

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/msg00766.html>

- *From:* Harlan Messinger <hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 17 Aug 2008 08:21:32 -0400
-

Franz Gnaedinger wrote:

On Aug 16, 5:51 pm, Harlan Messinger
<hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

(...)

The brown one and the wild one don't convince me as etymologies of bear. You can't say anything in defence of these etymologies, nor can anyone else in here, nor did Mallory and Adams take it up in their PIE bible, nor do they propose another etymology.

If you looked at the works of Newton for a defense of relativity and didn't find it, and the people with whom you were discussing it didn't give you one, is that all you need to honestly and sincerely discard the theory of relativity?

All I see are offences. "Analyst"
pointed out a shortcoming of PIE,

Since much of what Analyst says is irrational, who cares?

and the longer
you offend me

Offend you? Get over yourself.

the shorter and shorter you come

yourself. My Magdalenian approach solves the
problem in a big sweep,

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Much as Kipling's "just-so" stories "solve" many of our questions about animal biology.

> and I have this beautiful

vision of the verbal morphospace keeping more intact and retrievable information on the human past than previously held possible. My task will now be to remove the obstacles for other people so they can share my vision.

So this isn't about reality, this is about sharing your vision.

One obstacle is surely the blind belief in Darwin's model of gradual evolution.

Yeah, instead we should all blindly believe you? Get over yourself.

.