

Re: Vinca script, cross bar angle – Ki Ri Ke

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-06/msg01043.html>

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 19 Jun 2006 01:42:51 GMT
-

grapheus@xxxxxxx wrote:

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

grapheus@xxxxxxx wrote:

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

Franz Gnaedinger wrote:

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

Why don't
you give me
a page
reference?
Is it the
same
page(s) I
cite in
*The
World's
Writing
Systems*,
sec. 2?

I have / had three books by
Marija Gimbutas:

Die Sprache der Goettin
Die Zivilisation der Goettin
The Goddesses and Gods of
Old Europe

Re: Vinca script, cross bar angle – Ki Ri Ke

I would have preferred the English versions of the two first books, alas, there were only German ones available, beautiful and large volumes, though. I helped a friend of mine with her diploma, and when she got it (well deserved)

I gave her the first book for a present, so I can't tell you the

title of the English original.

May have been: The

Language

of the Goddess, since the English title of the second

book

is: The Civilization of the Goddess, and chapter 8 of

that

book is devoted to the Vinca signs: Heilige Schrift, in

English

probably Sacred Sript.

Marija Gimbutas doesn't mention the

sacred script in The

Goddesses and Gods of Old Europe,

but she does mention it in

her book on the Civilization of the

Goddess, and, as I recall,

also in her book on the

Language

of the Goddess. Beautiful

books. I hope they can be

found

in American libraries.

They were, and I think still are, ubiquitous.

They're published by

HarperSanFrancisco, not exactly a scholarly publisher.

ANOTHER ERROR of yours !.. The original editions were published by

"Thames & Hudson" , a reputable editor !

Re: Vinca script, cross bar angle – Ki Ri Ke

Don't be ignorant.

T&H is a publisher, not an editor. (But not a scholarly publisher.)

Why would an American professor place her work with T&H?

OK, sorry ! I gave only half of the story !.. The book has been published in 1974 by the "Berkeley University of California Press" , and by "Thames & Hudson" . If the last publisher is not a "scholarly" publisher, the first one is.

You are not talking about the two books I described, but about the one I have never seen.

If they were originally published by T&H and only released in the US by HSF, then the copyright page would say so, and it does not.

The English is
the original, the German is a translation.

YES.

The Language of the Goddess (1989),
\$24.95 in pbk. (1991), makes it
abundantly clear that she interprets the signs
as _symbols_ only, what
writing scholars call "ideograms," and hence
not as writing. They are
the sole topic of that book.

CORRECT. But that "it is not "writing" " is YOUR opinion,
which comes
from a restrictive and arbitrary definition of what is "writing"
and
what is not !.. When one accepts the definition that there is "a
script" when any sign or signs–group transmits a message
which can be
understood by the "reader", then one may call "writing" a
"NO ENTRY"
sign as well as the 7 letters alphabetic mention "No entry"..
Both
they convey the same message, and both may be called

Re: Vinca script, cross bar angle – Ki Ri Ke

"script" !..

You may define "script" however you wish. That, however, has no bearing on the definition of "writing."

Writing represents _language_, not _"thought"_.

So, do you believe that one may "think" without using a "language" ???

Philosophers have been discussing that for 2500 years or so.

The only difference between "Ideographic Script" and the other types of (phonetic) script, is that the signs are "read" by the reader in his OWN language, what is not the case with the phonetic scripts, where the "reader" must know the language of the "writer" to fully understand the message.

I repeat it : the distinction you make between what is writing and what is not is ARBITRARY and ARTIFICIAL. It's just a question of CONVENTION.

Chinese script is writing — it cannot be read in any other language. (Sino–Japanese and Sino–Korean are no exception — they can't be read in Chinese.)

Symbols that can be "read" in any language are not writing, because to weaken/broaden the meaning of "writing" to cover any visual/semiotic system merely means that another term would have to be devised for what has hitherto been called "writing."

—

Peter T. Daniels grammatim@xxxxxxx

.