

Re: Fr/lat/ru tu–vous/tu–vos/BK–2K: etymology ?

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007–09/msg01016.html>

- *From:* Franz Gnaedinger <frgn@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 25 Sep 2007 22:09:45 –0700
-

On Sep 25, 4:02 pm, Franz Gnaedinger <f...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 25, 2:05 pm, Harlan Messinger

<hmessinger.remove...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Just in case it isn't obvious to the OP, the "in my opinion" caveat is essential. This analysis is fictitious, kind of a one–man parlor game of Franz's that he finds pleasing but that has no basis in linguistic research and evidence.

Harlan is right, my caveat is essential, on the other hand: we are here in a scientific forum, not in a chat room for beginners, and the sciences move along the borderline between the known and the unknown. Sir Karl Popper, eminent theoretician of the sciences, asked for testable and falsifiable theses, but not only, he also asked for daring theses, the more daring the better. I was wondering about the double form of saying I and me, French je et moi, and I find two possible roots for these words: humming as origin of the m–words, and eye contact as origin of the I / je / ego form, which is also an eye–form: les yeux je, eye I, oculus ego. Moreover, eye words resemble yes words: eye aye, eyes yes, oeil oui, Italian occhio for eye, Occitanian oc for yes, Scottish 'och, aye' as affirmation with a fatalistic note, 'aye, aye, sir' as answer to an order, American OK okay. The Magdalenian origin would have been OC AY -- right eye (oc) left eye (ay). The oldest form of saying yes was a firm look into each other's eyes.

Can anyone explain the double form I and me, je et moi? did anyone ever wonder? Asking questions and proposing answers is the scientific way, avoiding new questions and cutting the world down to a textbook size is the unscientific way so precious to sci.lang and it's killrating mob.

Re: Fr/lat/ru tu-vous/tu-vos/BK-2K: etymology ?