguistic cycle) provides insight in the Faculty of Language. Publications include *The Linguistic Cycle: Language Change and the Language* (2011), *Clause Structure* (2013), *Syntax* (2017), and *The Diachrony of Meaning* (2018).

**Iain Giblin** is a Scholarly Teaching Fellow at Macquarie University, Sydney. His main research interest is child language acquisition with a focus on syntax and semantics.

**Michael Glanzberg** is a Professor of Philosophy at Rutgers University. He works on a number of topics in philosophy of language, logic, and the foundations of linguistic theory. He is a co-author of *Formal Theories of Truth* and the editor of *The Oxford Handbook of Truth*.

**James Griffiths** holds the position of Junior Professor of English Linguistics at the University of Tübingen. Specializing in syntax and how it interacts with pragmatics, morphology, and phonology, his main research interest to date has been the distribution of parenthesis and ellipsis within and across languages. His longer articles on this topic have been published in the highly regarded journals *Linguistic Inquiry*, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, and *Syntax*.

**Tim Hunter** is an Associate Professor in the Department of Linguistics at the University of California, Los Angeles. Much of his research focus on syntax and its interfaces with experimental psycholinguistics and with semantics, from a computational perspective.

**Lila Gleitman** taught at the University of Pennsylvania from 1972 until 2001, and where she is currently Professor Emerita in the Department of Psychology. From 2000–2010 she was a visiting faculty at the Cognitive Science Institute (RUCS) at Rutgers University. She is the (co-)author of innumerable books and articles on language acquisition. In 2017 she was a recipient of the David E. Rumelhart Prize for Contributions to the Theoretical Foundations of Human Cognition. She is also a member of the National Academy of Sciences.

## NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

**Steven Gross** is a Professor of Philosophy at Johns Hopkins University, with secondary appointments in Cognitive Science and in Psychological and Brain Sciences. He has published on a variety of topics in philosophy of language, philosophy of mind, and the foundations of the mind-brain sciences. His most recent publications have focused on perceptual consciousness and on cognitive penetration. Current projects include “anti-Bayesian” updating in vision and whether linguistic meaning is perceived or computed post-perceptually.

**Tanja Kupisch** is a Professor of Linguistics at the University of Konstanz and Adjunct Professor at UiT, The Arctic University of Norway. Her research is primarily concerned with early bilingualism during childhood and adulthood, and especially the development of migrant and indigenous languages. Research domains include phonology and syntax. Current projects include ethnic policies and the acquisition of rhetorical questions.

**Dave Kush** teaches at NTNU, Norwegian University of Science and Technology. His research interests sit at the intersection of psycholinguistics and syntactic theory.

**Joseph Levine** is a Professor of Philosophy at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Prof. Levine specializes in philosophy of mind, particularly the problem of consciousness. He has published one monograph, *Purple Haze: The Puzzle of Consciousness*, one edited collection, *Quality and Content: Essays on Consciousness, Representation, and Modality*, and many articles, including ‘Materialism and Qualia: The Explanatory Gap.’

**Diane Lillo-Martin** is a Board of Trustees Distinguished Professor of linguistics at the University of Connecticut, and a Senior Research Scientist at Haskins Laboratories. Her research interests include the acquisition of American Sign Language by deaf and hearing children in monolingual and bimodal bilingual contexts, and how analyses of the grammatical structure of ASL contribute to understanding linguistic universals.

**Terje Lohndal** is a Professor of English Linguistics at NTNU, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, and Adjunct Professor at UiT, The Arctic University of Norway. His main areas of research are comparative grammar, including research on multilingualism, and the history of generative linguistics.

**Eloi Puig-Mayenco** holds a Lecturer Position at King’s College London. His research focuses on bi-/multilingualism during the lifespan. Specifically, he is interested in how previously acquired languages affect the initial stages and subsequent development of additive sequential multilingualism in childhood and adulthood.

**Gereon Mueller** is a Professor of General Linguistics at Universität Leipzig. His main research interest is grammatical theory, with a special focus on syntax and morphology. An underlying assumption that guides his research is that both these systems are organized derivationally, with Chomsky’s Strict Cycle Condition at the core.

**Frederick J. Newmeyer** is Professor Emeritus at the University of Washington and Adjunct Professor at the University of British Columbia and Simon Fraser University. He is the author or editor of 12 books, including *Linguistic Theory in America*, *Language Form and Language Function*, and *Possible and Probable Languages*. In 2002, Newmeyer was President of the Linguistic Society of America.

**Lisa Pearl** is a Professor of Language Science at the University of California, Irvine. Her primary interests are in language acquisition and quantitative approaches to

## NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

language science, including computational developmental modeling. She has authored 47 scholarly publications on these topics and maintains a YouTube channel with videos discussing related research ideas and educational content.

**Paul M. Pietroski** is a Distinguished Professor of Philosophy and a Member of the Center for Cognitive Science at Rutgers University. He is also Professor Emeritus in Linguistics and Philosophy at the University of Maryland. His most recent book is *Conjoining Meanings: Semantics without Truth Values*.

**Anne Reboul** is a Senior Researcher at the National Center for Research Science (CNRS) in France at the Laboratory of Cognitive Psychology, Marseille. She is mainly interested in philosophy of language and pragmatics with a strong interest in language evolution. Her last book, *Cognition and Communication in the Evolution of Language*, was published by Oxford University Press in 2017.

**Charles Reiss** is a Phonologist at Concordia University, Montreal, and a Founding Member of the Concordia Center for Cognitive Science. His publications include *Phonology: A Formal Introduction* (with semanticist Alan Bale); *I-language: An Introduction to Linguistics as Cognitive Science* (with syntactician Dana Isac); and *The Phonological Enterprise* (with historical linguist Mark Hale).

**Georges Rey** is a Professor of Philosophy at the University of Maryland at College Park. He has written some sixty articles and a book, *Contemporary Philosophy of Mind: a Contentiously Classical Approach*, on the foundations of cognitive science, and has just completed a new book for Oxford University Press, *Representation of Language: Philosophical Issues in a Chomskyan Linguistics*.

**Joel Rogers** is the Chomsky Professor of Law, Political Science, Public Affairs and Sociology, at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. He also directs COWS, a national strategy center on “high-road” development. This uses better democratic organization to reconcile, even in competitive markets interests in fairness, sustainability, and public accountability by increasing the multifactor productivity of places and sharing its benefit. A widely published academic, he is also a long-time social activist.

**Jason Rothman** is Professor of Linguistics at UiT, the Arctic University of Norway and Adjunct Professor of Psycholinguistics at Universidad Nebrija (Madrid). At UiT, he directs the Psycholinguistics of Language Representation (PoLaR) lab and is deputy director of the AcqVA Aurora Centre. He primarily works on language acquisition and processing across the life span as well as language induced/associated links to neurocognition in various bilingual/ multilingual populations.

**Peter Sells** is Professor of Linguistics at the University of York. His primary interests are in comparative syntactic theory and the relation between syntax and morphology.

**Michelle Sheehan** is Professor of Linguistics at Anglia Ruskin University in Cambridge, UK. Her research is focused on comparative syntax, notably word order asymmetries, nonfinite embedding, and extraction restrictions. She has published in *Linguistic Inquiry*, *Syntax*, *Journal of Linguistics*, *The Linguistic Review*, *Glossa*, and with Oxford, Cambridge and MIT presses.

**Roumyana Slabakova** is Professor and Chair of Applied Linguistics at the University of Southampton and Adjunct Research Professor at NTNU Norwegian University of



## NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Science and Technology in Trondheim. She investigates the interfaces of form and meaning in the linguistic competence of adult second language learners, heritage speakers and multilinguals. Her book *Second Language Acquisition* was published by Oxford University Press in 2016.

**Neil Smith** was Head of Linguistics at UCL for a third of a century until his retirement in 2006. He worked on West African languages, the acquisition of phonology, the *savant* syndrome, the thought of Noam Chomsky, and anything else that looked fun, from birdsong to bananas.

**Sergio Miguel Pereira Soares** is a PhD Marie Curie Student from the MultiMIND network based at the Department of Linguistics at the University of Konstanz, Germany. His research agenda involves, among others, the neural systems underlying bi- and multilingualism and third language transfer. He is currently using neuroimaging methodologies combined with behavioral techniques to advance the field of multilingualism and to improve foreign language pedagogy.

**Peter Svenonius** is a Professor at the Center for Advanced Study in Theoretical Linguistics at the UiT, The Arctic University of Norway. He works on syntax and its interfaces with semantics, morphology, and phonology.

**Rosalind Thornton** is a Professor at Macquarie University. Her work focuses on children's acquisition of syntax and semantics within the biolinguistic framework of linguistics.

**Patrick C. Trettenbrein** is a PhD Candidate in the Department of Neuropsychology at the Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences in Leipzig, Germany. His main research interest is the neurobiology of language, currently focusing on sign language and modality (in)dependence of linguistic computations in the brain. Moreover, he is interested in how brains compute more generally.

**Ianthi Maria Tsimpli** is Professor of English and Applied Linguistics at the University of Cambridge. She works on multilingualism, first and second language acquisition, language impairment, attrition, language processing and the interaction between language, cognitive abilities, education, and print exposure.

**Veno Volenec** is Assistant Professor of Linguistics at Concordia University (Montreal, Canada). His research mainly focuses on phonology, phonetics, and their relationship.

**Deirdre Wilson** is Emeritus Professor of Linguistics at University College London. Her main research interests are in communication and theoretical pragmatics: her long-standing collaboration with Dan Sperber (*Relevance: Communication and Cognition; Meaning and Relevance*) has led to publications on a wide variety of pragmatic topics, from disambiguation and reference resolution to rhetoric, style and the interpretation of literary works. Her novel *Slave of the Passions* was shortlisted for two prizes, and she has just completed a second.

**Emiliano Zaccarella** is Group Leader in the Department of Neuropsychology at the Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences in Leipzig, Germany. He is primarily interested in understanding the general organizational principles of linguistic combinatorial abstraction in the human brain.



REVISED PROOFS



# Chomsky on the Evolution of the Language Faculty: Presentation and Perspectives for Further Research

ANNE REBOUL

~~Institute for Cognitive Sciences, Marc Jeannerod, Lyons, France~~  
Laboratory of Cognitive Psychology, Marseille, France

## 30.1 Introduction

What might be the most remarkable thing about Chomsky's view of the evolution of language is that it has changed very little throughout the years (see Chomsky 2016). Since the 1960s, he has claimed the following:

- Language is species-specific (no species other than mankind has anything even remotely comparable to language).
- Language is a biological endowment.
- Language is not the product of evolution in the sense that it is not an adaptation (see below for a more detailed discussion).
- Language is not first and foremost a tool for communication.
- Language emerged as a whole, rather than gradually (a so-called saltationist position).

Surprisingly, these positions have occasionally been interpreted as an attack against a biological approach to language on the rather flimsy grounds that all biological approaches should see language as an adaptation. Given the emphasis that Chomsky has always put on a biological conception of language (against most nongenerative linguists until recently), this seems a gratuitous view.

What is most remarkable about this continuity in Chomsky's thought about language is that it takes place against a theoretical landscape in constant flux, the landscape of generative grammar (GG). While this is not the place to give a history of GG, there is one major change that has affected the very notion of a Faculty of Language and hence the stance in the GG community regarding the question of the evolution of the Language Faculty. This will be our point of departure.

### 30.2 The Faculty of Language: Then and Now

A central question in any evolutionary query is the very object of the query: what has evolved? While a lot of approaches to the evolution of language (for a recent example, see Christiansen and Chater 2016) center on E-languages (the various and fuzzily delimited languages that are used for communication in human groups, e.g. French, English, Tagalog, etc.), this is not the case in the Chomskyan paradigm. Chomsky (1986) introduced a central distinction between E-languages and I-language<sup>1</sup>, the internalized knowledge of language that each speaker has and which is the result of the interaction between his or her language faculty and the (limited) experience that he or she had of his or her mother tongue during language acquisition. The object of linguistics is, in that perspective, not E-languages, but I-language. And the object of any question about language evolution is the Faculty of Language, the ability, unique to the human species, that allows all humans to develop an I-language, regardless of the linguistic environment in which they are born or raised. In other words, if anything evolved in the biological sense, it was not E-languages (as any human infant can acquire any E-language whatsoever given the relevant linguistic environment), but rather, the ability to develop an I-language, i.e. the Faculty of Language. Thus, in terms of the question of language evolution, a lot will depend on what exactly is meant by the Faculty of Language, notably whether there is any chance of answering the question of its evolution, and whether to see language as an adaptation in the strong sense that it evolved to fulfill a specific, adaptive, function. And it is here that the GG paradigm has undergone a major change.

A good outline of this shift and of its consequence for the question of evolution is given in Chomsky (2010). While the notion of *biolinguistics* was introduced by Massimo Piattelli-Palmarini at an international conference in 1974, following Lenneberg (1967), the view of the language faculty at the time saw it as “rich, highly structured, and substantially unique to this cognitive system” (Chomsky 2010, p. 46). As pointed out by Pinker and Bloom (1990), under such a view, it makes sense to consider that the Faculty of Language is an adaptation, progressively evolved through natural selection to fulfill some specific function. This is however in tension with Chomsky’s views, according to which the Faculty of Language evolved as a whole (in one step, i.e. in a saltationist way). However, the introduction of the Principles and Parameters approach (see Chomsky 1986) has changed the situation in major ways. Principles are invariant and operate beyond language as they have to do with computational efficiency. Parameters can be set to different values. While principles explain the universality of grammar, parameters account for the variability of E-languages. The question relative to language evolution then becomes that of whether there is anything specific to the Language Faculty and if so, what. This corresponds to the distinction between the *Faculty of Language broadly understood* and the *Faculty of Language narrowly understood* introduced in Hauser, Chomsky, and Fitch (2002/2010).<sup>2</sup>

The Faculty of Language narrowly understood (FLN) corresponds to “the abstract linguistic computational system alone, independent of the other systems with which it interacts” (Hauser, Chomsky, and Fitch 2010, p. 17). As such, it is subject to the principles that characterize Universal Grammar (UG) and is a subset of the Faculty of Language broadly understood (FLB). The FLB gathers the FLN and the systems with which it interacts, i.e. the conceptual-intentional system and the sensory-motor system. Very roughly, the first provides the “meaning,” while the second has to do

ANNE REBOUL

with externalization and notably with externalization for communication. What is most relevant here is the FLN and its characterization. The FLN has the property of producing discrete infinity (an infinity of discrete sentences) from a finite set of elements and the computational operation that makes this possible is *recursion* (more technically, *Merge*). Hauser, Chomsky, and Fitch (2010) have insisted on the idea that it is this computational operation that is relevant to the question of language evolution. They argued that “although many aspects of FLB are shared with other vertebrates, the core recursive aspect of FLN currently appears to lack any analog in animal communication and possibly other domains as well” (Hauser, Chomsky, and Fitch 2010, 19). As the paper is oriented toward comparative psychology, this obviously makes sense. In such a perspective, looking for what is not shared with other species is crucial regarding the evolution of a faculty that, as language, is species-specific. Additionally, the authors advocate investigating recursion not only from the viewpoint of language, but also in other cognitive domains, more widely shared among animal species, such as number, social relationships and navigation, where it might also apply.

So, to sum up, the question of the evolution of language concerns the FLN rather than the FLB, and the FLN is reduced to a single computational operation, recursion. This *Minimalist* position (see Chomsky 1995/2015) has the advantage of reopening the question of language evolution by radically simplifying the FLN. While the initial, complex view of the FLN seemed to make a strongly adaptationist (and progressive rather than saltationist) approach mandatory, this difficulty disappears under Minimalism. Additionally, the question of E-languages is now entirely a question of externalization, that is of the interaction between the FLN and the sensory-motor system, a question of historical, not biological import. Let us now turn to how Chomsky’s main positions about the evolution of language articulate themselves with this new view of the FLN.

To recapitulate, Chomsky sees language as species-specific, and as a biological endowment. He claims that language did not evolve as an adaptation for any specific function and that language is not primarily a tool for communication. Finally, he insists on a saltationist account, in which the FLN emerged in a single step, rather than in a progressive and piecemeal way.

In Hauser, Chomsky, and Fitch (2010), the authors advocate investigating recursion (the computational operation that makes the FLN species-specific to humans) not only in the domain of language, but also in other domains, such as counting, social relationships and navigation. This is clearly linked to the idea that recursion itself is not “new,” rather what is new in the FLN is its range of application. This leads rather naturally to the notion that the FLN is a species-specific exaptation (a reutilization for other purposes of a feature that initially evolved as an adaptation for another function: see Gould, and Vrba 1982) and not an adaptation. Thus, it is not recursion as such that is species-specific, but rather its use in the specific domain of language. The fact that recursion is the only species-specific part of the FLN also makes a saltationist account mandatory. While recursion, as a computational operation, may be limited in a cognitively modular sense (for instance, to keep track of hierarchical social relationships or to navigate the environment) or be constrained by other cognitive restrictions (linked to performance) such as working memory, it cannot be had “in part.” One either has recursion (notwithstanding modular or performative limitations) or not. In other words, its emergence as the FLN cannot be the result of a progressive process but must have occurred in a single step. Thus, the emergence of the Minimalist Program and the new view of the FLN it entails has made all of Chomsky’s tenets about language evolution very reasonable.

## CHOMSKY ON THE EVOLUTION OF THE LANGUAGE FACULTY

One question that I want to discuss here, because it opens new avenues for research is the domain of the FLN. Should it really be seen as limited to Merge? The view that it should was qualified in Fitch, Hauser and Chomsky (2005), where the authors recognized that the FLN might contain more than Merge, a point also insisted on by Pinker and Jackendoff (2005). One interesting question, thus, is what else the FLN could encompass. The most obvious extensions to the FLN would seem to be found in the FLB, i.e. in the sensory-motor and conceptual-intentional interface systems. Here I want to follow the trail of Chomsky's strongly reiterated claim throughout the years that language is not primarily a tool for communication, but rather, a tool for thought.

### 30.3 Language Is Not Primarily a Tool for Communication

As we have just seen, Chomsky has an exaptationist view of language evolution. While this basically means that the FLN (seen as the use of recursion in language) did not evolve as an adaptation for a specific function, it nevertheless does not mean that an exaptation is not in need of an account of some kind. So, is there a reason why one should discount, as Chomsky does, the possibility that the FLN was an exaptation for communication? In other words, why not think that the use of recursion in language, i.e. *Merge*, emerged to facilitate communication?

#### 30.3.1 Language Uniqueness

The major problem with the view that Merge emerged to facilitate communication is language uniqueness. As Bickerton (2009) has pointed out, while communication (in the broad sense of transfer of information) is ubiquitous in the living world, language is unique, inasmuch as it has Merge and allows for discrete infinity. This might seem like a minor objection.

If, as hinted in Hauser, Chomsky, and Fitch (2010), animal species have recursion in noncommunicative modular systems, why not think that if Merge is the only difference between language and animal communication systems, Merge could have been exapted in the FLN to allow more widespread communication in the human species? In other words, contrary to Chomsky's claims, language would be primarily a tool for communication. Language would be basically in continuity with animal communication systems. There are, however, quite a few problems with this proposal.

First of all, while animal communication systems seem limited to around 30 different signals with different contents (see Reboul 2017), language is in principle unlimited in the range of different contents it can communicate. This raises the question of why animal communication systems are so drastically limited relative to language, as well as the related question of why only humans needed a more extensive communication system. One of the most popular answers to this question (see, e.g. Tomasello 2010) is that humans have a uniquely cooperative and altruistic sociality relative to all other animal species, including primates. Apart from any doubt that one might have about such an optimistic view of human sociality (for a detailed discussion, see Reboul 2017), this raises the question of where all this unlimited content that humans can communicate comes from. While one may legitimately think that animal conceptual systems are less limited than the range of their communicative signals suggest, there still are strong indications that human conceptual apparatuses are cognitively a lot

ANNE REBOUL

more powerful than anything found in nonhuman species. While social explanations have also been proposed for the emergence of higher cognitive abilities among primates and particularly among humans, it is not clear that these hypotheses fare very well under scrutiny. The Machiavellian view (see Byrne, and Whiten 1988, Whiten, and Byrne 1997) argues that higher intelligence evolved in an evolutionary arms race to deceive and manipulate other group members in social animals. However, the paucity of deception in the animal world (see Searcy and Nowicki 2005), even among apes, sheds doubt on the Machiavellian hypothesis. Tomasello's (2014) view, according to which human thinking emerged due to social pressures from human altruism, does not fare much better. Apart from any doubt one may harbor about human altruism, the main problem is that it is not clear why altruism as such should lead to higher cognitive capacities.

There is another major discontinuity between language and other animal communication systems. Language is displaced or decoupled<sup>3</sup> in a strong sense. Human language is unique not only in its discrete infinity but also because the contents communicated can be independent of the situation of communication: they don't have to relate to what is present in the environment of the communicators. One can in principle talk of entities that are not present in the communication space, but also of abstract entities and even of nonexistent objects, and independently of any actual, future or potential action.<sup>4</sup> In contrast, animal communication seems limited to concrete (perceptible) objects that are present in the environment, when it is "referential" rather than merely devoted to regulating the social interaction. One major question is where decoupling in the strong, human, sense, came from. As we will see below, decoupling in this strong sense is absent not only from all animal communication systems, and even from the communicative acts of the animals engaged in animal language programs. One might want to argue that decoupling evolved through the interface between the FLN (merge) and the sensory-motor system. There is, however, a problem with this thesis.

The interaction between the FLN and the sensory-motor system is directly linked to externalization, and externalization has a communicative function (indeed, one could say that the communicative part of human language is this interface). If this is the case, it would be very unlikely that decoupling could be due to the interface between the FLN and the sensory-motor system. This is because decoupling makes deception easier because the audience, in the absence of what the communication is about, cannot verify its veracity. There is a general consensus that communication should be profitable for both the sender and the receiver, and deception is obviously not in general profitable to the receiver (see Krebs, and Dawkins 1984). Thus, it is very unlikely that decoupling would emerge in a communication system. Hence, the origin of decoupling is unlikely to be found in the interface between the FLN and the sensory-motor system.

This other main difference between language and animal communication systems, in addition to Merge, has been relatively ignored in the literature on the evolution of language. So, let us turn to decoupling and to the Chomskyan idea that language is not primarily a tool for communication, but rather, a tool for thought.

### 30.3.2 *Language as a Tool for Thought*

It seems that there is a common factor in the limitations of animal communication systems and of animal conceptual apparatuses. As pointed out above, the question of why Merge emerged in the FLN and not in other animal communication systems

## CHOMSKY ON THE EVOLUTION OF THE LANGUAGE FACULTY

may be the question of where the infinity of different contents that Merge allows to communicate come from in the human species. In other words, and contrary to Hauser, Chomsky, and Fitch (2010), there would be major discontinuities between human and nonhuman thought.

While there is evidence that some primate species can master, after numerous trials, abstract relations such as *similar* and *different*, it seems clear that they are limited in their conceptual range in a way that humans are not. A first indication of this lies in the very different vocabulary sizes of human children and animals engaged in animal language programs (where animals of different species are taught sign or symbolic languages). While insistence is often (and rightly) put on the absence of anything like syntax in these animals, it is also notable that they are limited in the size of their vocabularies, learning around 250/300 “words,” about the size of the vocabulary of a three-year-old child, at the most. By contrast a six-year-old has a vocabulary of around 10,000 words (see Anderson 2004 on animal language programs, Bloom 2000 for children’s vocabularies, and Reboul 2017 for a more extensive discussion). One might argue that nonhuman animals are more limited than humans in the number of associations they can master (words in animal language programs are typically considered to be associations between forms and meanings), but recent works have demonstrated that this is not the case (see, e.g. Fagot, and Cook 2006; Kaminsky, Call, and Fisher 2004; Pilley, and Reid 2011). Rather the limitation seems to lie in the nature of concepts that animals can build. While human concepts, just as words used in linguistic communication, can be *decoupled* (used regardless of the presence of the referent in the environment or of any intention to action), it is not clear that this is the case for animal concepts.

Here, one possible domain of interest is so-called *mental time travel* (see Suddendorf, and Corballis 2007), a notion that covers both episodic memory (memory for specific past events and the associated emotions and feelings) and projection into the future. Clearly, given that it concerns past or future events or situations, mental time travel has to deploy concepts for entities that are not present in the environment of the thinker. The question of whether nonhuman animals have mental time travel or not (for a positive argument, see Corballis 2013, for a negative one, see Suddendorf 2013) is thus relevant to a potential difference of nature between human and nonhuman concepts. Clearly, human capacities for mental time travel are wide ranging far beyond animal capacities (distance in time is not strongly limited in humans, while it seems to be in animals, where a few days is the limit). But beyond the distance in time limitations, there seems to be other differences. Up to now, the only evidence regarding episodic memory in animals is relative to food hiding. Regarding projection into the future it has to do with planning (e.g. chimpanzees taking with them hammer and anvil when they go to eat nuts). A good example of so-called “spontaneous planning” is given in Osvath (2009) who describes how the alpha male of a chimpanzee group in a zoo would make caches of stones that he would throw at zoo visitors the next day. But in all of these examples, while concepts may be deployed in *absentia*, they are strongly linked to an intention for action. In other words, they are not deployed in the disinterested way of which Millikan (2013) rightly argues that it is a central characteristic of human thought. Additionally, when an animal engaged in an animal language program refers to an absent object, it is always in a request for that object (see, e.g. Segerdhal, Fields, and Savage-Rumbaugh 2005). Indeed, it has been noted (see, e.g. Cheney and Seyfarth 1990) that animal communicative acts do not take into account the informational state of the audience. Apparently, they are not informative, but directive acts. Thus, there

ANNE REBOUL

seems to be an entire lack of transmission of information for anything other than practical purposes both in naturally occurring animal communication and in communication in animal language programs. This suggests that either the nature of concepts or the way in which they are deployed (or, presumably, both) are different in human and nonhuman animals. While there is a limited form of decoupling in at least some animal species, it is a weak decoupling in which concepts can be deployed in absentia, but only in representations linked to actions. By contrast, human concepts are strongly decoupled in the sense that they can be deployed not only in absentia but independently of actual, potential, or future action.

While this is not the place to give a detailed account of human concepts (see Rebol 2017), there is one interesting example, which is color concepts. On the face of it, colors being so-called secondary qualities (see Locke 1975), they seem to be the epitome of a visual concept, a concept that would depend for its very existence on visual experience.<sup>5</sup> Yet, as was pointed out by Milligan (see Magee and Milligan 1995), even people blind from birth can use and deploy color concepts, in the sense that they can amass (and transmit) information about colors. This is possible because humans (and presumably only humans) have *deferential concepts*, concepts that are not based on direct knowledge of their referents, but on knowledge “borrowed” from “experts” (see Fodor 1975). And this, in turn, is possible because human linguistic communication allows humans to communicate about entities that can be absent or inaccessible to perception. There is however an hen-egg problem here: Do we have deferential concepts because we have decoupling in language or do we have decoupling in language because we have decoupling in concepts? The first possibility would imply that decoupling (both in language and in concepts) depends on the interface between the FLN and the motor-articulatory system. The second would imply that decoupling in language depends on the interface between the FLN and the intentional conceptual system. While one can argue for the first hypothesis by appealing for instance to Dennett’s (2017) notion of language as a *cognitive crane*, it is not clear why externalization as such would allow humans and only humans to decouple language and concepts. After all, the few animal signals that are referential are not decoupled (see Cheney and Seyfarth 1990), so externalization is clearly not enough for decoupling. Additionally, when provided with such an externalization, animals engaged in animal language programs do not thereby become able of decoupling, as shown by their communicative acts. And finally, this hypothesis fails to explain the limitations in their vocabularies.

Let us come back to this point. As noted above, explanations in terms of memory limitations are unsatisfactory because it has been shown that animals (primates, dogs, and pigeons) can learn more than a thousand arbitrary associations, much in excess of the vocabularies attained in animal language programs. But what is it exactly that these animals learnt? In a study by Fagot and Cook (2006), the subjects (baboons and pigeons) learnt arbitrary associations between pictures and one or the other of two colors. Pigeons learnt between 800 and 1200 such associations and baboons between 3500 and 5000. In Kaminsky, Call, and Fischer’s (2004) study, a border collie learnt around 200 associations between linguistic expressions (e.g. “the blue ball”) and individual objects. Finally, in Pilley and Reid’s (2011) study, Chaser, a female border collie mastered 1022 “names” for different objects, all toys, over the course of three years, before the study was discontinued, leaving open the possibility that she might have done even better with a longer time. This achievement is intriguing, in light of the limitations of chimpanzees’s vocabularies in animal language programs.

## CHOMSKY ON THE EVOLUTION OF THE LANGUAGE FACULTY

What is it exactly that Chaser learnt? She learned something like proper names for individual objects, that is, associations between auditory forms and individual objects. By contrast, animals engaged in animal language programs learned (very laboriously) associations between forms (abstract visual symbols or gestures) and categories of objects, something clearly more demanding from a cognitive point of view. While Pilley and Reid (2011) claimed that Chaser also learnt three common names (*balls*, *frisbees*, and *toys*), it is not clear that she actually learnt *toys* as a superordinate category for both balls and frisbees (for a discussion, see Reboul 2017). So, all in all, Chaser learned a great number of proper names, but only two common names. All of this suggests that what is important in acquiring a lexicon is not so much the ability to learn new associations, but rather, the ability to categorize objects on the fly (to conceptualize), the resulting categories (or concepts) being then associated with forms, whether these are acoustic, gestural, or visual.

Do we have any indications that human and nonhuman animals have different conceptualizing abilities? The first relevant factor is obviously lexical acquisition, which is fast, seems painless, and is unlimited in human children, while it is slow, laborious, and limited in other animal species. Beyond that, it seems that the human perceptual (and notably visual) system is geared toward abstraction in a way that animal perception is not (see Reboul 2017). For instance, the human preference for the treatment of visual information at a global rather than a local level may be linked to the ease with which humans master basic categories (see Rosch et al. 1976 and for a general discussion, Reboul 2017). Finally, and crucially, the very nature of the concepts acquired may be different.

I have already suggested above that this may be the case: animal concepts seem linked to actual, potential, or future action in a way that human concepts are not.

### 30.3.3 Affordances

To pinpoint the difference, the notion of *affordance* introduced by Gibson (1986) in his ecological theory of visual perception is interesting. Gibson's view was that a visual scene is perceived by a given organism in terms of the potentialities for action that it makes available to this organism and that (some of) the objects in the scene are categorized accordingly (as potentialities for action, i.e. as affordances). On such a view, the same visual scene will offer different affordances to different species, but also to a single organism at different times depending on its current biological status. Now, clearly, the notion of affordance has a strong adaptive flavor: natural selection determines, at least in part, what affordances are for a given organism, because affordances are important for survival. This does not mean that some affordances cannot be learnt, for instance through association, but one would expect a number of affordances to be genetically inherited (see New, Cosmides, and Tooby 2007 for a nice experimental demonstration of this). Beyond the adaptive aspect, what is central to the notion of affordances is the idea of a direct link between (visual) categorization and action. This direct link between categorization and action is precisely what seems to characterize animal concepts relative to human concepts.

Clearly, the claim is not that humans do not have affordance categorization. Given the adaptive impact of affordances, it seems safe to postulate that if affordance categorization exists, it will be widespread among species. Rather, it is that in humans, and as far as we know, only in humans, concepts are not limited to affordances. Side by

ANNE REBOUL

side with affordance categories, humans are able to develop a much richer conceptual apparatus, in part independent of visual perception as the possibility of decoupling manifest in deferential concepts as well as the existence of abstract concepts show. And this is presumably the explanation for the very different lexicon sizes that are manifested by humans and by animals engaged in animal language programs. Thus, a natural conclusion would be that the strong decoupling that characterizes human linguistic communication is due to the interface between the FLN (merge, in other words) and the conceptual-intentional system, rather than to its interaction with the sensory-motor system.

### 30.4 Conclusion: Extending the FLN

Thus, it seems that the core of human language is the interface between the FLN (merge) and the conceptual-intentional system. Additionally, there are good reasons to believe that the human conceptual-intentional system is specific to humans in the sense that human concepts can be deployed independently of actual or potential action (they are strongly decoupled), while this is not the case for animal concepts. This suggests that it might make sense to extend the FLN in such a way that it is composed of both Merge and the conceptual-intentional system. This, it should be noted, echoes Chomsky's view that language is primarily a tool for thought.

Such a move would also open new possibilities for research on language evolution. First, it means that it is not only recursion but also decoupling that should be investigated in comparative psychology. As said above, chimpanzees seem to be able of planning, manifesting a weak kind of decoupling, and investigating the scope and the limits of decoupling in other primate and non-primate species might be interesting.

Second, investigations of the interface between Merge and the conceptual-intentional system would be rewarding. This could be done from a more syntactic point of view, as in the exo-skeletal model proposed by Borer (2005a, 2005b, 2013). It could also be done from a pragmatic point of view. Chomsky (2006) argued that meaning is largely a matter of pragmatics rather than of "externalist" semantics. Contemporary pragmatics, notably of the relevance-theoretic variety, centers on conceptual matters (the so-called lexical pragmatics approach, see Carston 2002, as well as Wilson and Carston 2007, and Allott and Wilson, Chapter 27, this volume) and has advocated an immediate pragmatic interpretation, rather than a pragmatic interpretation mediated by a primary semantic interpretation. This would seem to be an area of profitable investigation regarding the evolution of the Faculty of Language if the FLN is extended to include both Merge and the conceptual-intentional system.

### Endnotes

- 1 Previously, generative grammar had distinguished between *performance* and *competence*. While the two distinctions are not equivalent, they are related: what is paramount is inner representation versus external production.
- 2 Quotations and references to pages will be given relative to the 2010 reprint in Larson, Déprez and Hiroko (2010).

## CHOMSKY ON THE EVOLUTION OF THE LANGUAGE FACULTY

- 3 Hockett (1959) used “displacement” or “displaced reference,” but the term “decoupling” has been extensively used in the psychology of early symbolic activity in young children and has the advantage of targeting cognitive ability beyond communication (see, e.g. Nichols and Stich 2000).
- 4 This excludes the honeybee dance, whereby a bee inside the beehive indicates the location of nectar outside of the hive to the other bees. It is clearly not decoupled in the strong sense.
- 5 This was confirmed by the World Color Survey (see Kay et al. 2011), which demonstrated that despite lexical diversity, color centroids are remarkably stable among human populations and dependent on the human visual apparatus.

## References

- Anderson, S. 2004. *Doctor's Dolittle's Delusion: Animals and the Uniqueness of Human Language*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Bickerton, D. 2009. *Adam's Tongue: How Humans Made Language: How Language Made Humans*. New York: Hill & Wang.
- Bloom, P. 2000. *How Children Learn the Meaning of Words*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Borer, H. 2005a. In *Name Only*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borer, H. 2005b. *The Normal Course of Events*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borer, H. 2013. *Taking Form*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Byrne, R., and A. Whiten, eds. 1988. *Machiavellian Intelligence: Social Expertise and the Evolution of Intellect in Monkeys, Apes and Humans*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Carston, R. 2002. *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cheney, D., and R. Seyfarth. 1990. *How Monkeys See the World: Inside the Mind of Another Species*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1986. *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Chomsky, N. 2006. *New Horizons in the Study of Language and Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2010. Some simple evo-devo theses: How true might they be for language? In *The Evolution of Human Language: Bilingual Perspectives*, edited by R. Larson, V. Déprez, and Y. Hiroko, 45-62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2015. *The Minimalist Program*. 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Edition. Cambridge: The MIT Press. (1<sup>st</sup> edition: 1995).
- Chomsky, N. 2016. *What Kind of Creatures Are We?* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Christiansen, M., and N. Chater. 2016. *Creating Language: Integrating Evolution, Acquisition and Processing*. Cambridge: The MIT press.
- Corballis, M. 2013. Mental time travel: A case for evolutionary continuity. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 17/1: 5–6. DOI:10.1016/j.tics.2012.10.009
- Dennett, D. 2017. *From Bacteria to Bach and Back: The Evolution of Minds*. New York/London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Fagot, J., and R. Cook. 2006. Evidence for large long-term memory capacities in baboons and pigeons and its implications for learning and the evolution of cognition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 103/46: 17564–7.
- Fitch, T., M. Hauser, and N. Chomsky 2005. The evolution of the Language Faculty: Clarifications and implications. *Cognition* 97: 179–210.

ANNE REBOUL

- Fodor, J. 1995. *The Elm and the Expert: Mentalese and Its Semantics*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Gibson, J. 1986. *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gould, S., and E. Vrba. 1982. Exaptation: A missing term in the science of form. *Paleobiology* 8: 4–15.
- Hauser, M., N. Chomsky, and T. Fitch. 2010. The Faculty of Language: What it is, who has it, and how did it evolve? In *The Evolution of Human Language: Bilingual Perspectives*, edited by R. Larson, V. Déprez, and Y. Hiroko, 14–41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Initially published in *Science* (2002), 298: 1569–1579.
- Hockett, C. 1959. Animal “Languages” and human language. *Human Biology* 31/1: 32–39.
- Kaminski, J., J. Call, and J. Fischer. 2004. *Word learning in a domestic dog: Evidence for “Fast Mapping.”* *Science* 304: 1682–1683.
- Kay, P., B. Berlin, L. Maffi, W. Merrifield, and R. Cook. 2011. *The World Color Survey*. Berkeley: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Krebs, J., and R. Dawkins. 1984. Animal signals: Mind-reading and manipulation. In *Behavioural Ecology: An Evolutionary Approach*, edited by J. Krebs and N. Davies, 380–402. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.
- Lenneberg, E. 1967. The biological foundations of language. *Hospital Practice* 2/12: 59–67.
- Locke, J. 1975. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Magee, B. and M. Milligan. 1995. *On Blindness: Letters between Bryan Magee and Martin Milligan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Millikan, R. 2013. Natural information, intentional signs and animal communication. In *Animal Communication Theory: Information and Influence*, edited by Ulrich. E. Stegmann, 3313–3603. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Kindle edition).
- New, J., L. Cosmides, and J. Tooby. 2007. Category-specific attention for animals reflects ancestral priorities, not expertise. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 104/42: 16598–16603.
- Nichols, S., and S. Stich. 2000. A cognitive theory of pretense. *Cognition* 74: 115–147.
- Osvath, M. 2009. Spontaneous planning for future stone throwing by a male chimpanzee. *Current Biology* 19/5: R190-1.
- Pilley, J., and A. Reid. 2011. Border collie comprehends object names as verbal referents. *Behavioural Processes* 86/2: 184–195. DOI:10.1016/j.beproc.2010.11.007.
- Pinker, S., and P. Bloom. 1990. Natural. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 13/4: 707–727. language and natural selection.
- Pinker, S. and R. Jackendoff. 2005. The nature of the language faculty and its implications for the evolution of language (Reply to Fitch, Hauser, and Chomsky). *Cognition* 97: 211–225.
- Reboul, A. 2017. *Cognition and Communication in the Evolution of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rosch, E., C. Mervis, W. Gray, D. Johnson, and P. Boyes-Braem. 1976. Basic objects in natural categories. *Cognitive Psychology* 8/3: 382–439.
- Searcy, W., and S. Nowicki. 2005. *The Evolution of Animal Communication: Reliability and Deception in Signaling Systems*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Segerdhal, P., W. Fields, and S. Savage-Rumbaugh. 2005. *Kanzi’s Primal Language: The Cultural Initiation of Primates into Language*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Suddendorf, T. 2013. Mental time travel: Continuities and discontinuities. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 17/4: 151-152. DOI:10.1016/j.tics.2013.01.011
- Suddendorf, T. and M. Corballis. 2007. The evolution of foresight: What is mental time travel and is it unique to humans? *Behavioural and Brain Sciences* 30/3: 299–313.
- Tomasello, M. 2010. *Origins of Human Communication*. Cambridge: MIT Press.



## CHOMSKY ON THE EVOLUTION OF THE LANGUAGE FACULTY

- Tomasello, M. 2014. *A Natural History of Human Thinking*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Whiten, A., and R. Byrne, eds. 1997. *Machiavellian Intelligence II: Extensions and Evaluations*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, D. and R. Carston. 2007. A unitary approach to lexical pragmatics: relevance, inference and ad hoc concepts. In *Pragmatics*, edited by N. Burton-Roberts, 230–259. Basingstoke: Palgrave.



REVISED PROOFS

