

## Re: Pyramidable

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-10/0499.html>

---

**From:** Qakare ([qakare\\_at\\_hotmail.com](mailto:qakare_at_hotmail.com))

**Date:** 10/10/04

Date: 10 Oct 2004 05:42:33 -0700

grapheus@www.com (grapheus) wrote in message  
news:<337ae51f.0410091239.5c187295@posting.google.com>...  
> [qakare@hotmail.com](mailto:qakare@hotmail.com) (Qakare) wrote in message  
news:<dad05270.0410090632.61555a56@posting.google.com>...  
> > grapheus@www.com (grapheus) wrote in message  
news:<337ae51f.0410082346.7dc4b54a@posting.google.com>...  
> > > This is one of the best DOGMATIC reasoning I've even read !...  
> > > Qakare considers as "PROVEN" a theory which is not, but as UNPROVEN a  
> > > theory which has DEFINITELY shown to be the ONLY CORRECT ONE !!!!  
> >  
> > Hi Faucounau.  
>  
> AND HERE YOU GO AGAIN !.. Always the SAME MOTTO, applying the rule  
> number one of PROPAGANDA : REPEAT AGAIN AND AGAIN THE SAME LIE and  
> MANY PEOPLE WILL FINISH BELIEVING IT !..

Hi Faucounau alias grapheus. Have you count the number of times you has named people don't sharing your imaginations as dogamtics? There are more then 100 postings in which you are repeating this word. Even in your last posting you had used this word five times. Or that you are talking about proofs without showing a single one? You repeat this statement over and over in more then 500 postings during the last years. If you had some morality, you should be ashamed of your double standard. Anyway in one of your last postings you were writing about naming you as Faucaunou: "But I don't really care. Being considered as a respectable scholar is NOT an insult !.. So, please, GO ON." So if I'm able to do you a favour ...

> > > [qakare@hotmail.com](mailto:qakare@hotmail.com) (Qakare) wrote in  
message<br>news:<dad05270.0410081329.1aae4985@posting.google.com>...  
> > > > grapheus@www.com (grapheus) wrote in  
message<br>news:<337ae51f.0410071328.64e53af0@posting.google.com>...  
> > > > > [qakare@hotmail.com](mailto:qakare@hotmail.com) (Qakare) wrote in  
message<br>news:<dad05270.0410070431.6df0dfce@posting.google.com>...  
> > > > > > grapheus@www.com (grapheus) wrote in  
message<br>news:<337ae51f.0410061218.61bcaae5@posting.google.com>...  
> > > > > > >  
> > > > > > > As Mr Grapheus / faucounau, only one theory, never proved but repeated<br>again

>>>>>>> *and again.*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *And here you go again with your BLATANT LIES !.. I will not mention*  
>>>>>>> *once more your UNPROVEN BUT REPEATED AGAIN AND AGAIN "equation" that I*  
>>>>>>> *would be Faucounau, but I'll just say that the "Proto-Ionian Theory"*  
>>>>>>> *has been PROVED by MORE THAN 30 PROOFS.*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *Faucouanou alias Grapheus,*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *And here you go again with this UNPROVED (and FALSE!) identification*  
>>>>>>> *!..*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *Why unproved? All the consequences of the theory that you are*  
>>>>>>> *Faucounau are verified by the facts.*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *WRONG !.. There are SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES between J.F.'s and*  
>>>>>>> *grapheus' orthography !.. As a general rule, grapheus' orthography is*  
>>>>>>> *BETTER than J.F.'s one.*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *Prove it.*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *Just look at the LIST of J.F.'s orthographical mistakes !..*

It's your theory therefore you have to prove it! Anyway we have already your confession, that you were "correcting" Faucounaus work.

>>>>> *Or is this only enough as proof*  
>>>>> *for theories of respectable scholars?*  
>>>>>  
>>>>> *Ha, ha, ha !!! Even if one accepts your statement – which is FALSE –*  
>>>>> *that J.F. and grapheus would make the SAME orthographical errors,*  
>>>>> *there are more than 10 ways to explain your so-called "proofs" – in*  
>>>>> *fact some "coincidences" – in YOUR "theory" !.. Examples : a)– J.F.*  
>>>>> *has a very bad orthography and "grapheus" corrects his texts (what has*  
>>>>> *been said by grapheus for the texts in English, but only for these)*  
>>>>> *b)– J.F. has too great rheumatisms in his fingers, so that grapheus –*  
>>>>> *who is his wife, his nephew or a friend of his – acts as his*  
>>>>> *secretary c)– J.F. and grapheus have the same typist, Miss Sabrina*  
>>>>> *Chiemgau d)– Etc.*  
>>>>> *Do you have "proofs" that ANY of the hereabove hypotheses CANNOT be*  
>>>>> *true, Mr the DOGMATIC ????*  
>>>>>  
>>>>> *As you have written your explanation was, that you was correcting your*  
>>>>> *articles.*  
<snip of a repeated statement of you>  
>>>>> *Therefore only a) comes in question But you have changed*  
>>>>> *this explanation. At first, you were telling us, that your English*  
>>>>> *teacher has also teached you as Faucounau. Therefore your explanations*  
>>>>> *in this point are not reliable.*  
>>>>>  
>>>>> *Yes. One explanation DOES NOT EXCLUDE the other !... Even if you*

> *didn't notice that... DOGMATICS [number 1] are often BLIND, you know...*

There is nothing written about excluded explanations. You can not deny, that having the same English teacher as Faucounau does not include that you made the mistakes during "correcting" Faucounaus articles.

> > *As for me, I have PROOFS that not only ALL the CONSEQUENCES of the  
> > Proto-Ionic Solution are VERIFIED by the FACTS, but ALSO that ANY  
> > COMPETITIVE THEORY \*IS\* WRONG !..*

> >

> > *State of the art is that it's impossible to decipher an unknown script  
> > in an unknown language, if there is only one short text available (see  
> > Chadwick).*

>

> *AND THIS HAS BEEN SHOWN TO BE WRONG by the mathematician Claude  
> Shannon !.. But you prefer, of course, IGNORING THIS FACT !..*

Wrong! Shannons theory is related to encrypted texts of WELL known languages. In this case you have numerous texts to compare the encrypted message to. Therefore the last part of the statement "if there is only one short text available" is not true for Shannon. There is no contradiction.

> > *A second competitive theory is, that there are significant  
> > structural similarities between the Phaistos Script, Linear A and the  
> > Cretan*

> > *Hieroglyphic Script (see Grumach, Schürr and Duhoux).*

>

> *AND THIS IS WRONG !.. The Signs of the Disk are NOT BELONGING to the  
> large LIST of the "CRETAN HIEROGLYPHS" !... As for seing  
> "similarities" between HIEROGLYPHS and LINEAR SIGNS, it's JUST a  
> WORTHLESS IMAGINATIVE EXERCICE !... Anyone can do it with success,  
> with any script : For instance, the alphabetic letter H may be  
> considered as "coming from" the Cretan Double Axe...*

Maybe I have to write in capital letters for you. I was writing about significant STRUCTURAL similarities. Please read the articles written by Grumach, Schürr and Duhoux before you start talking about them. The point about similar signs as argument does exist only in your imagination.

> > *You are not able to show that these two theories are wrong!*

>

> *Of course, I am !... How many "hieroglyphs" from the Disk on one hand,  
> from the Cretan ones on the second hand, are STRICTLY IDENTICAL ?...  
> NO MORE THAN A HANDFUL ! And the SAME can be said when one compares  
> the Phaistos Disk's Signs with the Egyptian, or with the Hittite  
> Hieroglyphs !...  
> From this, it is CERTAIN that the Phaistos Disk's Script has NOTHING  
> TO DO with CRETE !..*

Your logic is very special: "I'm not able to prove that it's true, therefore it must be wrong." That you are not able to see a relation for the Phaistos Disk to Linear A or the Cretan Hieroglyphs does not mean that such a relation does not exist.

> *ONLY DOGMATICS [number 2] refuse this OBVIOUS CONCLUSION ...*

Even in this posting you repeat again and again the word dogmatic. Obviously you believe that only you are allowed to repeat the same idea. You are indeed a double standard guy.

> > > *Obviously you know that your interpretation of your interpretations*  
> > > *about proto-ioniens as proof for the correctness of your*  
> > > *interpretation of the Phaistos Disk is nonsense. Or what is the reason*  
> > > *that you have deleted the following lines:*  
> > > *:But this is only the definition for a workable theory and not for a*  
> > > *proved one.*  
> > >  
> > > *NO, Sir !.. Because, in THAT SECOND CASE, not only ALL THE*  
> > > *CONSEQUENCES of the Theory are VERIFIED BY THE FACTS , but ALL THE*  
> > > *COMPETITIVE THEORIES have been shown to be or IMPOSSIBLE (using a*  
> > > *false direction of reading, for instance)*  
> > >  
> > *This is nonsense (see last point) and it does not explain that you*  
> > *have deleted the point, that your definition for a proved theory is*  
> > *only the definition for a workable theory.*  
>  
> *This is WHAT \*YOU\* say !..*

You lost.

> > > *or VERY IMPROBABLE ("Minoan*  
> > > *Calendar" for instance, because ALL the CONSEQUENCES that the Phaistos*  
> > > *Disk would be "Minoan" are NOT VERIFIED BY THE FACTS. E.g. the*  
> > > *INEXPLAINED surprising absence of the MOST USUAL MINOAN SIGNS in the*  
> > > *text, like the "Double Axe").*  
> > >  
> > *The text is very short.*  
>  
> *BUT, as DEMONSTRATED by Cl. Shannon, LONG ENOUGH TO BE DECIPHERED !..*

Only, if you are able to compare it with other texts in the same language! Anyway the type of the language is part of shannons formula, therefore you have to determine the language before you are able to know if the message is long enough or not.

> > *You are saying that only half of the signs in*  
> > *the script can be found on the Disk. Therefore the absence of one sign*  
> > *shows nothing.*  
>  
> *THIS IS THE NEGATION of the CALCULUS Of PROBABILITIES !!!!! You are*

> *reasoning as ALL the signs had the same FREQUENCY !!!!*

In a syllabic script the frequencies of the signs are indeed more similar as in an alphabetic script. Additionally your imagination of probabilities is wrong. It's not unlikely that in a short sample, a frequent event is not frequent or missed. Therefore the frequency of one sign says nothing.

> > *Secondly, we didn't know anything about a usual Minoan  
> > calendar. Therefore you are not able to tell something about usual  
> > signs for such a calendar.*  
>  
> *Except that if this calendar is "Minoan", why its signs would be  
> DIFFERENT FROM THE MINOAN HIEROGLYPHS ?... Is an English Calendar  
> using Chinese characters ?... Or a Chinese Calendar alphabetic signs  
> ?...*

Obviously you are not able to understand a sentence without capitals. I was writing about USUAL signs. Does, in an English calendar the signs occur with the same frequency as in a text? No there are more numbers on it. Also additional signs for the zodiac are possible.

> *But of course you DON'T CARE about PROBABILITIES !...*

You are the one ignoring the fact that to decipher the Phaistos Disc by guessing has a chance less than 1 to  $10^{69}$ .

> *For you, as for  
> all the DOGMATICS [number 3], the DOGMA is "true", whatever the CONTRARY  
> PROBABILITIES...*

Very interesting definition of dogmatics: "whatever the contrary probabilities". With other words if something is unsecure its not allowed to say "we didn't know", instead every one has to believe in your imaginations or he is a dogmatic. Very funny.

> *It's IMPOSSIBLE to convince a DOGMATIC [number 4] with  
> SCIENTIFIC ARGUMENTS... The only thing one can do is showing HOW  
> DOGMATIC [number 5] HE IS.*

Why do you use the word dogmatic so often instead of using arguments?

qakare

> *grapheus*