

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-08/msg00741.html>

- *From:* Franz Gnaedinger <frgn@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 16 Aug 2008 08:08:30 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Aug 16, 3:38 pm, Harlan Messinger
<hmessinger.removet...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

So they just magically appear in the reference books without anyone ever having done the research and written up the analysis that arrives at the conclusions reported in the reference books? Just because you haven't seen them doesn't mean they doesn't exist. Meanwhile, stop disagreeing with things you haven't even seen.

They don't appear "magically" in textbooks, they have been proposed: bear as the brown one (from *bher- brown) and bear as the wild one (from *gwer-), but I don't see anyone in sci.lang defend one of these etymologies, nor propose another one, and above all Mallory and Adams 2006 don't mention any etymology of English bear German Bär Dutch beer. So there is no convincing etymology, a fact all the aggressive and humiliating replies to me can't conceal, on the contrary, all your aggressive and humiliating replies, and the killrating campaign, confirm my opinion. Centuries of IE and PIE studies involving thousands of scholars, and still no convincing etymology of English bear German Bär Dutch beer ...

.