

- (1) **Two early positions (p. 1)**
 - a. “Es gibt keine Mischsprache” — Max Müller (1871.1:86), c.f. comparative method
 - b. “Es gibt keine völlig ungemischte Sprache” — Hugu Schuchardt (1884:5)
- (2) **Responses (p. 2)**
 - a. One (relatively) immune linguistic subsystem (i.e. basic vocabulary, inflectional morphology)
 - b. The bulk of the lexicon and grammar must come from a single source
 - c. All languages are mixed/creoles
- (3) **T&K’s responses to the responses (p. 3)**
 - a. One (relatively) immune linguistic subsystem (i.e. basic vocabulary, inflectional morphology)
 - Demonstrably untrue
 - b. The bulk of the lexicon and grammar must come from a single source
 - This is a *simplifying* assumption of the Comparative Method
 - c. All languages are mixed/creoles
 - This position underdifferentiates the linguistic results of contact
- (4) **T&K’s major claims (pp. 3–4)**
 - a. Mixed languages cannot be classified genetically at all
 - b. Most languages are not mixed
- (5) **Boas-Sapir controversy (pp. 5–6)**
 - a. Boas: “At a certain time depth it [is] impossible to distinguish results of borrowing from those of common origin”
 - b. Sapir: there is always “a recognizable structural distinction between the two kinds of similarity”
 - i. Morphology: Sapir, Hymes, Hancock; Ma’a: Bantu
 - ii. Vocabulary: Weinreich, Greenberg; Tok Pisin, Ma’a (Mbugu): Cushitic
 - c. Their stand: Truly mixed languages *do* exist, hence (4a) above.
 - i. Ma’a; Tok Pisin (and other English-based Pacific creoles); Anglo-Romani
 - ii. Caribbean creoles misleading: their grammar is now influenced by vocabulary-base languages
- (6) **T&K’s additional claims, c.f. (4) above**
 - a. Mixed languages cannot be classified genetically at all (pp. 3–4)
 - i. Mixed languages arise from two kinds of contact situations: borrowing vs. substratum
 - ii. Purely linguistic factors (e.g. pattern pressure, markedness) easily overridden by social factors
 - b. Most languages are not mixed (p. 3)
 - i. “Genetic relationships in the traditional sense of one parent per language can only be posited” when systematic correspondences are found in *all* linguistic subsystems: vocabulary, phonology, morphology, and (they add) syntax. Others pose no threat to the Comparative Method. (p. 8)
 - ii. Interrupted transmission can be detected by lack of correspondence among subsystems (p. 11)

(7) Genetic relationship (pp. 9–11)

- a. All languages change through time, sometimes giving rise to multiple offspring
- b. Change can occur at any and all linguistic levels, but internally motivated change is regular
- c. Normal transmission is gradual over the short run, unlike language shift
- d. The label “genetic relationship” does not properly apply when transmission is imperfect
 - “Languages arising outside of normal transmission are **not** related (in the genetic sense) to **any** antecedent systems.” (p. 10)
- e. A language cannot have multiple ancestors in the course of normal transmission (pp. 11–12)
 - “If properly applied, the Comparative Method will yield no results at all for Tok Pisin”
 - “There are languages whose history hovers on the borderline between genetic and nongenetic”

(8) Questions: Genetic relationship vs. relationship

- a. We cannot detect the antecedents of mixed languages without knowing their history?
- b. No regular sound changes (or other correspondences) link mixed languages to their antecedents?

Logistics

(9) Dates

24 Jan	Overview, logistics	14 Feb	—	7 Mar	Spring break
31 Jan	—	21 Feb	Claire away	14 Mar	Spring break
7 Feb		28 Feb	Andrew Garrett		

(10) Readings for the near future

- a. **Overview.** Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; Oxford: University of California Press. Chapter 3: Contact-induced language change: An analytic framework. 35-64.
 - A typology correlating sociohistorical circumstances with linguistic results
- b. **Areal.** Campbell, Lyle (2006). Areal linguistics: A closer scrutiny. In *Linguistic areas: Convergence in historical and typological perspective*, ed. Yaron Matras, April McMahon & Nigel Vincent. Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 1-31.
 - ... it is individual historical events of diffusion that count, not the *post hoc* attempts to impose geographical order on varied conglomerations of these borrowings.
- c. **Andrew Garrett** (2006). Convergence in the formation of Indo-European subgroups: Phylogeny and chronology. In *Phylogenetic methods and the prehistory of languages*, ed. Peter Forster and Colin Renfrew (Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research). 139-151.
 - ... an alternative model: the familiar [Indo-European] branches arose not by the differentiation of earlier higher-order subgroups — from ‘Italo-Celtic’ to Italic and Celtic, and so on —but by convergence among neighbouring dialects in a continuum.
- d. **Second language acquisition.**
 - i. Krashen, Stephen D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon. Chapter 2: Second language acquisition theory. 9–56.
 - Five hypotheses: Natural order, acquisition/learning, monitor, input, affective filter.
 - ii. Schwartz, Bonnie D. & Rex A. Sprouse (1996). L2 cognitive states and the Full Transfer/Full Access model. *Second Language Research* 12(1): 40–72.
 - Full transfer from L1, full access to UG.
- e. Makassarese contact variety in N. Australia; Malay Pearling Lugger Pidgin, also Australian