

Re: Etymology of "Ketzer"

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-06/msg00162.html>

- *From:* me <noreply@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 03 Jun 2006 19:13:59 -0500
-

Neeraj Mathur wrote:

"Holly" <noon_union@xxxxxxxx> wrote ...

me wrote:

Holly wrote:

I read that the Dravidian word for fish "min" is the same sound as their word for star; therefore they use the fish pictogram with other pictograms when writing about a star.

Dravidians don't use pictograms and use [mi:n] only for "fish", not for star. Star is [vel.l.I] in Tamil.

One of the places that I got my information was from here.
<http://www.ancientscripts.com/indus.html>

That doesn't say that Dravidians *currently* use pictograms. Today's Dravidians typically use "abugida" scripts and don't use pictograms.

1) A proposed reconstruction for the Proto-Dravidian word for fish matches that for star, giving *mi:n. (I suppose that Dravidianists will be able to give us the evidence for these reconstructions; it is of course not nearly good enough to say that because one particular language, Tamil, has no reflex for *mi:n in the meaning 'star' that the word could not have existed in that meaning in Proto-Dravidian, which me is suggesting.

I said it *is*n't *the* Dravidian word. With the meaning "star", [mi:n] is used only as a morpheme; it isn't used as a word. That is, Dravidians use

Re: Etymology of "Ketzer"

words containing the morpheme [mi:n] meaning star but Dravidians don't use [mi:n] as the word for "star". "vAnil mIn irukku" and "AkAs;attil mIn uNDu" would invite quizzical frowns since they would mean ONLY "there are fish in the sky" in Tamil and Malayalam, respectively.

I don't know of anything like this happening in Indo-European languages;

On vanity licence plates, 2 can mean "to", 4 can mean "for", etc.

.