

Re: Related languages (Re: A China–Sumer connection)

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology/2005–03/1271.html>

From: Comm (tjsrno_at_spampost.com)

Date: 03/17/05

Date: Thu, 17 Mar 2005 06:43:49 GMT

"Neeraj Mathur" <neemathur@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:d1afl9\$7ig\$1@news.ox.ac.uk...

An aside – you have a beautiful name! Ok, see inside :)

>

> "Comm" <tjsrno@spampost.com> wrote in message

> news:9lLZd.9617\$oO4.4756@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...

>>

>> "Neeraj Mathur" <neemathur@hotmail.com> wrote in message

>> news:d164co\$i91\$1@news.ox.ac.uk...

> [snip for brevity]

>> This is usenet, I chimed in because it looked like fun. Then I got

>> flamed; and so did others, PKM got flames, PM got flamed. So I flamed

>> back. Typical usenet.

>

> It does get a bit tiresome. Thank you for taking my post in the tone it

> was intended, and responding in kind.

Well, I'm friendly to friendly people – very much so, too.

>

>> Your central claim

>>> seems to be that 'English has been a creolized language since after

>>> 1066'. You also stated above 'arm chair or usenet linguists tend to

>>> think creoles are some kind of pidgen.' At this point it seems that we

>>> are losing each other – rather than debate terminology with you, I'll

>>> just ask you to define what you are using 'creole' and 'creolized' to

>>> mean. (To most linguists, creoles and pidgins are intimately related:

>>> pidgins are vastly simplified languages meant to allow contact between

>>> cultures speaking different languages, and creoles develop from pidgins

>>> when their use exceeds that original contact purpose and they gain in

>>> grammatical complexity to express a wider range of communicative needs.)

>>

>> I agree with your definitions. I say English is a creole (that has

>> becom