

Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2005-09/msg00208.html>

- *From:* "Darkstar" <darkstar100@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 3 Sep 2005 07:47:05 -0700
-

John Atkinson:

- > Such a statement is meaningless.
- > If you mean, "the ancestors of the speakers of American...

You seem to be nitpicking. Anyway, you have a point there, my writing is too careless at times.

- > But Gascon lies on the *same* side of the Pyrenees as all other
- > varieties of Occitan!

Great! So what? It's still Occitan, not a different language. You mean I have to show where the difference between Gascon and other varieties of Occitan arose from? That's a separate question.

- > Basque does occur on both sides of the western Pyrenees, and has for
- > millenia, though during the last 2000 years its distribution seems
- > to have changed from largely north of the Pyrenees (Aquitania) to
- > predominately south of them. The mountains don't seem to have done
- > much splitting there.

Okay, this punch is a little better. Basque was NOT split by the Pyrenees, because languages like Basque, Nouristani group, Nakh-Dagestani group, etc are seen as *highland* languages in this theory. This means that the life style of their speaker has been associated with living in the mountains for hundreds or thousands of years. Mountains is their home. In some cases, when ridges are particularly high (as in Nuristan, 5000-6000 m, or 15.000-18.000 ft) *and* people inhabit this territory long enough, dialects and subsequently distinct languages begin to form. But in most cases, because the speakers of these languages are adapted to this particular life style, the contacts between different groups are still sufficiently intense, hence little or no splitting no matter how the exact distribution of speakers changes over time.

- > Could you elaborate? How does "the same reasoning" (whatever that
- > is) explain why the Australian languages are so much *less* diverse
- > typologically and (especially) phonologically than the North American
- > languages?

Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography

This is a good one. I'll try to answer it a little later.

- > Again, what is your evidence that trade was "invented" recently in
- > either America or Australia, or that the amount of trade carried out
- > in either of those places 10 000 years ago was significantly less (or more) than
- > it was just before the whites arrived -- when, as is well known, many
- > long-distance trade routes existed?

The idea is that less population spread over larger distances necessarily means less linguistic contacts either in the form of trade, marriages or warfare. I wrote "the trade was invented" because it is known from economics, that intense trade appears with the division of labor which usually comes with agriculture and permanent settlements...

Peter T. Daniels:

- > They formed `_subgroupS_` within the IE family.
- > There is no reason to
- > suppose there was a single Satem subgroup.

If you insist on this point, I could demand evidence for this just as well as you do for the opposite. I doubt that proving the Satem subgroup never existed is any easier than proving the opposite statement.

- > No, there were `_four_` distinct groups of English settlers

Maybe I oversimplified a bit. Anyway, it looks like the split between the Northern and Southern dialects is connected with the Appalachians that diverted some of the migrating colonists to the south.

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography**
◇ From: Brian M. Scott
- ◆ **Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography**
◇ From: Nathan Sanders
- ◆ **Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography**
◇ From: Peter T. Daniels

• *References:*

- ◆ **Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography**
◇ From: Darkstar
- ◆ **Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography**
◇ From: Christopher Culver
- ◆ **Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography**
◇ From: Darkstar

Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography

- ◆ ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
 ◇ *From:* Peter T. Daniels
- ◆ ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
 ◇ *From:* Darkstar
- ◆ ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
 ◇ *From:* Peter T. Daniels
- ◆ ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
 ◇ *From:* Darkstar
- ◆ ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
 ◇ *From:* Brian M. Scott
- ◆ ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
 ◇ *From:* Darkstar
- ◆ ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
 ◇ *From:* Miguel Carrasquer
- ◆ ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
 ◇ *From:* Darkstar
- ◆ ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
 ◇ *From:* John Atkinson

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Indo-European Origins and Geography***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***