

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/msg00812.html>

- *From:* Franz Gnaedinger <frgn@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 18 Aug 2008 04:21:10 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Aug 17, 5:33 pm, Pat <jpk...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Aug 17, 8:04 am, Franz Gnaedinger <f...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

My thought of this weekend: What if the present is of a fractal structure, enfolding past and future? Language certainly contains both it's past and future, and both in fractal ways.

Where could I get some of what you've been smoking?

That's an old Usenet joke that has grown a long beard. (Beard, by the way, is yet another derivative of Magdalenian BIR.) Do you smoke "funny things"? (quoting Kid Rock). If you care about my advice: love and science are better than drugs.

Now for my weekend thought. The Roman Empire once ruled most of Europe. Where is it now? We have Roman ruins, artefacts in the ground, the Lex Romana at the foundation of western law, and Latin words in western languages. All in all the once powerful Roman Empire has a fractal presence in our time, and the same is true of every past. What about the future? it will develop and evolve from parts of our present and in that sense has also a fractal presence in our time. If we remove the fractal past and the fractal future from the present, also our actual present is of a fractal nature ... Over the weekend I read a book about time: Michael Lockwood, The Labyrinth of Time, Introducing the Universe, Oxford University

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Press, first published in 2005. Fractals are not mentioned in the book. For example Minkoswkian space-time is locally Euclidian, as a tiny part of the surface of a saucer is practically flat. Yet if you look really close at a tiny part of the surface, it gets ragged, namely on the scale of molecules and nuclei and particles, and fractal geometry would be more appropriate. Also the surface of the light-cone can't be real smooth, for light – as Richard P. Feynman showed – moves at every speed, also backward in time, and follows every path, also zigzag lines, also performing loops, also writing the Bible en passant, and in every language. Only the average speed equals about 186,287 miles or nearly 300,000 km a second, and only the sum total of all pathways results in a geodesic line in space-time. And so on. All we ever know is the here and now, but our present is of a fractal nature, containing an enrolled fractal past and future. I like this thought, and formulated it for my future readers, as I don't write – you may now this – for the present members of sci.lang. Seems to be a contradiction. But think about it. As the future is enrolled in the present, though in fractal form, I can well write for future readers, and maintain kind of a dialogue with thinkers of the past ...

You see? science is better than drugs, mind-boggling and great fun. There is only one thing better than science. You know what I mean. I told you above.

.