

Re: Deeper relations of Chinese

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2004-09/3230.html>

From: Jacques Guy (jguy_at_alphalink.com.au)

Date: 09/20/04

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 06:47:24 -0700

Rex F. May wrote:

- > *I would think that two language*
- > *groups might be related, but have diverged so much that there could be*
- > *reasonable disagreement about their relationship.*

Take any two related languages. Wait. Wait, wait again. Eventually all traces of a common origin will have disappeared. All you will observe are chance resemblances in their _innovations_.

>*From which cretins, er... let me qualify that, CRETINS like Arpad and Anti-Something conclude that languages sharing chance resemblances are related. That is exactly like the argument that I am fond of quoting:*

1. God is infinitely good.
2. Chocolate is good.
3. Therefore, God is made of an infinite amount of chocolate.

And fucking stop answering those jerks without removing their talk.blah.blah from the ng line (actually I think it's talk.politics.middle-east or something like that). You're behaving like someone at a picnic leaving a pot of honey open for every ant, wasp, and fly to come swarming.