

# Re: More Etymology!

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-02/msg01037.html>

---

- *From:* "Peter T. Daniels" <[grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:grammatim@xxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 13 Feb 2007 05:57:56 -0800
- 

On Feb 13, 4:49 am, "Franz Gnaedinger" <[f...@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:f...@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

I have combined Franz's two replacement replies into one.

I wrote a long reply, posted it. My post was succesful, Google said, but until now it did not arrive, so I write a small part of it again:

Yes, google lies. I realized after losing just a few posts to google that the way to beat it is to copy -- initially, just to the Clipboard -- the full text of my reply. If I don't have immediate confirmation that my message has been posted, I Paste the reply into a Notepad file and try again a few minutes later.

my  
distinction between pictures, pictograms,  
hieroglyphs, glyphs, and writing. Also the star  
counting doesn't work, it gives me a sum total  
of 32 ratings while I got 3,024 ratings yesterday  
morning. Heidi: look up the `_profile_`, I told you  
so in my long message about Google rating  
a couple of days ago in another thread (please  
read my replies when I take my time answering  
your questions).

On Feb 12, 8:38 pm, "Peter T. Daniels" <[gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

I don't have Klaus Schmidt here to ask.

Read his book.

I asked `_you_`.

## Re: More Etymology!

And I told you that I agree on his distinction.

You have not stated what is distinction is. I have told you that his book is not available to me, and from your description, it does not sound like a professional site report, but a popularization.

What is the distinction that seems plausible to you?  
Then you are using a strange definition of "pictogram."

You say that the bit that can be read /nar mer/ is "writing" because it is "hieroglyphs"?

Now, then, you must define both "writing" and "hieroglyphs," as well as "pictogram."

Pictures represent, say, animals. Pictograms convey precise messages via symbolic pictures.

This is not how "pictogram" is used by scholars of semiotic systems. I believe that you would convey your meaning if you used "ideogram" instead.

The horses in a Paleolithic cave painting may be just animals, or they may represent the sun: the descending horses in the niche at the rear end of the axial gallery of Lascaux the winter sun (Marie E.P. König), the red horse in the rotunda of Lascaux the rising midsummer sun (me) ... Narmer possibly was the legendary Menes who united Egypt after two hundred years of war. The pictures on the Narmer palette convey his victory, and his position in the Nile valley, on the basis of an ancient and mostly but not completely lost ancient iconography. I identified Narmer with the constellation of Orion, his servant with Sirius, and the falcon in front of him with Aldebaran. So

Do you find any justification for this whatsoever in Egyptian astronomical texts? (Yes, there are Egyptian astronomical texts.)

## Re: More Etymology!

the pictures on the Narmer palette are pictograms: conveying precise messages via symbolic pictures. The two small signs on top have phonetic values: nar mer, they form a minimal string of two phonetic signs and convey his name, Narmer, so they are writing. The sign 'nar' shows a fish, but the meaning of the picture doesn't count anymore, all that counts is the phonetic value 'nar'. Our letter A came from the picture of the head of an oxen, you can still see it when you turn it upside down, but ALASKA doesn't mean land of oxen. 'A' was once the picture of the head of an ox, became a pictogram, then a hieroglyph, then a glyp, and now is a simple letter in writing.

Your definition of "writing" is the correct one, but "A" never "became" an [ideo]gram, and you have still not defined "hieroglyph" or "glyp[h]."

I snip the rest, hoping to come through at least with this.

On Feb 13, 5:09 am, "Franz Gnaedinger" <f...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

As the new Google interface doesn't work properly, and swallowed my long and careful reply, I answer piece by piece now, hastily, so that I come through.

On Feb 12, 8:38 pm, "Peter T. Daniels" <gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I left in that entire pointless paragraph to show that you still don't have the slightest idea what I or your more persistent critics are talking about, and how when we raise the crucial objections, you simply ignore them.

My paragraph was a \_reductio ad absurdum\_ of your understanding of language.

Well, you've gone and removed it, so I don't know what you're talking about, but, no, it wasn't.

We are NOT TALKING ABOUT 147,592 BP; we are talking about the Magdalenian Period, for which you have reconstructed a linguistic system that you posit as an ancestor to Indo-European. We are talking about a period when human language was already as evolved as it was

## Re: More Etymology!

going to get, when the human speech ability was identical to what it is today. (Even evolution understands "If it ain't broke, don't fix it.")

Language is the means of getting help, support and understanding from those we depend upon in one way or another — and every means of getting help, support and understanding may be called language, on whatever level of life it occurs ... (my definition of from 1974/75).

No matter how many times you repeat it, it does not become a useful or helpful definition of "language." Fortunately, it is irrelevant here.

Language was different in Magdalenian times, since life was different. I assume that words by then consisted of one or two or three phonemes. I make this assumption, and I look how far I get with it. It led me to the discovery of my four laws of Magdalenian, and using these laws, I mined plenty of Magdalenian words.

As you say, this is your assumption. You have taken to ending every post with an assertion that you make arguments that are never answered. You have, however, never offered an argument in support of this assumption.

You are completely incapable of explaining how a language you posit for Franco-Cantabria before 12,000 could be identical to the language you posit for GT half a millennium later (never mind the spurious specificity of your dates), and how that one language could be ancestral to Indo-European, thousands of years later and thousands more km away.

Magdalenian art came to a sudden stop around 12,000 years ago. My claim is that the learned – shamans and arch-shamans and their folks – wandered northward and eastward, following the retiring animals, and so some of them came to the Eurasian steppes and Anatolia, where the Magdalenian language turned into Azilian and later into the language called Japhetic.

There are no such thing as "Azilian" and "Japhetic" languages, but

Re: More Etymology!

Re: More Etymology!

that has nothing to do with the point. While they were "wandering" north and east for thousands of years, their language did not stay the same. GT-language was NOT the same as Magdalenian language.

What is your evidence that it "certainly" does anything of the sort?

Google introduced rating, in order to cope with too much nonsense. They are certainly watching now whether it works, and how it works.

So your evidence is a repeated assertion.

You assert that again and again, yet you never offer an argument in support of your approach.

Titles, ranking, Google stars, and your going along with the mainstream may count in academe, for publishing houses, etc., but not in the sciences per se, where only one thing counts: arguments and better arguments.

We wish you would offer any sort of argument at all.

I say it again: the above is only the stripped rump of the second part of a long and carefully written message I posted before, Google said my post was successful, but it did not arrive.