

# Re: Solid Ground

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2007-09/msg01102.html>

---

- *From:* hagen <dan5mark@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Fri, 14 Sep 2007 13:41:52 -0700
- 

On Sep 14, 8:42 pm, grapheus <graph...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 14, 3:17 pm, hagen <dan5m...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 14, 2:01 pm, grapheus <graph...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 14, 1:31 pm, hagen <dan5m...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 14, 11:41 am, grapheus  
<graph...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 14, 11:19 am, hagen  
<dan5m...@xxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

What do  
you want  
me to do?  
Here I count  
every  
reliable  
stroke in the  
clay 244  
+61+60.  
And this is  
wrong, you

Re: Solid Ground

say.

This is not "mathematically wrong". But it is "biaised" by your desire to reach a given figure, and moreover without any signification !..

<http://web.gvdnet.dk/GVD002393/husk.gif>

When I  
demonstrate  
another  
choise by  
defining 70  
stems, and  
as a  
logical  
consequence  
receive 104  
abbreviations  
244 +104  
+17, this is  
wrong too

Same remark : it is not "mathematically wrong", but "biaised" by your desire to reach a significant figure !..

<http://web.gvdnet.dk/GVD002393/demo2.htm>

The fact is,  
I did all my  
countings  
correct!

On a mathematical point of view, yes !.. But on the point of view of "making meaningfull

## Re: Solid Ground

calculations", no !.. Your calculations are going against the "common sense", and are adding pears and apples to reach a given number, known in advance...

If this is not  
a  
calendar,  
what is then  
a calendar?

An object where the hieroglyphs can be interpreted as having some meaning !.. In your case, you are just dealing with them and with the dividers as if they were just points and strokes ! (And your Figure is clearly showing that !). But the hieroglyphs are NOT just that ! they MUST have a meaning. But in whatever "Calendric solution" (not only yours, but others' too), no "reasonable meaning" can be given to them in the case of thePhaistosDisk, contrary to the other known, similar true calendars...

Regards  
grapheus

You are making up that last paragraph by pure convenience.

Re: Solid Ground

Not at all ! It's the truth (see hereafter), even if you refuse to see it...

It is accepted, that the Stone age populations had confidence with the year. Simply because they marked those 365 dots usually in a spiral pattern.

The Maya calendar was accepted as such, long before the meaning and the method of the hieroglyphs was known,

But there are BIG differences between the Maya Calendar and the Phaistos Disk, that you have (voluntarily) not seen !  
a)– the Maya calendar is CIRCULAR, not spiralic. A circle is LOGICAL

for a calendar, not a spiral.

b)– It is clearly divided into months of almost equal length, what is

not the case with the Disk, the length of the "compartments" presenting variations from 1 to 3!..

c)– nobody has to "adjust the number of the glyphs" to reach 365 days.

On the Phaistos Disk, we have only 241 or 242 glyphs.

So that, there has NEVER been the least doubt about the Maya Calendar

being a calendar : already in his "Relaciones", in 1864,

Landa has

given an universally accepted interpretation... And

NOBODY has

presented another one !.. The case is completely different with the Phaistos Disk !..

Please, Ole, open your eyes for once !..

Regards

grapheus– Hide quoted text –

Re: Solid Ground

– Show quoted text –

So that, there has NEVER been the least doubt about the Maya Calendar being a calendar : already in his "Relaciones", in 1864, Landa has given an universally accepted interpretation... And NOBODY has presented another one !.. The case is completely different with thePhaistosDisk !..

Was it the same Landa, who efficiently had all the written heritage from the Inka's destroyed?

I don't know, but what I know is that the Landa's work, written around 1566, but forgotten during 300 years, has been "the key to solve the Mayan Hieroglyphs" (S.D. Houston, "Maya Glyphs", Berkeley 1989 p. 8).

Please, Ole, open your eyes for once !..

That will wait until you write a single true word about my decipherment.

I have said NOTHING untrue about your work : I said that first you make a REMARKABLE and VERY INTERESTING DISCOVERY with your (true) stems. But that, after, you drew FALSE CONCLUSIONS from it, choosing EACH TIME the less probable hypothesis : a Minoan versus a Cycladic ORIGIN for this item, and a Calendar versus a religious document... In spite of the fact that there were only 241/242 "days" on it and that they were other strong problems, including : "What may be the meaning of the glyphs in the calendaric solution ?"... That you refuse, with a strange lack of "open mind spirit", to see the Truth is one thing ; but don't be surprised if others do not believe in a "calendaric solution", based upon IMPROBABILITIES (Minoan origin, for instance), ERRORS (e.g. your statement that "there is no satisfactory translation of the Disk, considered as a written document"), and UNSOLVED PROBLEMS (for instance : "What can be the meaning of the 45 glyphs?". For the Maya Calendar, the thing is easy to guess : as they are only 20 and regularly appear in the same order when the month changes, they are the "Names of the days of a 20 days month". No such a thing does exist with thePhaistosDisk).

Re: Solid Ground

Regards

grapheus– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

The two outstanding separators are invited into the family of signs once and for all. Absolute nothing forbid that! Grapheus is talking rubbish when he state different, at the same time he is indoctrinating some of you to feel doubt about this castling, which is of course a much better choice! I've demonstrated that convincingly over and over again, latest in this new illustration:

<http://web.gvdnet.dk/GVD002393/Newton.gif>

$244 + 244 + 244 = 366 \times 2$ ,

$244 / 61 = 4.00$  instead of  $242 / 61 = 3.97$

Part A = 100

Part B = 144 signs instead of 142

Hagen

.