

# Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-08/msg00118.html>

---

- *From:* "John Atkinson" <[johnacko@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:johnacko@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 04 Aug 2008 04:22:05 GMT
- 

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

On Aug 3, 9:26 pm, [analys...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:analys...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx) wrote:

On Aug 3, 6:32 pm, Harlan Messinger wrote:

Duaan Vukoti wrote:

On Aug 3, 6:42 pm, Harlan Messinger  
<[hmessinger.removet...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:hmessinger.removet...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>  
wrote:

Duaan Vukoti wrote:

Is there  
anyone who  
is able to  
explain the  
homonymy  
of English  
bear (carry,  
cause to be  
born) and  
bear  
(omnivorous  
animal/mammal)?  
Why and  
how has it  
happened?

Because there isn't any  
reason why it \*wouldn't\*  
happen, and both  
words evolved in  
unsurprising ways to  
become, as it happens,

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales  
homonyms.

And how that "unsurprising way" looked  
like? Could you be more  
specific? What bear (carry, cause to be born,  
bring forth) and bear  
(animal) have in common?

Why don't you LOOK THEM UP and find out for yourself if  
you want to  
know what they are? If you haven't bothered to look up the  
details,  
then you have no basis for disputing them.

Maybe you believe it happened by chance?

Yes.

But  
what if there is no accidental  
word-developing within the IE  
vocabulary?

Who said anything about "accidental word-developing"?  
What does that  
even mean?

In French, the words "ou" ("or"), "où" ("where"), "houx"  
("holly"),  
"houe" ("hoe"), and "août" ("August") are all homonyms,  
derived,  
respectively, from the non-homonymic words Latin "aut",  
Latin  
"ubi", Old High German "hulis", Old High German "houwâ",  
and Latin  
"Augustus".

## Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

thats very instructive. Thanks.

But of course I would use something like this to poke holes in the standard PIE model.

I am sure there are no homonyms in any PIE reconstruction – since the

Sheesh, you've never even opened a "dictionary of Indo-European roots" and noticed all the homophonous ones????

neogrammarian principles would prevent two words that sound alike in the parent language from evolving along different paths in the daughter languages.

Very true.

But nothing prevents them from having taken on different affixes, surviving with different vowel grades, different accents, etc.

All of which seem to have occurred in the case of \*bher-, which was apparently four- or five-way homophonous in PIE:

\*bher- [boil] > Latin fermentum, Greek porphu:ro:, Sanskrit bhurati

\*bher- [brown] > English brown, Greek phru:nos, (with suffix, via \*bhruHnos); and Sanskrit babhru-, Gaulish beberu-, Latin fiber, English beaver, Lithuanian bebrus, Russian bobr, Avestan bawra (with reduplication, via \*bhebhru-); and English bear, Lithuanian be:ras (via bhe:ro-)

\*bher- [carry] > Old Irish beirid, Latin fero:, English bear, Albanian bie, Greek phero:, Armenian berem, Sanskrit bhurati, Tocharian p&r, Russian beru, Lithuanian beriu; and OCS breme, Greek ferma, Sanskrit bharman (with suffix, via \*bhermn-); and Latin fors, English birth, Sanskrit bhrti- (with suffix, via \*bhrtis)

\*bher- [cure] > Lithuanian burti, Albanian bar, Greek pharmakon

\*bher- [strike, bore] > Latin ferio:, English bore, Greek pharao:, Irish bern, Lithuanian bar(i)u, Russian borju, Armenian brem, Persian burrad, Sanskrit brna:ti; and Old Irish bruid, Latin frustum, English bruise, Albanian bresh@r (with suffix, via \*bhreus-)

\*bher- [weave] > Lithuanian burvam, Greek pharos (with suffix via \*bhrw-, bolt of cloth)

John.

.