

Re: Waradpande seems to have destroyed PIE already

# Re: Waradpande seems to have destroyed PIE already

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-12/msg00086.html>

---

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <[grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 2 Dec 2007 11:08:10 -0800 (PST)
- 

On Dec 2, 12:35 pm, Franz Gnaedinger <[f...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:f...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Dec 2, 3:38 pm, "Peter T. Daniels" <[gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

What is "definitionem"?

Typo. Per definitionem, by definition. A law can be violated, per definitionem, by definition, otherwise it weren't a law.

Please learn the meaning of "sound law."

Sound laws allow some reconstructions and forbid others.

No; on the one hand that's not a definition, and on the other it's not what they do.

Now if the sound laws of PIE hold,

That has no meaning.

there are the traditional solutions provided by comparative linguistics, and now there is a new one, the Magdalenian solution. I prepared a test case concerning words for wolf, differing pointedly from the traditional PIE reconstruction; apparently it is possible under the sound laws

Re: Waradpande seems to have destroyed PIE already

Re: Waradpande seems to have destroyed PIE already

of PIE, as nobody pointed out a violation of one of those sound laws in my reconstruction.

You have not announced the discovery of any principled regularity a la "Grimm's Law," "Verner's Law," "Grassman's Law," etc.

Please learn the meaning of "experiment."

Please learn about the bottom up approach in ever more scientific disciplines, as opposed to the usual top down approach. For example in robotics, at the university of Zurich. Making a robot walk in the traditional way, programming its gait, is very hard. Now a team at the university of Zurich experiment

Please learn the meaning of "experiment."

with very simple elements. For example with a dog-like creature made of metal sheet and simple electromotors that move the legs. No programming at all. The only thing is you can run more or less electricity through the electromotors. Give little electricity and the animal walks. Give more electricity and it walks at a quicker pace. Give again more electricity and it breaks into a trot. Give again more electricity and it is trotting faster. Give again more electricity and it breaks into a run ... This animal can walk, trot, and run. These ways of moving forward are not programmed, they emerge in combination of the simple motors and the specially shaped elegant and elastic metal spine. This team is experimenting all day long. What other word can I use instead of experimenting? What is wrong about the word experiment in this context? I really don't know what you mean.

Precisely.

.