

## Re: The Phaistos Disk, side A, according to Fischer

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2004-07/1036.html>

---

**From:** grapheus (grapheus\_at\_www.com)

**Date:** 07/09/04

Date: 9 Jul 2004 01:34:13 -0700

qakare@hotmail.com (Qakare) wrote in message  
news:<dad05270.0407081433.145edf99@posting.google.com>...  
> grapheus@www.com (grapheus) wrote in message  
news:<337ae51f.0407080403.1b91e296@posting.google.com>...  
>> **VERY INTERESTING MESSAGE, but it DOES'N'T SHOW what you claim !..**  
>> *See hereunder the explanation .*  
>>  
>> qakare@hotmail.com (Qakare) wrote in message  
news:<dad05270.0407070902.1689f198@posting.google.com>...  
>>> grapheus@www.com (grapheus) wrote in message  
news:<337ae51f.0407070100.2f3adb87@posting.google.com>...  
>>>> Jacques Guy <jguy@alphalink.com.au> wrote in message  
news:<40EBC5D2.642F@alphalink.com.au>...  
>>>>> Peter T. Daniels wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> grapheus wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>> **PROOFS, as I said,**  
>>>>>>> *which are THE MOST IMPORTANT, a lot more than the*  
>>>>>>> *translation of the text or the method J.F. used!...*  
>>>>>  
>>>>> *Of course, WRITING that the "Proto-Ionic Solution" is THE ONLY ONE to*  
>>>>> **EXPLAIN in a VERY SATISFACTORY WAY \*all\* the EPIGRAPHICAL FACTS, like**  
>>>>> *: "Why are the signs crowded in A29 and not in the adjacents*  
>>>>> *compartments ?" , or DISCUSSING matters like : "What is the*  
>>>>> *probability that a false deciphering-attempt can lead to acrophony ?"*  
>>>>  
>>>> **100%! And here comes the explanation:**  
>>>>  
>>>> *Professor Hempl published in 1911 the first decipherment theory for*  
>>>> *the Phaistos Disc.*  
>>>>  
>>>> **CORRECT !**  
>>>>  
>>>> *In contrast to Faucounau Hempl has described his*  
>>>> *way of deciphering in detail*

>>  
>> *WRONG !.. Here is, for instance, the way he chose the language : " I  
>> had no chance of succeeding unless the language was Indo-European, as  
>> I am familiar with no other languages. An Indo-European language in  
>> Crete was most likely to be Greek, so I decided to test the text first  
>> for Greek".*  
>  
> *His arguments may not very convincing but in contrast to Faucounau he  
> gives all the details.*

YES !.. But when those "details" are : "I chose the Greek language  
because it was the only one I knew", one may prefer " I chose the  
Greek language after a long series of Statistical Calculations", EVEN  
IF THESE CALCULATIONS have NOT been PUBLISHED !... Obviously you do  
not, but me, yes !...

>  
>> *Here is, in contrast, what J. Faucounau wrote concerning his choice of  
>> Greek (Translation from French and emphasis are mine) : "A first round  
>> of Statistical Calculations, \*which lasted more than four years\*,  
>  
> What do you want to say with \*which lasted more than four years\*?*

That he worked 4 years before reaching a sufficient probability for  
concluding that the Greek hypothesis was "PROBABLY" the good one !...  
Something wrong with that ?...

>  
>> *convinced me that Greek was the language which seemed the most in  
>> accordance with the statistical data of the Disk"...*  
>> *Eloquent comparison, is it not ?..*  
>  
> *As long as Faucounau does not publish his calculations in detail such  
> a statement is worth nothing.*

That is WHAT YOU THINK !...

>*But maybe you need to read the word  
> detail in capital letters.  
> Here it is: In contrast to Faucounau Hempl has described his way of  
> deciphering in DETAIL.*

I'll NOT DENY THAT !... But I don't see ANY REASON to accuse J.F. to  
be a LIER when he says that he REACHED HIS CONCLUSIONS concerning the  
LANGUAGE and the TYPE OF SCRIPT using Statistical Calculations !...  
Mainly when he gives the PRINCIPLES of his method !.. Do \*YOU\* have  
a MOTIVE for accusing him of not saying the truth ?...

>  
>> >: *"... it would be necessary to weigh the  
>> > probabilities, form tentative theories, and the rigorously test them –*

> > > *in other words, to do some judicious guessing and see if it worked."*  
> > > *First he guessed that sign 02 must be <a> and sign 29 must be <e>.*  
> > > *After that he "looked for words beginning with signs already*  
> > > *identified, and then" he "examined every word in the dictionary that*  
> > > *began with the sounds represented by the known characters." By this*  
> > > *way he comes to the conclusion that the Script was using acrophony.*  
> >  
> > *YES. Like J. Faucounau, he met acrophony "on the way".*  
> > *BUT, one of the reason was BECAUSE HIS CHOICE of the LANGUAGE WAS*  
> > *CORRECT !... For instance, the phonetic values he assigned to signs*  
> > *S4, S33, S27 WERE THE GOOD ONES !!!!*  
> > *In a similar way, Florence M. Stawell, who followed Dr Hempl's*  
> > *hypothesis concerning the language (Ionic), IDENTIFIED CORRECTLY 60%*  
> > *of the S I g n s and got 5 or 6 CORRECT Phonetic values !...*  
>  
> *Wrong. There is no proof that the language or some signs are correct.*

YOU too, YOU HATE THE WORD "PROOFS", do'nt you ?...

Have you ever tried to read only one of the NUMEROUS REFERENCES given in the J.F.'s book concerning the PROOFS ?..

I bet NO !... Am I wrong ?....

>  
> > > *But this conclusion was not very helpful, for Instance for sign 45 he*  
> > > *decided to try the word 'stream': "After testing nineteen other Greek*  
> > > *words for 'stream', " he "found that <pnyn> was what " he "was after.*  
> > > *..." Or for sign 32 "There are plenty of greek words for 'dove', but*  
> > > *no one of them would work, try as" he "would. It was only when" he*  
> > > *"thought of Latin columba, 'dove', that" he "got hold of Greek*  
> > > *<kolvmsoc>." "One can readily imagine the amount of time and patience*  
> > > *required. But all the drudgery way quickly forgotten when it led to*  
> > > *results." (George Hempl in Harpers Monthly Magazine, January 1911, p.*  
> > > *187–198)*

>  
> > > *It is clear that by this way always a acrophonic word would*  
> > > *be found. So the probability that a false deciphering–attempt leads to*  
> > > *acrophony is 100%!*

> >  
> > *WRONG CONCLUSION of YOURS !...*  
> > *Because 1)– Most of the "ACROPHONIC VALUES" proposed by G. Hempl are*  
> > *OBVIOUSLY far–fetched. For instance, the "horn" was supposed to come*  
> > *from Greek <karè> which means "Head" , NOT "Horn".*

>  
> *Yes Hempl is wrong, but his examples are enough to demonstrate that*  
> *akrophonie is useless.*

IF used "alone", YES, I fully agree !...

But J.F.'s \*PROVED\* decipherment has shown that used as a complementary method, it may be very useful !...

- >
- > > 2)– *In spite of his efforts, G. Hempl COULD NOT READ the whole text,*
- > > *so many of his "acrophonic equations" LEAD TO NOTHING, and are*
- > > *therefore valueless.*
- > > *In contrast, J.F.'s decipherment IS COMPLETE.*
- >
- > *Because Hempl was the first one and was only guessing for less than*
- > *two years. Faucounau was able to start with Hempls and Stawells*
- > *results and had four years alone for his calculations about the*
- > *language. Therefore a complete wrong decipherment can be expected.*

Ha,ha,ha !... 1)– J.F.'s values are almost COMPLETELY DIFFERENT from Hempl's and Stawell's values, in spite of the fact that in the three cases, the starting hypotheses concerning LANGUAGE and TYPE of SCRIPT were the same. 2)– ONCE AGAIN, you WANT TO IGNORE the \*PROOFS\* – I repeat : the \*PROOFS\* !– in the case of the "Proto–Ionic Solution" !!!!!

- >
- > > 3)– *His hypothesis concerning the language WAS CORRECT. No surprise,*
- > > *then, if he could find SEVERAL CORRECT ACROPHONIC EQUATIONS. Would his*
- > > *decipherment be TOTALLY CORRECT (i.e. the same as J. Faucounau's), ALL*
- > > *his acrophonic equations would have been excellent..*
- >
- > *Only Faucounau himself believes that his akrophonic equations are*
- > *excellent.*
- > *For instance sign 06 he determines with "woman". But instead of using*
- > *the corresponding Greek word he prefers to use the word for "wife".*

WRONG !.. You are NOT paying attention to the ARCHAÏC CHARACTER of <damar> v./ <gunè> !...

Both words have practically the SAME MEANING, i.e. "woman" and/or "wife, spouse". But the OLDEST is <damar>. So, WHAT IS SO STRANGE finding it in a 1750BC–text ?????

- >
- > > *In other words, it is not correct to deduce from this attempt, as you*
- > > *do, that ACROPHONY can always be reached, for ANY FALSE DECIPHERMENT*
- > > *!...*
- >
- > *That the rare signs are read with complex values shows that Faucounau*
- > *was using the same way like Hempl: some guessing and see if it worked!*
- > *(See my last posting for details.) So it is correct to show with Hempl*
- > *as example, that Akrophonie is worth nothing for deciphering an*
- > *unknown script in a unknown language.*

Once again, I agree IF akrophony ALONE is used !...

grapheus

> > > *qakare*  
> > >  
> > > *P.S.: At the end of his article Hempl comes to the conclusion that the  
> > > Phaistos Disk contains a text in a archaic ionic dialect. If you think  
> > > that it is remarkable that Faucounau also found an ionic dialect you  
> > > are right. Here is the explanation: At the beginning of his book  
> > > Faucounau writes "A la memoire de Florence Melian Stawell qui  
> > > pressentit, la premiere, la solution de l'engme". (Jean Faucounau, Le  
> > > dechiffrement du disque de Phaistos, p.7) And Stawell herself was  
> > > writing at the beginning of her article: "credit must be given to  
> > > Professor Hempl for being first in field. ... I have no doubt that  
> > > many of the sound-values he proposed are right" (Florence Melian  
> > > Stawell, in the Burlington Magazine 19, 1911 p. 23-38).*  
> >  
> > *And Florence Stawell WAS RIGHT saying this !..*  
>  
> *This is only your opinion.*  
>  
> >  
> > >  
> > > *Here comes the start of Hempls readings of side A: A-po-su-la-r  
> > > ke-si-po e-pe-t e-e-se a-po-le-is-tu te-pe-ta-po. (Lo, Xipho the  
> > > prophetess dedicates spoils from a spoiler of the prophetess.) Te-u-s,  
> > > a-po-ku-ra. (Zeus guard us.) Vi-ka-na a-po-ri-pi-na la-ri-si-ta  
> > > a-po-ko-me-nu so-to. (In silence put aside the most dainty portions of  
> > > the still unroasted animal.) A-te-ne-Mi-me-ra pu-l. (Athene Minerva,  
> > > be gracious.) A-po-vi-k. (Silence!) A-po-te-te-na-ni-si tu-me. (The  
> > > victims have been put to death.) A-po-vi-k. (Silence!)*  
> >  
> > *CORRECT. In other words, G. Hempl supposed that the group "Crested  
> > head+ shield" was to read IN GREEK : <a-po>.*  
> > *If he had been smarter, he would have noticed that this reading was  
> > leading to TWO very mediocre "acrophonic equations" :*  
> > *a)- "Crested head" = <anêr> : acceptable, but not very good !*  
> > *b)- "shield" = <boagrion> : very bad, if not impossible : the  
> > <boagrion> was VERY PROBABLY a RECTANGULAR shield, the "Round shield"  
> > being an <aspis>*  
>  
> *The problem with that is, that a "round shield" was unknown at the  
> time of the Phaistos Disc. At this time only rectangular shields are  
> known.*

UNFOUNDED ASSUMPTION, based upon the "Risch-Chadwick Theory" !...  
And at the time of the Phaistos Disk, there were NO "Feather-Helmet"  
worn by the warriors, neither, right ?...

> *Therefore sign 12 is for sure not a shield. A sign with a  
> circle and some dots can also be found in the luwian hieroglyphic  
> script (sign 181). There it is used as a Ideogram for bread (see  
> Emmanuel Laroche, 1960, Les hiérollyphes hittites. Paris: Éditions du  
> Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. p. 95).*

SO WHAT ?... The Phaistos Disk IS NOT a "Luwian artifact" !... It's a PROTO-IONIAN one !!!!  
Your assumption is RIDICULOUS !...

- > *This shows that*
- > *Faucounaus "AKROPHONIC VALUES" are like Hempls obviously far-fetched!*

NO !.. This shows that YOU are trying to DISPARAGE the "Proto-Ionic Solution" with UNFOUNDED ASSUMPTIONS of YOURS (like : "the Proto-Ionians did'n't use a Round Shield c. 1750 BC"), instead of discussing about THE ONLY THING WHICH COUNTS : the \*PROOFS\* !!!!  
Show us that ALL the c. 30 \*PROOFS\* are deadly wrong, and you will be more credible in your criticism !...

- >
- >> *The comparison with J.F.'s work is eloquent, is it not ?..*
- >
- > *You are eloquent. But this is not enough. You need at least one proof.*
- > *That you always talking about 30 pieces of evidence without showing*
- > *one real proof says enough.*

I said WHY I don't want to explain IN A POST such difficult-to-explain proofs like the "Astronomical" one, for instance. But THE needed REFERENCES are in the J.F.'s book. WHY you don't do WHAT I DID, i.e. READING THESE published REFERENCES ?... Or better, read the "Les Proto-Ioniens..." book, which gives the main EVIDENCE ?...

And my following remarks are still valid !..

- >>>> -- *"Why 3 leading astronomers have involuntarily demonstrated that the*
- >>>> *"Inventors of the Constellations" were the Proto-Ionians ?.. What to*
- >>>> *think about the Ovenden's theory ?" -- etc. ARE TO PUT ASIDE !..*
- >>>> *ONLY COMPARING the \*PROVED\* J.F.'s decipherment with OBVIOUS*
- >>>> *STUPIDITIES like the Crombette's one IS, in YOUR eyes, ESSENTIAL !!!!*
- >>>> *Think a bit about it : What IF the discussion of the CENSORED SUBJECTS*
- >>>> *was leading to the conclusion that, YES, the Proto-Ionic Solution*
- >>>> *\*IS\* the GOOD ONE ?... HOW SHOCKING !.. Better keep silent about*
- >>>> *such matters !..*
- >>>>
- >>>> *By the way : NOBODY in this group has commented one of the*
- >>>> *EPIGRAPHICAL PROOFS I gave, am I wrong?...*
- >>>>

grapheus