

# Re: A for B

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-03/msg00768.html>

---

- *From:* "Alan" <[in\\_flagrante@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:in_flagrante@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 12 Mar 2006 02:40:07 GMT
- 

"Dr. Jamshid Ibrahim" <[Jdibrahim@xxxxxxx](mailto:Jdibrahim@xxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
<news:1142120901.607814.252430@xx>

Alan schrieb:

While it may be "interesting for a linguist" to pursue Polish via Russian, the original poster's goal appears to be improving his Polish. Although there is certainly a relationship between Polish and Russian, it would be as foolish to learn Polish by listening to Russian as it would be to learn Dutch by listening to German, or to learn Italian by listening to Spanish, "interesting" as those approaches may be to a linguist.

P.S. The languages are usually called "Slavic" ("Slavonic", much less used, is acceptable). The plural of "Slav" is "Slavs", not "Slaves".

I mean if you speak German you already speak Dutch(don't take it to heart).

What's there to take to heart?

In addition Sounds can be easily substituted. ...

It's not only a matter of substitution of sounds, Dr J, it's the substitution of words, it's the substitution of grammar, etc. In other words, German is German and Dutch is Dutch. A monolingual Dutch speaker cannot speak German any more than a monlingual German speaker can speak Dutch. They may find some sound-betn similarities in their language which, of course, are "interesting" to a linguist, but they do not speak the same language. But I

Re: A for B

respect enough to assume that you know that already ——— you just have a bad habit of writing hyperbolically.

I am not sure Alan but I think the words Slave and Slaves existed (motivated by analogy) but could be no more in use now because of the associations. They were said to have even caused some problems.

They do come from the same root, Dr J. In English, at any rate, we do make the distinction of capitalizing the "S" and leaving off the final "e" when referring to the ethnic group and adding a "final "e" when referring to an involuntary worker. Do not be confused by etymology. We are speaking English, Dr J. You may indeed find some instance of some writer using "Slave" for "Slav", but that is neither common nor accepted. If you wish to write "Slave" when you mean "Slav", do not complain if you are misunderstood.

.