1. Two early positions (p. 1)
   a. “Es gibt keine Mischsprache” — Max Müller (1871:86), c.f. comparative method
   b. “Es gibt keine völlig ungemischte Sprache” — Hug e 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. 7–9)
   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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(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 typology correlating sociohistorical circumstances with linguistic results
      ‣ … it is individual historical events of diffusion that count, not the post hoc attempts to impose geographical order on varied conglomerations of these borrowings.
      ‣ … 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.
         • Five hypotheses: Natural order, acquisition/learning, monitor, input, affective filter.
         • Full transfer from L1, full access to UG.
   e. Makassarese contact variety in N. Australia; Malay Pearling Lugger Pidgin, also Australian