First commentso n Some Observations on the PhaistosDisc Part 1//

I, ve got a bit into theexamination, but must break off for a few days. But in view of what I, ve found in the way of preliminary carping at detail, I think I'd better send this much on, with more general and perhaps gentler comments to follow in the next batch.

p. 1 It ill behooves an American to question the ztyle of a British author--- yet I find it disturbing to consider ≙$&+*()_/]:" (sorry, trying to find the right key on this machine) ""The direction in which ..."" parallel to ""if a decipherment..."; and I find it impossible to swallow the implied definition: A controversy is ""if a decipherment..."

""Leading from centre" -- would not ""whether the characters are to be read beginning at the centre and proceeding to the circumference, i.e. R/ Left/Right, or beginning at the circumference.. i.e. Right/Left, be a better way to say it -- or now that Im farther along why not immediately go to IN and OUT and omit the rather ambiguous Left/Right/Left bit altogether?

Minor quibble. There should be no second controversy possible. It is plain that a decipherment can be attempted trhough the Greek language, and indeed through any language. It has been done, several times. It can be attempted through anything, e.g. music, and has been. The question is rather whether progress toward decipherment can be made through Grekk.

I would be much happier if the ""two controversies"" were considered , even in this introductory part, as separate and separable questions.

A critical reader will jump on the ""background...is the belief"" (please make these at least two separate beliefs). Of course it may be a true statement. But rather put it that the ""results of this work are consistent with belief a and Belief b. Also, there may be several more than two positions in the dispute(s).

Comparison of number of caharacters. It will be asked, who counted? What does 4.7/4.4 letters per word mean? How much text was counted, and what text was counted for Homer? Ditto for Linear B?

Beginning the next page is a very rough worksheet of half hour's checking on your ""Homer 4.7/4.4 letters per group. taking groups of 61 consecutive words from Iliad 9 (Benner's selections, the nearest thing at hand to my chair even if not the best text. AND I COME OUT with very DIFFERENT figures. Now if I kept on and on I might find indeed an average of 4.7 letters per word, but it's not a very promising beginning, and if 4.7 is the average ((Iliade? and 4.4 Odyssey?) something of the range would be a good thing to know. Or was the calculation from a lexicon? or was it taken from somebody else's compiitation? I haven't my Linear B statistics handy so I won't check these. They seem close enough as I remember them. But a reference to published statistics, which do exist in quantity, for Homer as for Linear B, would not be out of place, even if you have properly relied upon your own counting. But it si an essential of a scientific process that the reader can do the same thing for himself (once he has shown how) and come to approximately the same answer. The result is a boring, space-consuming, but necessary footnote --- and confidence in some readers, thankfulness in those who wish to or must check up on you.

After the statistics you imply that a language has a characteristic length of written word. Stick to alphabetic for example. What is average for Greek, Italian, Spanish, English, Hebrew? these are known. Do they diverge enough to be significant? Let thereader consider the other possibility - ""If language of disc is NOT common, then middle position of disc leads to no/or other? conclusions?

bad planning, so it ran over the page. Errors, including one I remember making, but where? and the running toatals probably as much as a shift of 3 off, and perhaps some errors even in counting the letters in words.

2	9	322	2	308	7	301
2	13	333	4	299	5	302
3	7	337	3	295	2	301
5	6	338	3	292	3	301
7	3	334	8	297	3	296
4	6	336	3	294	6	299
5	11	342	10	293	9	298
7	5	340	5	293	10	303
8	7	339	9	295	through	
3	2	338	9	302	Iliad 9	
4	2	336	10	310	line 28	
5	4	335	3	309		
8	5	332	2	306		
6	2	328	5	309		
6	4	326	6	311		
1	8	333	10	313		
6	7	334	3	309		
9	4	329	2	307		
6	1	324	7	313		
7	3	320	7	317		
2	5	323	5	316		
1	9	331	7	315		
6	2	327	4	317		
3	1	325	5	321		
6	9	328	5	317		
8	6	326	4	315		
9	5	322	4	314		
6	4	320	3	313		
3	2	319	3	314		
7	2	314	6	318		
2	5	317	9	322		
2	10	325	5	317		
8	1	318	5	321		
5	2	315	2	321		
6	3	312	2	320		
8	9	313	7	318		
6	6	313	6	318		
2	8	319	8	318		
2	4	321	6	320		
4	4	321	2	318		
8	2	315	3	319		
9	1	308	3	321		
6	4	306	5	322		
2	8	312	3	317		
5	3	310	3	317		
3	9	316	6	311		
5	7	318	4	308		
6	1	313	8	315		
2	5	316	3	313		
8	7	315	4	309		
5	8	318	2	=03		
3	3	318	2	302		
9	8	317	3	297		
6	4	315	4	297		
8	2	309	9	304		
1	5	313	6	305		

Summary
292 x
293 xx
294 x
295 xx
296 xx
297 xxx
298 x
299 xx
300
301 xxx
302xxxx
303xxx
304x
305xxx
306xx
307x
308xxx
309xxxxx
310xxx
311xx
312xxx
313xxxxxxxx
314xxxx
315xxxxxxxxx
316xx
317xxxxxxxxx
318xxxxxxxxx
319xxxx
320xxxx
321xxxxxx
322xxxx
323x
324x
325xx
326xx
327x
328xx
329x
330
331x
332x
333xx
334xx
335x
336xx
337x
338xx
339x
340x
341
342x

341.6 corresponds to
av. average of 5.6
292.8 to an average of 4.8

Maybe Iq better check up on the "4.0 ch. per group"? from illustration (d)

2	12	6	5	R
3	48	16	14	RR
4	84/88	21/22	19/20	RR
5	65/60	13/12	12/11	R
6	12	2	1	R
7	21	3	2	R
tot	61	61	53	8

61 into 242/241 equals certainly close enough.
4X61 - 244.

p. 2-- The search for a pattern - (are there others to be considered?) - seems rather aout of place. You are simply compiling dictionaries in each direction, looking for repeats. On Table I, 'duple beginning' not defined . 'ranges' not definred. It takes too long to figure out that a 'duple beginning' is aparticular inttial swquence of two signs, and that a range is the number of words in which a 'duple beginning' may be found. Definitions in a note would le help. You will notice also, that the attempt to find out what terms meands leads inevitabl6 to a close look at the tabulations and calculations, with the result that any errors may be seen as it were by invitation.

I assume no quadruple 'stem' that ought to be defined, too, but better yet simply avoided. It assumes a linguishtic character of the text which is betst not yet assumed.

By this time I rtust you are reconciled to the poor quality of my typing, and I hope you will pardon me for it.

At bottom of p. 2 someone will surely ask, can Table I be really useful in determining or confirming a direction to be read?

Is it useful without an assumption that this is a language of longer stems and short inflecting endings? If one assumes that, can one, may one, or should one assume a particular language? And further isn't the whole difference between OUT and IN in effect eliminated if one suddenly became blind to the presence of sign / 2? That is, 2 makes all the difference. Then do we want it at beginning of end. Is itş preponderance a result of linguistic pattern, prefix, inflection, or the like, or of 1vocabulary choice?

Table I can be reduced to this form - but if this is done there is a discrepancy of 38-42 I must discover why.

sing.	19	15 7 5 4 3 2 1	13	10 2 1	12	5 4 3 2 1
duple	36	10 2 1	12	9 2 1	27	1
triple	30	2 1	11	2 1	20	1

those were in beginnings/out endings.

single	21	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	15	4 3 2 1	14	6 4 3 2 1
dup	38/42?	2 1	20	2 1	24	2 1
tri	31	2 1	13	1	18	1

53	at least 2	total sing minus 32 repeats -	21	out ends	IN ENDS 34 19
48	at least 3	total dup minus	6/10 rep -	42/38	12 36
34	at least 4	tot tri minus	3	31	4 30

If then you've made an error (probably one of copying from worksheets) on 38 (as I suppose now) in Table I (c) OUT No. of duple endings, sombeody?s going to catch it , simply by checking one part of the table I agains th e other. That's the advantabe I have, if I. ve made a mistake here, of not ounderstanding what was being done, no one but you will know.

But seriously, why not make a complete table of to show Number of quadrup, pent, sext, endings and gebeginnings even if they don't happen to repeat. There's at least one quad which is important, as being added to to make a 5 letter word ourt of a four.

So. Back to page 2. 'Stems' "These analyses gave a minimum...." I would avoid analyses as a word. I would prefer "I tabulated occurrences of particular one, two, three ... sign initila sequences in discrete (i. e. I have excluded repeats of whole words) sign-groups. In each direction. The results, in either direction, show very few instances of partic7lar initla eq sequences in more than one such sign-group. The most re g frequent recurring initial sequence c was 2. 12 (IN direction), beginning 9 groups. No other initial d sequecne began more than so many sign groups, thoug there were so many which did this."

"No contin Connecting development" _ introduced without warning, or explanation. This is especially trouplesome, since there is little (for the uninitiated) to see in the way of a connecting development in A. 6 IN 2. 12. 13. 1 and A. 24 IN 2. 12. 6. 18. 1 OHO _ Error.. You meant to say, I think A. 6 and A. 31 2. 12. 13. 1. 18 - Then the ee development is easier to figure out, but I still would prefer to be told what it meant.

There seem to be several further erros in Table I, or else I cant count, or else I follow different rules. My figures come to

12	9 2 1	11	2 1	28	1	21	1
20	2 1	13	1	24	2 1	19	2 1
20	2 1	15	3 2 1	24	2 1	14	6 4 3 2 1
12	9 2 1	13	10 2 1	28	1	12	6 4 3 2 1

37	10 2 1	31	2 1
41	2 1	31	2 1
41	2 1	21	7 6 5 4 3 2 1
37	10 2 1	19	15 7 5 4 3 2 1

I have done this hastily, but here are my worksheets. Where have I gone wrong? I send a second copy, please mark it up to show my errors.

text reduced to numerical status.

FACE A OUT	FACE B OUT	FACE A IN	FACE B IN
38.3.10	7.45	2.12.13.1.18	2.12.22.40.7
1.13	25.23.34.29	24.40.12	27.45.7.35
21.37.35.27.27.12.2	7.23.35.6.2	29.45.7	2.37.23.5
38.3.10	7.18.39.30.9	29.29.34	22.25.27
35.19.23	8.7.36.29.22	2.12.4.40.33	33.24.20.12
1.13.12.2	24.18.23.7	27.45.7.12	16.23.14.43
12.26.31	7.45.7	27.44.8	13.1.39.33
19.17.18.6	35.18.7	2.12.6.18.x	15.7.12.1.18
27.18.32.14.27.12.2	25.23.34.27	31.26.35	22.37.42.25
26.31.12.2	8.7.36.29.22	2.12.41.19.35	7.24.40.35
1.28	7.45.29	1.41.40.7	2.26.36.40
18.23.10.25.27.2	13.8.29	2.12.32.23.38	27.25.38.1
26.31.12.2	8.7.36.29	39.11	29.24.24.20.35
23.33	1.27.9.2	2.27.25.10.23.18	16.14.18
21.37.35.27.27.12.2	33.39.32.35.6	28.1	29.33.1
26.31.12.2	1.33.29	2.12.31.26	6.35.32.39.33
1.28	18.14.16	2.12.27.27.35.37.21	2.9.27.1
18.23.10.25.27.2	35.20.24.24.29	33.23	29.36.7.8
11.39	1.38.25.27	2.12.31.26	29.8.13
38.23.32.12.2	40.36.26.2	2.27.25.10.23.18	29.45.7
7.40.41.1	35.40.24.7	28.1	22.29.36.7.8
35.19.41.12.2	25.42.37.22	2.12.31.26	27.34.23.25
35.26.31	18.1.13.7.15	2.12.27.14.32.18.27	7.18.35
1.18.6.12.2	33.39.1.13	6.18.17.19	7.45.7
8.44.27	43.18.23.16	31.26.12	7.23.18.24
12.7.45.27	12.20.24.33	2.12.13.1	22.29.36.7.8
33.40.4.12.2	27.25.22	23.19.35	9.30.39.18.7
34.29.29	5.23.37.2	10.3.38	2.6.35.23.7
7.45.29	35.7.45.27	2.12.27.27.35.37.21	29.34.23.25
12.40.24	7.40.22.12.2	13.1	45.7
18.1.13.12.2	xxxxx	10.2.38	xxxx
xxxxx		xxxxx	

Repeast in A	4x2	1x3	31-6 - 25
in B	ix2	0x3	30-1 - 29
in AB	6x1	1x3	61-8 - 53

These copies depend ypn your transcription, and have not been independently checked. I may have made an error in copying (which will show up in errors in what whfollows) but you had better check my copy against yours first.

OUT transcription checked vs Ephron p. 23 OK

AB IN

1.41.40.7	A21	1	1.41	1.41.40				
2.6.35.23.7	B3	2	2.6	2.6.35	2.6.35.23			
2.9.27.1	B14	-	2.9	2.9.27				
2.12.4.40.33	A27	-	2.12	2.12.4		2.12.4.40		
2.12.6.18	A24	-	-	2.12.6				
2.12.13.1	A6	-	-	2.12.13				
2.12.13.1.18	A31	-	-	-		2.12.13.1		
2.12.22.40.7	B30	-	-	2.12.22		2.12.22.40		
2.12.27.14.32.18.27	A9	-	-	2.12.27		2.12.27.14	2.12.27.14.32	2.12.27.14.32.18
2.12.27.27.35.37.21	A3, 15	-	-	-		2.12.27.27	2.12.27.27.35	2.12.27.27.35.37
2.12.31.26	A10, 13, 16	-	-	2.12.31				
2.12.32.23.38	A20	-	-	2.13.32		2.12.32.23		
2.12.41.19.35	A22	-	-	2.12.41		2.13.41.19		
2.26.36.40	B20	-	2.26	2.26-36				
2.27.25.10.23.18	A12, 18	-	2.27	2.27.25		2.27.25.10	2.27.25.10.23	
2.37.23.5	B28	-	2.37	2.37.23				
6.18.17.19	A8	6	6.18	6.18.17				
6.35.32.39.33	B15	-	6.35	6.35.32		6.35.32.39		
7.18.35	B8	7	7.18					
7.23.18.24	B6	-	7.23	7.23.18				
7.24.40.35	B21	-	7.24	7.24.40				
7.45.7	B7	-	7.45					
9.30.39.18.7	B4	9	9.30	9.30.39		9.30.39.18		
10.3.38	A1, 4	10	10.3					
13.1	A2	13						
13.1.39.33	B24	13	13.1	13.1.39				
15.7.13.1.18	B23	15	15.7	15.7.13		15.7.13.1		
16.14.18	B17	16	16.14					
16.23.18.43	B25	-	16.23	16.23.18				
22.25.27	B27	22	22.25					
22.29.36.7.8	B5, 10	-	22.29	22.29, 36		22.29.36.7		
22.37.42.25	B22	-	22.37	22.37.42				
23.19.35	A5	23	23.19					
24.40.12	A30	24	24.40					
27.25.38.1	B18[[9	27	27.25	27.25.38				
27.34.23.25	B9	-	27.34	27.34.23				
27.44.8	A25	-	27.44					
27.45.7.12	A26	-	27.45	27.45.7				
27.45.7.35	B 29	-	-	-				
28.1	A11, 17	28						
29.8.13	B12	29	29.8					
29.24.24.24.20.35	B18	-	29.24	29.24.24.		29.24.24.20		
29.29.34	A28	-	29.29					
29.33 1	B16	-	29.33					
29.34.23.25	B2	-	29.34	29.34.23				
29.36.7.8	B13	-	29, 36,	29.36.7				
29.45.7	A29, B11	-	29, 45					
31, 26, 12	A7	31	31.26					
31.26.35	A23	-	-					
33.23	A14	33						
33.24.20.12	B26	-	33.24	33.24.20				
39.11	A19	39	37	31	14	3	2	
45.7	B1	45	+11	+5				
T. TALS		53	48	34				

Now that I got through that page, I must admit I don't feel like typing the three other pages which are transformations of the same stuff, but I guess Id better at least put down the list of ~~Hix~~ sorry OUT words in numeric al order.

1.13	A2
1.13.12.2	A6
1.27.9.2	B14
1.28	A11, 17
1.33.29	B16
1.38.25.27	B19
5.23.37.2	B28
7.18.39.30.9	B4
7.23.35.6.2	B3
7.40.22.12.2	B30
7.40.41.1	A21
7.45	B1
7.45.7	B7
7.45.29	A29, B118.7
8.7.36.29	B13
8.7.36.29.22	B5, 10
8.44.27	A25
11.39	A19
12.7.45.27	A26
12.20.24.33	B26
12.26.31	A7
12.40.24	A30
13.8.29	B12
18.1.13.7.15	B23
18.1.13.12.2	A31
X18.6.12.2	A24
18.14.61	B17
18.23.10.25.27.2	Q12, 18
19.17.18.6	A8
21.37.35.27.27.12.2	A3, 15
23.33	A14
24.18.23.7	B6
25.23.34.27	B9
25.23.34.29	B2
25.42.37.22	B22
26.31.12.2	A10, 13, 16
27.18.32.14.27.12.2	A9
27.25.22	B27
33.39.1.13	B24
33.39.32.35.6	B15
33.40.4.12.2	A27
34.29.29	A28
35.7.45.27	B29
35.18.7	B8
35.19.33	A5
35.19.41.12.2	A22
35.20.24.24.29	B18
35.26.31	A23
35.40.24.7	B21
38.3.10	A1, 4
38,33.32.12.2	A20
40.36.26.2	B20
43.18.23.16	B25

At least there are the samenumber of items in the column on this and the last page.
the totals at the bottom of this read

21	41	31	14	3	2
32	7	3			
53	48	34	14	3	2

Yhe other two sheets were just like these except that they treated sides A and B separately.
totals of Side A in read

13	12	11	7	3	2
12	9	2			
25	21	13	7	3	2

of Side A out read

15	20	13	7	3	2
10	1				
25	21	13	7	3	2

of Sid4 B IN

12	28	21	7	0	0
17	0	0	0	0	0
29	28	21	7	0	0

of Side B out

14	24	19	7	0	0
15	4	2			
29	28	21	7	0	0

Then the next page is the tabllation, fuller thayn your Table I, of which your Tzble I ought to be a summary, agreeing, supposing only that Iye done my addition correctly.

IN		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15		OUT	T	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
AB	T																										
Sing	19	9	5	1	1	1		1								1	= 53		21	11	2	3	1	1	1	2	53
A	T																										
	13	9	3								1						= 25	15	9	2 3	4					25
B	T																										
	12	6	1	2	1	1	1										= 29		14	7	3	2	1		1		29
AB	T																										
Dupl	37	34	2								1						= 48		41	34	7						48
A	T																										
	12	10	1							1							= 21		20	19	1						21
B	T																										
	28	28															= 28		24	20	4						28
AB	T																										
Tri	31	28	3														34		31	28	3						34
A	T																										
	11	9	2														13		13	13							13
B	Y																										
	21	21															21		19	17	2						21
AB	T																										
Qua	14	14															14		14	14							14
A	T																										
	7	7															7		7	7							7
B	T																										
	7	7															7		7	7							7
AB	T																										
Pent	3	3															3		3	3							3
A	T																										
	3	3															3		3	3							3
B	T																										
	0	0														0	0		0	0							0
AB	T																										
Sex	2	2															2		2	2							2
A	T																										
	2	2															2		2	2							2
B	T																										
	0	0															0		0	0							0

Before I stop, a few more general ~~things~~ things.
The corrections which this may produce in your MS (even where I am wrong, there are obviously some corrections to be made) will have no ___--- No , I should put it the other way. If there are errors in what I have covered so far, and even if they are real errors in your calculations, which I doubt, they will hardly have any effect either in validating or in breaking down whatever conclusions you come to in the parts I haven,t come to yet. They are smallenough,I am sure, to be of no effect.
Most of your readers, most of the editors ~~whom~~ will to whom you submit the MS will say, aha, figures and statistics, this must be profound and correct, and will not look further. But your enemies , among whom I am to be counted at the moment as advocatus diaboli, will immediately look to see whether you are consistent in your figures. Only after theyye found the addition and subtraction correct, like the Inland Revenuers, will they go on to ask whether the figures are significant. You can be sure that they will do so, if they find your arithmetic quite correct. But some of them will be inclined not to look further if they find a couple of errors in the first couple of pages. That is why the careful working over of the form to be presented to the public is so terribly important.

You make no f reference (except to say that there has been controversy) to those who have done work on the Disc before. You ought, I think, at least give a note to the largest gathering of bibliography. Some critics will say, aha, she doesnt know Joe Soandsos fundamental work, and look, her figures dont agree with his. The sequel to that is likely to be dismissal of both as hopeless. Except, that if your's are correct, somebody will go on, encouraged.

That's enough for the moment. I've kept a carbon, though I often forget, but if you do check over those pages of which Iye made duplicates, and point out any error of transcription or addition, Iç b I would be most gratefull. I offer the poor excuse of doing it in a hurry, and not proofreading, and not double checking.
With best wishes,

ELB.