

CHOMSKY-TYPE UNIVERSALS

Universal core vs. superficial differences

This is definitional for what counts as core or superficial

Universals serve to explain data of acquisition

Universals are innate and non-cultural

Researchers can reasonably concentrate on one language as universals are the necessary givens for language acquisition for all languages

Linguistic explanations should be inter-translatable with any neurological explanation

GREENBERG-TYPE UNIVERSALS

Universals may be absolute, statistical, implicational, or typological

Core vs. surface is not really a concern

No a priori constraint on what is to be explained or how

Universals all presumably—often trivially—rely on innate principles of some sort, but their key elements and explanations may be cultural

Researchers must consider genetically and areally unrelated languages as their goal is to formulate candidate universals as such

Linguistic explanations should be inter-translatable with any neurological explanation

Figure 1: Some important differences and one important (tacit) similarity between Chomskyan and Greenbergian universals.