

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-08/msg00119.html>

- *From:* Harlan Messinger <hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 04 Aug 2008 02:21:31 -0400
-

analyst41@xxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Aug 3, 6:32 pm, Harlan Messinger
<hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Duaan Vukoti wrote:

On Aug 3, 6:42 pm, Harlan Messinger
<hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx> 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, 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?

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

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".

thats very instructive. Thanks.

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

Of course you will. You'll do anything that you think will poke holes in the standard PIE model without
regard to whether your argument makes any sense.

I am sure there are no homonyms in any PIE reconstruction – since the
neogrammarian principles would prevent two words that sound alike in
the parent language from evolving along dfferent paths in the daughter
languages.

Your understanding is incorrect, since two homonyms that by their nature appear in environments that are
mutually different can evolve separately under the influence of those respective environments.

What's really amazing is how you can continue to gloat about how "sure" you are about the things you are
saying when you have been informed of your incorrectness on objective factual matters as many times as you
have.

.