

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-06/msg01164.html>

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 21 Jun 2006 18:08:36 GMT
-

Franz Gnaedinger wrote:

Peter T. Daniels wrote:

We've been trying for a decade to do that, but the publisher has no interest in a new edition.

A pity.

You should learn to spell what you're talking about. What "decipherment"? Are you now going to claim that they record language and not quantities?

Is the name quipu? Sorry, then. But for me they are a form of writing.

Yes, you like to use words in your own private sense. They're not writing to anyone who studies writing carefully.

Also noting numbers is a form of writing, and as

No, noting numbers is not a form of writing, it's ideography.

far as I know the first knots of each string indicate a place. You can decipher numbers as well as letters. On the Babylonian clay tablet Plimpton 322 are only numbers, yet they have been written, and later deciphered. I don't live

No Babylonian tablet needs to be "deciphered" any more; the decipherment was done well over 150 years ago. Mayan numerals could be read for centuries before anyone even imagined that Maya writing was true writing

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

and not ideography to which the key was lost. Likewise, Egyptian hieroglyphic numbers could be read for decades before Champollion imagined that Egyptian writing was true writing and not ideography to which the key was lost.

in the cage of your categories and choking classifications,

Do they record language?

Numbers are part of every language, and places too.

And neither numerals nor location glyphs for places belong to any particular language.

I don't have a glass eye.

You go on dismissing the book by Derk Ohlenroth without having laid much as the empty box of a blind old glass eye on it, then. Doesn't make it any better, does it?

I don't have such a box, either. If you don't understand why the P.D. is undecipherable as matters stand, then your entire battle with g. was for nought.

I will continue to dismiss every book about P.D.

There, you say it again. And you hope I will take you seriously again?

I will also dismiss every book of so-called "American epigraphy," by Barry Fell and his dupes.

I have carefully read Cyrus Gordon's work. It is baseless, so anything based on it is equally baseless.

I know how you read Derk Ohlenroth, not at all, and how you read chapter 8, The Sacred Script, of The Civilization of the Goddess by Marija Gimbutas, twisting her words, and I know how you read my messages. Won't take stock

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

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

in your reading capabilities.

I've never claimed to have read D.O., and I've read Gimbutas's chapter — or rather, the chapter in her book that contains things she herself never claimed.

What makes you think this one particular tepe, out of all the tepes that have been excavated and all the ones that haven't yet been, is special? Because it's one you happen to have heard of?

Big sigh. If you had participated in the anthropological congress held in southern Germany in 1898 (as I recall) you would certainly have voted for the cave paintings being fakes. The participants of that memorable congress voted, and then officially concluded that cave paintings are fakes. You had voted for fakes without ever much as having looked at a cave painting yer own self, and you certainly will never look at the publications by Klaus Schmidt on Goebekli Tepe. For others I recommend his book that appeared recently. Just have a look at the pictures. And always have the time in mind: 11 600 – 9 500 BP (before present).

Just looking at the pictures accomplishes nothing. You need to read the text, also. Presumably it puts that site into the context of the other sites of the same period.

I ask again, what's special about that particular site, as opposed to all the other sites from similar times and places?

Apparently you have never read *The Language of the Goddess*, which is a very big book about the Vinc^a script and nothing else, which makes no claim whatsoever that the Vinc^a script is writing (except, of course, in the art historian sense that any visual semiotic system may be labeled "writing").

Yes, The Language of the Goddess is about symbols "only."
As I told you I have that book no more but gave it to a friend of mine as a present for her diploma, which is why I wrongly mentioned that book in the first place.

Then you should either go to the library, or buy yourself another copy.

The chapter on the
Sacred Script is found in The Civilization of the Goddess,

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

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

1991, and the way you are twisting Marija Gimbutas' words in that chapter surley earns you a seat of honor among the conspiracy kooks of talks.origins.

"Her" words in that chapter do not agree with anything she wrote over the previous decades on the topic. It is therefore unlikely in the extreme that she intended what that chapter says.

I am tired of your silly and systematic denying of everything that goes beyond your book. Contact Joan Marler herself and ask her about the Sacred Script. Here her address:

jmarler (a) archaeomythology.org

I contacted her this morning and just received her reply. She is leaving for Europe and will read my pages when she returns.

That's a typical polite response to nutcases who write to professors.

For the time being she forwarded my mail to a Finnish linguist called Harald Haarman, the foremost expert on the Danube / Vinca script, as she tells me.

Then you'll deserve what you get. Look up the reviews of his book, *Universalgeschichte der Schrift*. A while back he sent me, unsolicited, a package of offprints, and he's just as wacky as the others.

That's been done, actually. 10 or 15 years ago, they diverted the waters for several months so they could shore up the precipice and update the power stations. Unfortunately I didn't get to go see it.

Must have been a spectacle.

Again, one of the questions you ignored: How can you equate a Balkan language of 5000 BCE with an Anatolian language of 15,000 BCE?

Sighing again. I am pondering the Magdalenian level from around 15 000 BP, Goebekli Tepe lasted from 11 600 to 9 500 BP, the Vinca script from around 8 000 to 5 000 BP. Magdalenian GYN 'women' became Ki Nae in the Balkans, gynae in ancient Greek. Magdalenian NAI 'to find a good

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

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

place for to build a camp' may have become Nae in the Balkans, represented by an Y, which, combined with an arc for Os yields Nae Os for sanctuary. The Y may symbolize two confluent rivers on the one hand, suitable for a camp, and the female Y on the other had, indicating that the sanctuary of the goddess is her womb, since the upper lines of the womb of several figurines form a clear arc, and the womb of the Bird Goddess was the origin of life. There is plenty of wit * in the Vinca script. I love it.

Answer the question. What makes you think there is any legitimacy whatsoever in comparing "languages" that are 10,000 years apart and hundreds (or thousands?) of kilometers apart?

* While you are trying to be drier than an English man.
And you succeed. Which, however, amuses me sometimes.

—
Peter T. Daniels grammatim@xxxxxxx