

Re: How close is Vietnamese to Mandarin or Cantonese?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2005-05/msg00475.html>

- *From:* "Yusuf B Gursey" <ybg@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 8 May 2005 07:27:45 -0700
-

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

> Helmut Richter wrote:

>>

>> Peter T. Daniels:

>>

>>> Wexler says that Modern Hebrew is "relexified Yiddish," and he has a

>>> point — because Modern Hebrew grammar bears very little relation to

>>> Biblical Hebrew grammar and is very similar to "Standard Average

>>> European" grammar, which is reasonable because Hebrew was revived as a

>>> spoken language by people whose native language was Yiddish.

>>

>> I understand the point but I feel it is grossly exaggerated. A Modern

>> Hebrew speaker has no problems reading the Bible, and if he once and

>

> They could read TaNaKh, but they couldn't write it or speak its language.

a forgery of an inscription allegedly attesting to repairs on the Temple of Jerusalem was caught when a modern hebrew word was noticed. also IIRC some felt that "spiral staircase", included in the forgery was a misreading of the Biblical text. the letters were also phoenician rather than canaanite.

it also led to the reevaluation of the "James Osuary" given by the same dealer. both being judged forgeries, the dealer was arrested.

>

>> for all has learnt that what mitaking aspects as tenses can yield

>> unexpected meanings in some contexts (and surprisingly, statistically

>> only in few contexts because the most frequent BH form does not

Re: How close is Vietnamese to Mandarin or Cantonese?

exist

>> in MH and thus cannot cause misunderstandings), he will understand

>> everything correctly. One afternoon of BH lessons might well be enough

>> to learn the different tense system and the somewhat different SOV

>> word order.

>

> SOV??

>

>>> They

>>> assiduously learned Hebrew vocabulary, but they were not equipped

to

>>> take on a very alien syntax, including a tense–aspect system

totally

>>> different from what they were used to.

>>

>> Would such a shift in grammar (an aspect system with some tense

>> flavour becoming a tense system with a little aspect flavour) be

>> absolutely inconceivable, had the language gradually evolved over

the

>> last 2