

❖ Nevertheless, other scholars are of the view that even if language was to be defined in terms of a system of communication, human language still stands out superior and different from animal language **qualitatively** (i.e. in kind/in nature) and **quantitatively** (i.e. in degree/scope).

❖ They argue that the superiority of human language over animal languages can further be established by finding out whether or not animals can learn human languages. For example, though parrots can imitate human utterances, their knowledge of language to which these utterances belong is limited to only those utterances they heard. Humans on the other hand “know” their language (**i.e. linguistic competence**) and can produce/understand (**i.e. linguistic performance**) an infinite number of utterances in a given language because **human language is creative.**

❖ That talking birds can also produce many sounds used in human languages is therefore insufficient to differentiate human languages (**except sign language**) from animal language on the basis of sounds. Other design features of language need to be used.

❖ Additionally, biological differences such as differences in the powers of the brain can be used to differentiate between human language and animal language.

❖ For instance, some scholars argue that human language is superior to animal language on account of a human's ability to talk about things in time and space (**i.e. displacement**) and to understand and reproduce an infinite number of sentences, including those he has not heard before (**i.e. creativity**). Do you agree with their view?