

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/msg00239.html>

- *From:* "Ekkehard Dengler" <ED-RS@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 6 Aug 2008 15:17:54 +0200
-

John Atkinson wrote:

Ekkehard Dengler wrote:

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
wrote:

Dusan
Vukotic
wrote:

Is
there
anyone
who
is
able
to

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

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

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

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

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

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,

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

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.

Very true.

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

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

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, Sankrit 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

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

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.

I have no answer to your specific question, other than what others have already said.

ISTM that in the case of *bher- [strike, bore] and *bher- [weave], it's just about plausible from the semantics that they're the same word (primitive weaving involves sticking something through something).

Thank you for your answer. I would regard the semantic distance between "bore" and "weave" as comparable to that between an earlier meaning of "warp", namely "throw", and "arrange (strands of yarn or thread) so that they run lengthwise in weaving", from which it's only a small step to "weave".

My source, Mallory and Adams, lists them separately, but I said "four- or five-way homophonous" to allow for the possibility that these two were really the same. But in the case of *bher- [carry] and *bher- [brown], for them to have ever been the "same" root seems semantically impossible.

I agree that there's no obvious link between the two, but that doesn't mean that they *must* be unrelated. The semantic bridge might conceivably be "tan

healthy > strong > able to carry heavy loads". Of course I'm not

suggesting that this is what actually happened, but it could have, and we wouldn't necessarily know. Take "red" and "robust", which I understand are both ultimately derived from *reudh-.

And apparently stranger things have happened. My favourite weird-but-(probably)-true etymology is "tabby": "al-3atta:biyya(t), a suburb of Baghdad" > "striped silk" > "striped cat" > "cat" > "spinster" > "gossip". That's quite some distance covered in a handful of centuries.

I don't think it's ever safe to say that the meaning of a word whose history isn't well known couldn't have evolved in a particular way, since, unlike sound change, semantic change is largely unpredictable.

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

If you look at an alphabetical list of PIE roots, there really are an incredible number of apparent homophones. Lots more than just about any modern language I know of, except perhaps Mandarin. In the case of Mandarin we know that it's due to pretty extreme phonetic erosion over the previous millenium or so; but it seems unlikely that this is the case with PIE, which is phonetically pretty complex as languages go (more so than just about all the other "Nostratic" languages).

It is indeed hard to imagine how PIE could be a simplified version of anything.

Seems to me a perhaps more likely explanation is that lots of these roots were never really homophones, but differed in ways that can never be reconstructed via the comparative method, due to phonemes that merged or dropped in *all* the daughter languages (like the laryngeals, only more so, since they left no traces at all). Which I suppose leads back to the old question "Is the linguists' PIE intended to be an approximation to an actual past language, or is it simply the best set of abstract formulas that lead to the IE languages we know?"

At any rate I doubt that it can serve as a basis for reconstructing PPIE etyma.

Regards,
Ekkehard

.