

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/msg00917.html>

---

- *From:* Harlan Messinger <[hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 20 Aug 2008 06:53:33 -0400
- 

Franz Gnaedinger wrote:

On Aug 19, 2:52 pm, Harlan Messinger  
<[hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

If that's true, then it's a valid factor to be considered.

Why didn't you say so the first time? instead of maiming  
my argument?

You're  
whining about ideas being rejected for no reason, just because they're  
new ideas. Or are you under the impression that all new ideas should be  
blindly accepted, without regard to their validity?

They should be discussed by means of scientific  
arguments.

YOU have to present a scientific argument in the first place.

Neither by rating or by ad hominem  
nor by escaping to meta-levels, which is your  
favorite way of discussing. Kooks always escape  
to meta-levels.

No, kooks always complain when they aren't treated in the manner that serious researchers are, and the reason they aren't is because their claims fall apart at the meta-levels and include nothing that merits discussion at the base level.

You always escape to meta-levels.  
Apparently because you are a kook yourself.

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

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

Which has nothing to do with the rejection of new ideas.

Of course. Solar energy was rejected for twenty years or longer for not being efficient enough. It could be made efficient. Brilliant researchers got no funds and no encouragement on the basis of that wrong argument. Because powerful lobbies bush and bull the other way.

Rather than deal scientifically with people's failure to be impressed by your "bear" arguments, here you are once again "escaping to the meta-level" of bitching about how you are being treated like proponents of solar energy.

Since I stand to lose no money from your "bear" argument, your solar energy analogy remains inapplicable. Oh, and people use solar energy all over the place, so there is no doubt that it *\*works\**. Again, this puts it in an entirely different class from your arguments, which are rejected altogether.

Your words are exactly where you put them: in your message. They do not have to be repeated in every single message the follows it, and they *\*shouldn't\** be kept by people who aren't planning to address them, because it makes each subsequent message harder and harder to work with and obscures the *\*new\** material being added.

It is one of your foul tactics to maim and mutilate my arguments and thus forcing me to repeat them over and over again until I am tired and exhausted

> and become sloppy and then you can hang me.

FORCING you? If I've already explained why I don't believe you, (a) how does that FORCE you to repeat them and (b) what makes you think repeating them is going to change my mind? Do you think that repeating weak arguments makes them stronger? If you don't want to repeat them, THEN DON'T. (By the way: the overall problem is not that you become sloppy. Your reasoning is sloppy from the get-go.)

I am fed up with this way of discussing.

THEN STOP IT.

The topic of this thread is the etymology of bear. Contribute

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

Re: proof that most etymologies are only fairy-tales

to this question, or keep away from me.

Are you under the impression that you should have a free pass to write whatever nonsense you want and not have it called to your attention? Your sense of entitlement is awe-inspiring.

.