

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-08/msg00725.html>

- *From:* Franz Gnaedinger <frgn@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 16 Aug 2008 01:33:56 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Aug 16, 10:18 am, Franz Gnaedinger <f...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Aug 15, 9:04 pm, Harlan Messinger

<hmessinger.removet...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Franz Gnaedinger wrote:

Apparently nobody is willing to defend the PIE etymologies of English bear German Bär Dutch beer (the bown one, or the wild one, or the overcomer).

This isn't a self-contained game in which the people present are required to start from the same position. The PIE etymology is defended already, by the people who came up with it and anyone who later commented on it. If you want to know what the justification for it is, do the research. The support it has received has nothing to do with the people currently sitting in this newsgroup.

[snipping Franz's "just-so" story; Rudyard Kipling's stories were intended as entertainment, not masqueraded as research]

No, I don't see that anyone defends one of the etymologies. Trond Engen, one post later than your's, does not agree on the overcomer and is not happy with the brown one. Peter T. Daniels kept quiet, you keep quiet, hiding your opinion behind the rack you make about me. The brown one is not convincing at all – why the brown one from *bher– 'brown' and not the growling one from *bher– 'bark, growl'? and how many animals got a brown fur? what would make the brown color of a bear so outstanding that the animal would have been named for it? Likewise the wild one, other animals are as wild as the bear. And the overcomer: every animal of prey overcomes

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

it's prey, is an overcomer. Moreover turning ge- into b- seems like anything-goes-linguistics to me. Why three different PIE etymologies? and why so many homonyms? *bher- this, *bher- that, *bher- *bher- *bher- *bher- *bhere/o *bherg- ... PIE just doesn't reach deep enough, and it's the same problem as always: a successful theory is claimed to cover all there is, it is getting generalized and absolutized and no other view and no other approach is allowed anymore. That's how science goes kooky. I consider my Magdalenian etymology of bear a huge success, and am now definitely challenging PIE. As I said many times: I don't consider PIE fairy tales, but it does not reach deep enough, the sound laws are no real laws (I made Peter T. Daniels concede this much), the verbal morphospace, or the strata of the Eurasian languages can be explored with more methods than sound laws, it contains much more still intact information than previously believed.

PS. Also Douglas G. Kilday keeps quiet. And if there were a convincing etymology of bear Bär beer, Mallory and Adams would have taken it up in their PIE Bible (2006).