

# Re: Greek Psi

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2009-02/msg00590.html>

---

- *From:* Harlan Messinger <[hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 27 Feb 2009 20:19:40 -0500
- 

analyst41@xxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Feb 27, 8:41 am, Harlan Messinger  
<[hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

analys...@xxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Feb 27, 3:42 am, f...@xxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Feb 26, 5:59 pm, Harlan Messinger  
<[hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx)>  
wrote:

"Test case" implies  
falsifiability. You keep  
stating proudly that your  
conjectures are unfalsifiable,  
meaning that they are  
immune to testing.  
You don't seem to  
understand what you are  
talking about at all.

BIR means fur, especially the fur on which a  
newborn was laid  
(a peculiar meaning imposed by the  
permutation group, for,  
as I said many times, Magdalenian words  
don't come alone  
but in groups). The word has many  
derivatives, also of the  
second and third degree – a great many  
derivatives I listed  
up in five subsequent messages in my thread  
Magdalenian  
experiment (near the begin of that thread, to  
be retrieved  
via the Google interface of sci.lang).  
Yesterday I heard

Re: Greek Psi

Bob Dylan's song Man Gave Name to All  
the Animals and  
was amused about the first animal he namd:  
man saw an  
animal that liked to growl and had furry hair,  
so he thought  
he will name it a bear ... That's exactly my  
explanation of  
bear as the furry one, provider of the best  
fur, thick, longhaired,  
soft and warm. My explanation can't be  
falsified and disproved  
by anyone. And nobody could provide new  
and better evidence  
for the PIE explanation of bear as the brown  
one, which, in my  
opinion, is a lame explanation, someone  
looked up the six  
homonyms \*bher- and thought \*bher-  
'brown' fit best for the  
bear. I can easily unite the six \*bher-  
homonyms under BIR,  
and as fur very often is brown, also this  
aspect is included  
in my explanation. You Americans like  
competition, but not  
in sci.lang, you want PIE being the only  
language model,  
you like to have a monopole, you build up a  
wall of bricks.  
With my excellent Magdalenian etymology  
of bear I pose  
a real callenge, now you should show me  
and the lurkers  
how good PIE is, how it can cope with the  
views of alleged  
cranks, but you can't, you don't give me any  
evidence for  
the brown one, bear is just the brown one  
because you say  
so (using your favorite turn of phrase), albeit  
even the PIE  
hardliner Trond Engen is not happy about  
the brown one.  
Being such a lame etymology. Leading  
nowhere. While  
my BIR led me far since last August, when I  
went for the  
etymology of bear, even to a cosmic fur,  
namely the fur  
BIR of the fur giver BIR GID which

Re: Greek Psi

contained the primeval  
world BIR LAD and is depicted as a form I  
call 'bowl' on  
pillar 31 of temple D, Göbekli Tepe, in a  
hieroglyphic  
inscription I identified as origin of Genesis  
1:1 in the Bible:  
)OG BIR AC CA  
(also in my Magdalenian thread). Fertility, a  
word coming  
from BRI meaning fertile, is the first test of  
a new hypothesis  
that must solve problems and open windows  
and alleys,  
real test cases are then only a question of  
time. And, by the  
way, what are the test case you offer in  
testing the etymology  
of bear as the brown one? does bear mean  
the brown one  
just because you say so, no test and no  
evidence needed?

Yes – the establishmentarians know fully well that not a  
shred of  
what they call PIE can be proved or tested in any way with  
what we  
know up to now – and so their throwing fasifiability in your  
face is  
nonsensical.

You seem not to know the difference between "falsified" and "proved". Of  
course, every hypothesis of PIE theory can be falsified, as soon as a  
counterexample comes along that doesn't fit the current state of the  
model. That is, in fact, why PIE theory keeps changing.

Let us for the moment overlook that there is no one PIE theory agreed  
to by the establishment.

What would be an example of a datum "falsifying" PIE theory as of a  
certain point in time and how did theory change to accomodate it?

I need to demonstrate to you that conjectures have come and go and that the model has changed? Read up on  
the history yourself.

Let me even help you here. They say that the discovery of Tocharian  
changed the received opinion up to that time about the Kentum–Satem

Re: Greek Psi

split.

But that didn't occur because anything was falsified– all that happened was that one unprovable assertion was replaced by another unprovable assertion.

You still seem not to understand the concept of falsifying, nor its central role in separating science from what Franz is doing. The one assertion was shown false, so it was rejected. Another conjecture was chosen, which is also falsifiable. Yes, it is another conjecture. You have already been told here that no one argues that the reconstructions are perfect, solid facts. It has been explained to you that PIE theorists know perfectly well that the model at any given time is subject to revision. Yet you perpetuate the fiction that it's a blind and unyielding dogma, so that you can hang onto your self-perceived role as the hero revealing the truth.

.