

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/msg00184.html>

- *From:* "Ekkehard Dengler" <ED-RS@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 5 Aug 2008 14:21:22 +0200
-

John Atkinson wrote:

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

On Aug 3, 9:26 pm, analys...@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

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

Dusan Vukotic wrote:

On Aug 3, 6:42 pm, Harlan
Messinger
<hmessinger.removet...@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Dusan
Vukotic
wrote:

Is
there
anyone
who
is
able
to
explain
the
homonymy
of
English
bear
(carry,
cause
to
be
born)
and

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

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

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.

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 dfferent paths in
the
daughter languages.

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

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 bharati, 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)

How does one decide that *bher-, *bher-, *bher-, *bher- and *bher- are separate roots, though, other than on the basis of perceived semantic plausibility? How does the fact that they've undergone different changes show that they were different to begin with? German "saugen, saugte, gesaugt" and "saugen, sog, gesogen" both mean "suck", for instance, and go back to the same root, as far as I know, but they're not always interchangeable. There must be better examples, but I can't think of any. Now supposing German were Proto-Indo-European and supposing the weak variant of the verb had changed its meaning to, say, "drink" or further to "get drunk", "be drunk", "talk indistinctly", "talk unintelligibly", "talk nonsense", "clown around" or "be a fool", how would one avoid concluding that they must be homonyms? I realise these are uninformed questions, but they're not rhetorical.

Regards,
Ekkehard

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales