

Re: ,

**Re: ,**

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-07/msg00900.html>

---

- *From:* "Richard Wordingham" <[jrw0602@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jrw0602@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 19 Jul 2007 00:41:13 GMT
- 

<lorad474@xxxxxx> wrote:

On Jul 16, 7:26 am, Dusan Vukoti <[dusan.vuko...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dusan.vuko...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Derived from Baltic...? Would you like to say that Slavic is a "child" language and that Slavic branch was separated from Baltic "nucleus"?

That is exactly what I am saying.  
Linguistic cladistics conducted by other researchers confirms this.

If so, have you anything to substantiate such a "theory"?  
DV

Google. 'linguistic cladistics' + 'genetic relationship' + 'university of pennsylvania'..

Or just read this:

<http://www3.isrl.uiuc.edu/~junwang4/langev/localcopy/pdf/nakhleh05JLSA.pdf>

All this shows is the traditional view – that Balto–Slavonic split into Baltic and Slavonic. It provides no reason to label the common ancestral language as Baltic.

A biological analogy with what 'lorad' seemed to be saying can be found in the modern view of man and the great apes. The traditional view has two families, Pongidae for the great apes and Hominidae for man. However, it now appears that the oldest split was between orang–utangs and the rest, then gorillas versus the rest, then man versus the chimpanzees, and then the split between the chimpanzees and the pigmy chimpanzees. If this view is correct, then man should not be placed in a different family. Now, in this case, Hominidae is the older name, so rather than demoting Hominidae from a family to a subfamily (Homininae), we have to call the whole family Hominidae. We still end up using Homininae for what has long been called Hominidae.

Re: ,

Re: ,

However, Ringe & co.'s study shows nothing of the sort. It shows a clean split between Baltic on one hand and Slavonic on the other – the traditional model.

Richard.

.