

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

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-08/msg00523.html>

---

- *From:* Franz Gnaedinger <[frgn@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:frgn@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 12 Aug 2008 06:48:12 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Aug 12, 12:56 pm, Harlan Messinger  
<[hmessinger.removet...@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:hmessinger.removet...@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Myths, legends, and folk etymologies have long been created to "explain" many things. The fact that they seem to "explain" them does not mean they are the actual explanations of them. Do you believe Rudyard Kipling's story about how the camel got its hump? Your "laws" \*are\* fantasies that you decree to be true simply because you say so.

I called you a liar because you always deny that I work in a systematic manner: observing my four Magdalenian laws, being guided by physiology, archaeology, anthropology, and my theory of language from 1974/75. I mined a Magdalenian vocabulary using my four laws. You may consider them ridiculous and stupid, but the fact remains that I mined my words using my laws, and now I am looking what I can do with my reconstructions. And I achieve a lot, just now bringing together the many PIE homonyms \*bher- in an easy and effortless manner. My etymology of bear is much more encompassing than the PIE etymologies. Mallory and Adams 2006 don't even explain English bear, and they don't even mention fur. PIE has many shortcomings. Get honest and concede them instead of pretending that PIE is the one and only true theory on early language. Sound laws are no real laws, PIE formulas are not always reliable, there are other methods required to get back to early language. I stand along against the whole front, all of you, and the killrating mob, and yet I go on at my usual quick pace.

.