

Re: The Phaistos Disk, side A, according to Faucounau (was: Fischer)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2004-07/2461.html>

From: Qakare (qakare_at_hotmail.com)

Date: 07/20/04

Date: 20 Jul 2004 12:08:27 -0700

grapheus@www.com (grapheus) wrote in message
news:<337ae51f.0407200339.7a63d8d7@posting.google.com>...
> qakare@hotmail.com (Qakare) wrote in message
news:<dad05270.0407191206.ababf0@posting.google.com>...
> > grapheus@www.com (grapheus) wrote in message
news:<337ae51f.0407152328.53b0431@posting.google.com>...
> > > qakare@hotmail.com (Qakare) wrote in message
news:<dad05270.0407150728.1c97b80c@posting.google.com>...
> > > > grapheus@www.com (grapheus) wrote in message
news:<337ae51f.0407142341.34f80bed@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > qakare@hotmail.com (Qakare) wrote in message
news:<dad05270.0407141222.360e1605@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > grapheus@www.com (grapheus) wrote in message
news:<337ae51f.0407140259.5553da77@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > > qakare@hotmail.com (Qakare) wrote in message
news:<dad05270.0407131442.59df9ffa@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > > > grapheus@www.com (grapheus) wrote in message
news:<337ae51f.0407131053.3e522e8e@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > > > > The correct way is to BUILT a MODEL (working from the LANGUAGE
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Therefore it is necessary to proof the language first!
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > WHY "first" ?.. If there are PROOFS which show that the DECIPHERMENT
> > > > > > > > > > is RIGHT, this means that EVERYTHING IS RIGHT (Language, type of
> > > > > > > > > > script, etc.).
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > The text is to short to find out by yourself that you used the wrong
> > > > > > > > > > language.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > RIGHT !.. So what ?...
> > > > > > > > > > Proofs that the decipherment is CORRECT may come from elsewhere !...
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > The only external proof are some bilinguals using the script on the
> > > > > > > > > > Phaistos Disc and a known script. Everything else must come from
> > > > > > > > > > internal analyses of the text on the Phaistos Disc.
> > > > > > > > > >

sci.lang: Re: The Phaistos Disk, side A, according to Faucounau (was: Fischer)

> > > *WRONG !.. "External Proofs" are as useful than "Internal Proofs" .*
> >
> > *Only in they case of Faucounau, because all his proofs aren't useful.*
>
> *That is what *YOU* say, because AS USUAL, you have CHOSEN TO BE BLIND*
> *!...*

Wrong. I have only a different opinion as you.

> > *For instance in B 1 a sign 23 is overprinted by a sign 12. Faucounau*
> > *invented a Fairy tail about a overprinted additional sign with a funny*
> > *owl on this place.*
>
> *AND HERE YOU GO AGAIN with your BLATANT BAD FAITH !...*
> *Before PROPOSING to read a new sign n° 49 representing "an owl", J.F.*
> *HAS DEMONSTRATED that, from the traces left, IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE for the*
> *obliterated sign to be Sign n° 23 !....*

Faucounau only writes: "En B1, on voit sous le signe du 'bouclier' une sorte de hampe oblique qui ne correspond, d'après les traces restantes, à aucun des signes connus envisageables (Signes S19, 22, 23 ou 39).".

No further explanation is given. Anyway his reason for the correction is that ka-sae was changed to ka-s-ae. But in this case no correction would be necessary. Therefore his explanation is obviously wrong!

> *But, of course, you present the thing as this DEMONSTRATION DID'N'T*
> *EXIST, although anyone may find it on pages 140 to 143 with the*
> *corresponding figures !....*
> *This is the TYPICAL ATTITUDE of DOGMATICS : they DON'T DISCUSS the*
> *arguments against THEIR DOGMA. They JUST go on, ACTING and IGNORING*
> *THEM !!!!*
>
> >
> > > *And in the case of the Phaistos Disk, both DO EXIST, but you*
> > > *STUBBORNLY REFUSE to consider that If the decipherment EXPLAINS THE*
> > > *MOTIVE why the scribe has cut a sentence adding a KAS in A5, or has*
> > > *corrected several KA(s) in KA-S , or has crowded his signs in A29, but*
> > > *not in A31, or.. etc. are the INQUESTIONABLE PROOF that the*
> > > *decipherment is correct. Because when something having a very small*
> > > *probability happens, one may think to a coïncidence happening by*
> > > *chance. When SEVERAL of such coïncidences happen, CHANCE cannot more*
> > > *be called for !...*
> >
> > *Right this can not be explained by chance. It must be explained by the*
> > *hard work of Faucounau to find them.*
>
> *Ha,ha,ha !... "Hard work" CANNOT CHANGE THE "hard FACTS" !!!*

You can not expect chance at the end of hard work.

- > > *But to find a explanation doesn't*
- > > *mean that this is the right one.*
- >
- > *And for A DOGMATIC like you, it's always BETTER to be BLIND !....*
- > *"Denying, denying, denying" is YOUR MOTTO !...*

As usual you didn't understand the difference between "can be" and "definitely true".

- > > > > > > *The CORRECT conclusion is that the MODEL using GREEK as a language and*
- > > > > > > *a SYLLABIC system as a SCRIPT leads to the BEST FIT with the DATA of*
- > > > > > > *the SAMPLE that the Phaistos Disk's text is. Therefore the great*
- > > > > > > *percentage of the ATTEMPTS starting from these HYPOTHESES !..*
- > > > > >
- > > > > > *Please be so kind and give references where the descriptions of the*
- > > > > > *fits can be found.*
- > > > > >
- > > > > *Amongst the published ones, I'll cite the paper "Evidence for Hellenic*
- > > > > *Dialect in the Phaistos Disk" by St. Fisher (1988).*
- > > > >
- > > > > *Do you mean sentences like this: "It is surprising to find PD12 and*
- > > > > *PD35 having the values –qe and –te; this certainly cannot be Greek"*
- > > > > *(Evidence for Hellenic Dialect in the Phaistos Disk by St. Fisher,*
- > > > > *1988, p. 27)?*
- > > >
- > > > *These remarks are PERFECTLY CORRECT !... Because PD12 has NOT the*
- > > > *QE–value, and PD35 the TE–value.*
- > > > *The Fischer's error has been in TRYING TO FORCE the plausible things*
- > > > *!!!!*
- > >
- > > *But the plausible things are that he compared the signs at the*
- > > *Phaistos Disc with the signs in the Linear scripts. Anyway I found*
- > > *nothing in his book giving evidence for a Greek language!*
- >
- > *NOT in his book !.. I wrote : in his paper "Evidence for Hellenic*
- > *Dialct in the Phaistos Disk" !..*

In which magazine has he published his paper? In "Fairy Tales" edited by grapheus?

- > > > > > >
- > > > > > > *It's a pity that J.F. has not published this part of his work, but I*
- > > > > > > *can tell you that his conclusions were the same : There is a STRONG "a*
- > > > > > > *priori" PROBABILITY for the Phaistos Disk's Language to be GREEK.*
- > > > > >
- > > > > > *Demonstrate the probability or be quiet.*
- > > > > >
- > > > >
- > > > > *That you didn't answered to this point I take as confession that you*
- > > > > *have nothing to show that Faucounau is right at this point.*
- > > >

sci.lang: Re: The Phaistos Disk, side A, according to Faucounau (was: Fischer)

> > > *Faucounau ?.. No, because he did'n't publish his calculations... But*
> > > *he said what his conclusion was after his "First Round of*
> > > *Calculations" as he called it, and I have no reason for not believing*
> > > *him !.. If you have a strong one, please let us know !..*
> >
> > *Yes I have a strong one. He didn't publish his calculations! Maybe*
> > *because Faucounau means that it is helpful to write a "Fairy Tail"*
> > *about a statistical decipherment as long as nobody would be able to*
> > *disprove it. It seems to me that Faucounau has the same problem as you*
> > *to understand the difference between "maybe" and "it is" or "evidence"*
> > *and "proof". It is not enough to publish a decipherment saying you*
> > *have to believe me that all my conclusions are right.*
>
> *AND HERE YOU GO AGAIN !... DENYING, denying, denying THAT PROOFS DO*
> *EXIST !...*
> *And repeating ALWAYS the SAME MOTTO : "J.F. did not publish HIS*
> *METHOD" !...*
> *When it has been said several times that "the Method being of*
> *PROBABILISTIC NATURE, the RESULTING DECIPHERMENT HAS TO BE *PROVED* "*
> *!... And that ONLY THE PROOFS count !...*
> *But, of course, it's ESSENTIAL for A DOGMATIC to IGNORE THEM !!!!!*

Which proof did you mean? I didn't found any proof in his book.

> > > > > > > > > *Right, the majority does not count only facts count. Therefore your*
> > > > > > > > > *statement "Moreover, do you seriously believe that if the MAJORITY of*
> > > > > > > > > *the deciphering attempts have USED GREEK as a language, this CAN BE*
> > > > > > > > > *DUE TO MERE CHANCE ?" is only rubbish.*
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > *And WHY ?????*
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > *As Hempl has said it. Greek was used mostly, because this was the only*
> > > > > > > > > *known old language for the majority.*
> > > > >
> > > > > *This is also demonstrated by the scholars reading the Phaistos Disk*
> > > > > *from left to right like Ephron, Otto or Ohlenroth. They also mean that*
> > > > > *they found evidence for a Greek language!*
> > > > >
> > > > *SO WHAT ?..*
> > > >
> > > > *They are using the wrong reading direction! Evidence for a Greek*
> > > > *language they found only by mistake. But also the majority for this*
> > > > *reading direction is using Greek as language. Therefore you can't use*
> > > > *the majority as proof for a Greek language.*
> > >
> > > *I contest this point : If one does'n't count all the attempts using a*
> > > *wrong direction, there is STILL a MAJORITY in favour of attemps using*
> > > *Greek as a language !..*
> >
> > *The majority of the scientists (Ipsen, Gordon, Ventris, Grumach,*
> > *Duhoux, Nahm, Schürr) have a different opinion. This is a majority*

Re: The Phaistos Disk, side A, according to Faucounau (was: Fischer)

sci.lang: Re: The Phaistos Disk, side A, according to Faucounau (was: Fischer)

- > > *against an attempt using Greek as language.*
- >
- > *I was talking about people HAVING PROPOSED a DECIPHERMENT !...*

That's the problem; the result depends on the definition. Therefore the majority does not count only facts count.

- > *AS far as I know, NONE of the names you cited, but C. Gordon, have proposed one !...*
- > *As for Yves Duhoux, his "opinion" cannot be taken very seriously : In 1979, he wrote that the Phaistos Disk's text was "probably written in an IE-Language, possibly GREEK", but facing the contrary opinions of Grumach and co, he chose to "follow the leader" and in 1983 – USING THE SAME "METHOD" as in 1979 !!!– he CONCLUDED to the CONTRARY !...*
- > *No comments are needed : "Birds of same feather flock together"*
- > *!!!!!!*

It would be more convincing if Faucounau would discuss there arguments.

- > > *That means that I have won*
- > > *your little contest.*
- >
- > *That means that ONCE MORE, you DID TRY to CHANGE THE QUESTION !...*

Wrong. I have only a different opinion as you.

- > *Like when I am asking you : "WHAT do you find WRONG with the *PROOFS" ? "...*

This is a lie. See the next lines:

- > > > > >
- > > > > > > > > > *WHAT ABOUT the "Astronomical Proof" or the several "Linguistical Proofs" , to quote a few ones ?...*
- > > > > > > > > >
- > > > > > > > > > *These are external proofs. Even if they are right, this doesn't mean that the Phaistos Disk is written in Greek.*
- > > > > > > > > >
- > > > > > > > > > *RIDICULOUS !... These PROOFS confirm the EXISTENCE of a people who was, AT THE REQUESTED TIME, SPEAKING the REQUESTED LANGUAGE (with ALL its DIALECTAL PECULIARITIES !). Not enough for you ?...*
- > > > > > > > > >
- > > > > > > > > > *Because we have proof that other people lived at the earth at this time, for instance in Egypt or China and also at the right place for instance the Minoan people at Phaistos, this is not enough.*
- > > > > > > > > >
- > > > > > > > > > *Where the people you mention SPEAKING the REQUESTED LANGUAGE, with ALL the REQUESTED DIALECTAL PECULIARITIES ??????????*
- > > > > >
- > > > > > *The question is which the requested language is!*
- > > > > >

Re: The Phaistos Disk, side A, according to Faucounau (was: Fischer)

sci.lang: Re: The Phaistos Disk, side A, according to Faucounau (was: Fischer)

>>>> *The answer is easy : IT MUST be the SAME as the one USED for the*
>>>> *DECIPHERMENT, with ALL ITS DIALECTAL PECULIARITIES !...*
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>> *Wrong. As Ventris has said there are to much prefixes in the script.*
>>>
>>> *BALONEY !... They are NOT "prefixes" in the grammatical sense !...*
>>> *They are "Introductory particles" with are LINKED TO THE FOLLOWING*
>>> *WORD by the scribe, EXACTLY AS in the CYPRIOT SCRIPT !..*
>>> *You are STARTING from A (false) ASSUMPTION to reach a DUBIOUS*
>>> *CONCLUSION that you raise to the rank of AN OBJECTION, in TOTAL*
>>> *NEGLECT of the INFORMATION brought by the TRUE SOLUTION !!!!!*
>>
>> *You argue in a circle if you use the decipherment to determine the*
>> *language.*
>
> *RIDICULOUS !... I use the DECIPHERMENT – BECAUSE IT HAS BEEN PROVED !–*
> *to CONFIRM that the PROBABILISTIC CONSIDERATIONS, which have INITIALLY*
> *led to the CHOICE of GREEK, WERE CORRECT !..*
> *You are trying to pretend that there is a "circular arguments" were*
> *there is NONE !...*

==>"which have INITIALLY led to the CHOICE of GREEK, WERE CORRECT" <==
You argue in a circle if you use the decipherment to determine the
language.

> *Because there cannot be a "circular argument"*
> *WHEN the *PROOFS* DO EXIST !... These *PROOFS* that you want to*
> *IGNORE !...*

Give one proof that the language used on the Phaistos Disk is Greek or
be quiet.

If you can't find new arguments, I will stop this thread at this
point.

qakare