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DEAR READER,

One of the most prominent features of a real scholar is his readiness to reevaluate his own theories. Based on this characteristic, Mihály Mellár is a genuine scholar. After studying and publishing on the Phaistos Disc in our Journal, he came to the following conclusions:

"The shorter an unidentified writing the harder is to decipher it. The task is particularly difficult if the number of once occurring signs is high. On the Phaistos Disk out of the 45 signs 9 is hapax. Everybody takes this figure as fact, I have used to do the same, and however, this is only a misleading appearance. The disk is legible in both directions, thus the so called "hapax" occurs in at least two different readings. Beside the text, which is divided into fields, is a multiple acrostic poem: the initial and closing signs of the fields compose legitimate sentences in both directions, 16 lift out closing signs and the remaining closing signs are also readable in both directions. Thus, there are ten intertwined, but different readings on the disc, making the phonetic values of the signs verifiable. The contrivance of these manifold intertwining readings guided the scribe in choosing the picture-signs; therefore one can only draw conclusions about the effective realization of this objective. In this regards the scribe has created a perfect masterpiece.

He did manage to choose the 45 small pictures in such a way that with the help of the consonantal frame or the initial of the depicted objects (rebus principle) he could place ten different, but connected and with the many reading directions intertwined messages on a single disc.

With the ten possible reading directions, by using only 242 imprints of the 45 signs he managed to compose 497 words into meaningful sentences on a palm size disc. For this, to write it down with our modern alphabet we needed exactly 3,000 characters. The disc is indeed a real record!!!

These new revelations about the disk and the shaping of a theory of picture-writing challenged me to take the disk in hand again. The story has not changed, but significantly enlarged and its multiple interlacing this time assures the incontestability of the readings."

These new research results are presented in this Supplement of the Journal of Eurasian Studies, issue 2011/4. They are introduced by a theoretical paper on the hieroglyphic writings, entitled ‘The Codebook of Hieroglyphic Writings’.

Flórián Farkas
Editor-in-Chief

The Hague, December 31, 2011
THE PHAISTOS DISC
REVISITED
MELLÁR, Mihály

The codebook of hieroglyphic writings

Abstract
Awareness of linguistic structure is a product of a writing system, not a precondition for its development. David R. Olson.

Minoan hieroglyphic writing is a strictly phonetic writing system. All the hieroglyphs are acrophonic signs. A number of them (chosen by certain criteria) are characters, standing for the initial consonant, while the others represent the whole word or sound-group of the depicted object’s name. In alternative wording: the hieroglyph represents the consonantal frame of the depicted object’s name, so it can stand for one, two, three or more consonants.

When spread out as in plane-writing, the words and word-endings describing the correlation between the hieroglyphs (one element in or on another, one covers the other, etc.), namely the glueglyphs, pose as regular hieroglyphs in the listing of characters, in the so-called scene record.

The hieroglyphs and glueglyphs form an open-ended list: any object or event that can be depicted and unambiguously named by the reader could be used for graphical representation of speech.

It is a reasonable commandment that in a hieroglyphic text every discrete picture is a hieroglyph, it would be a logical somersault to decorate a writing consisting of nothing but pictures with similar pictures. The so-called normalisation – selection, sifting and regrouping, rearrangement of the hieroglyphs – is a scientific nonsense; the chauvinistic, denigrating overriding of the scribe is just not on.

The reading of hieroglyphic writing is similar to alphabetic reading: by pronouncing one after the other the sounds graphically represented with hieroglyphs and with depicted events/narratives (in the case of plane-writing), and letting the vowels change (rebus) until the locked in, meaningful verbal message can be heard again.

Alternatively: the consonantal frame of the words and word-endings graphically represented by hieroglyphs and glueglyphs are filled with vowels until the intended linguistic message recovers.

There is a reciprocally unequivocal correspondence between the hieroglyphic writing’s graphical system of notations and the sounds of speech, in other words: the hieroglyphic writing is the same kind of phonetic writing as the alphabetic, but with specific reading rules. Every picture element represents a row of sounds, a word, a word-ending or only a singular sound and exactly that: the picture elements represent only sounds; the reading, the forming of words and sentences gives those sounds syntactic roles and not vice versa.

The hieroglyphic writing is the model for syntax, since with rebus the picture turns from emblem, symbol, or sign representing the object into graphical/hieroglyphic sign for writing down words.

The hieroglyphic writing using the rebus principle is a consequence of organic development, the alphabetic writing is adopted and adapted in every language, even in the Phoenician and the Greek.

If you extend the inherent analogical reasoning, by which you recognize depicted objects, to analogically sounding words, than you have mastered hieroglyphic writing and reading, an academic discipline.

Actually you did better, as Egyptology is just not there yet. Wow, isn’t that cool!
Writing is the illustration of speech

The elements of hieroglyphic writing are not symbols, but (miniature) pictures, which we call hieroglyphs and glueglyphs, which are the relational suffixes and words describing the notion/aspect/shape of writing. Hieroglyphic writing should not be mixed up with depiction. Hieroglyphic writing does not convey its message with the written and unwritten rules and tools of drawing and painting, nor with the photography-like presentation of things, but phonetically: a description, a scene record is prepared (in thought, in word or in writing), than the reader deciphers or decodes this scene record, literally melts out (‘kiolvasz’) the message frozen into the picture, reads out (‘kiolvas’) its saying. The actual reading, the decoding of the hieroglyphic writing was named rebus principle by Sir Alan Gardiner. János Borbola calls it ancient Magyar vowel-substitution, but we could call it simply by its customary name – reading! What is it all about? When perceiving B+B, the reader simply articulates what s/he sees: Be-s, plural, because there are two of the same signs. BeS doesn’t mean anything, but the B_S_ consonantal frame can be filled with vowels to BaSe, BaSS, BoSS, BuS. This only diverges from the reading we know in that the vowels are depending on the context. Yet not even this is entirely new for us, for example the BaSS gapes on dry land, but doesn’t play a BaSS-clarinet. The actual vowel depends on the context. The alphabetic writing is more developed than the hieroglyphic, its reading is unambiguous, the experts say. But is it really? By doubling the number of signs (from BB to BaSS) is there a 100% improvement in unanimity? Of course not, the precise meaning of the word depends heavily on the context of it.

The hieroglyphs have a duplicity the researchers cannot cope with as yet: on one side the picture visualizes, depicts something, for example a pear; however in the message of the hieroglyphic writing it stands for the word pair. In the fictitious descriptions it acts like a pear, it simulates a pear, but the rendering of the message can be achieved only by concentrating on the sounds of its name, by substituting the vowel in the word-frame. The objective of the hieroglyph is not to depict the fruit, but to represent the ‘pear’ sound-group or word. In the scene record, which should not be mixed up with the message of hieroglyphic writing, the pear acts like a simulated or fictive fruit, not generally and universally, independently from the language, like as it would in a fruit-shop window, but exceptionally and exclusively in the language of the hieroglyphic writing (in Magyar for the Minoan Hieroglyphics).

In the fruit-shop window the message “-
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is valid for all hieroglyphic writings, therefore for the Minoan too: the ♥ hieroglyph is not an ideogram (thought/concept-mark) in its original meaning, namely irrespective of the language (pear for the English, kruška for the Croats), it stands for the word ‘körtle’ as the Minoan (Magyar) ‘language has clothed it’. The ♥ is a fruit only on the surface, in reading it stands for the word or group of sounds/letters ‘körtle’, for example on CHIC #294. Without this specification the Cretan writings are indecipherable, unreadable.

To recognise and name (in Magyar) the ‘pear’ and similar hieroglyphs is relatively easy and more or less unambiguous; the question is rather what the researchers refer to under its name. About this there is no clear definition, they like to decide arbitrarily in this matter, for example: the sign 084 ♦ iNG (’shirt’, J. G. Younger’s LANA), which turns up only once on its own in the whole Minoan corpus, they are listing as a hieroglyph, while the at least hundred times occurring ♦ iV (arch) is only a decoration.

Why? Just! The hieroglyph is in fact a miniature picture, the number of pictures people can draw is unrestricted, and so is the number of hieroglyphs. In the times of the Egyptian Middle-Empire they utilized about 850 hieroglyphs, by the time of the Roman era their number rose to five thousand; the Chinese dictionaries today hold about fifty-thousand signs, but out of these circa 500 are of pictographic and ideographic origin, the majority are compounds containing phonetic and semantic components. The number of signs in both cases settled in by usage; in practise, this much and exactly these hieroglyphs proved to be sufficient.

Each of the circa 350 known Minoan Hieroglyphic texts and the non numbered rings and murals are only short, just a few word long messages. A portion of them are noted, on pliable, by kneading repeatedly reusable clay tablets, nodules and rods, by their content reminder, sketch, but against the misconceptions without abbreviations and acronyms, but in extremely compact drafting. Our own handwritten reminders and sketches are full of under, over and around writings and symbols the academy doesn’t regard as letters, despite of this, if we want to re-read it, or someone else wants to use it, forsooth one has to pay attention to the scribbles as well. It is the same with the Minoan texts too.

The researchers, in the name of an a priori accepted idea, have restricted the number of Minoan hieroglyphs to around one hundred, because they force the presumption that the Minoan writing is a syllabism. Not the practice and not Minoans themselves, but the researchers, in the name of a preconception, disregard a large number of hieroglyphs as nothing but decoration. Such a “decoration” is the ‘tükör’ (mirror) on #206, #282, #312; the ‘fok’ (scale, grade) on #137, #203, #248, #268, the ‘fül’ (ear, handle) on #219, the ‘levél’ (leaf) on #216, #262, etc. Practically it would be a logical somersault to decorate a writing consisting of nothing but pictures with similar pictures. It would be similar to the beard, moustache and similar naughtiness drawn to the women on the bulletin boards. Actually even worse! Who is to decide which of the small pictures/hieroglyphs are only a decoration, the scribe or the reader? It is a waste of time to meditate on this question. To decide which sign is a hieroglyph in hieroglyphic writing and which is not cannot be subjugated to the mercy and/or liking of the reader, and it cannot be aim of the scribe to deliberately or unwittingly deceit the reader, therefore: it is a reasonable commandment that in a hieroglyphic text every sign/picture is a hieroglyph!

The selection, sifting and regrouping, rearrangement of the hieroglyphs – as a matter of fact, the denigrating overriding of the scribe – in the scientific literature is called normalisation. One wanders what is normal in that?! But that is not all. They compare the sign-groups picked out this way: sign-group DoG on #n tablet is the same as DoGma on tablet #m, because on the second tablet the hiero for Ma (cat-face) – as a decoration – was discarded!
Reading
How does the little Pete in the first year prove that he can read? He shows us that he can pronounce the sounds attached to letters of the alphabet and form meaningful words and sentences, that he can lace the sounds together in such a way that both himself and his listeners can understand the message legible from the graphical signs. There is no need to prove differently for the hieroglyphics either. The whole class is reading by the same reading rules, the same message from the same graphical signs. Everybody can master the ins and outs of reading of hieroglyphics; just the same, as one did when learning alphabetic reading. In fact this reading should be more easy and faster to learn. Reading hieroglyphics is not a question of faith or science, and definitely not the privilege of the initiated in some esoteric society. There is reciprocally unequivocal correspondence between the hieroglyphic writing’s graphical system of notations and the sounds of speech, in other words: the hieroglyphic writing is the same kind of phonetic writing as the alphabetic, but with specific reading rules.
Since the human fabric of Minoan culture as a consequence of man-induced and natural catastrophes vanished from the scene of history, the Cretan hieroglyphics also sank into oblivion. Its use in the Hungarian folk-art is in the dying phase as well. Worse than that, the Hungarian linguists ignore the still emerging sparkles of it, saying – the barbarians (that’s us) don’t even have a language, only some patchwork obtained by theft from neighbours, lest a standalone, organic writing we could have.

Encoding
Therefore the circumstances made it that the hieroglyphic writing had to be decoded like a cryptogram. The coding-decoding is a very plain science. The plain-text letters of the text we want to encrypt we transpose with an upfront-prepared codebook to another or to a rearranged set of lettering. The addressee with the reverse of the codebook decodes, reinstates the original lettering, and makes it legible again. This is it.
The enemy, who is the cause of encryption, is trying to break the code of encryption and knowing the language – this is important – it is only a matter of time and ingenuity will succeed. At coding, the signs of the given text are written out to another system of notation, at decoding we do this in reverse; the process overall can be mechanized. Infamous is the German’s Second World war Enigma Machine. The cracking of the code also can be mechanised; the probing of millions of possible fittings, until one intelligent reading comes across, and this is the point, there is only one such reading, exclusively in the language of the original text. Countless possible combinations may turn up some legitimate words in any language, but a given text can be decoded systematically, coherently and without contradictions only according to one key and in one way only. In our case, hundreds of texts are decoded by the same key.

The only but requisite evidence for the successful cracking of a code is the intelligent reading.
This trivial thing was important to tell, because the general belief is that some special verification is needed. The codebook presented here is unambiguous, easy to follow, exempt from inconsistencies, everybody can check it and it is applicable, so everybody can make certain that this is the only correct cipher-key, which always gives back the original intelligent text. Its fault is that the original Cretan hieroglyphic writings, after decoding, are only legible in Magyar. For this reason, the codebook presented here has no approval and support from scientist’s, nor will it have any time soon. But this is not the qualification of the codebook.
The formal classification of hieroglyphics

The texts by their form can be sorted in the following classes:

1. picture-like writings, which can be found on murals and frescos, on (seal-)rings and on some seals and imprints. On these items the picture editing is made with such thoroughness that the extrinsic event, the narrative and story almost completely covers the pictures writing-nature, its real verbal message (see bellow the inventing of a religion). The decoding of these picture-like writings is extremely difficult without the knowledge of their context, for this reason it is essential here too to keep in mind that there are no “decorations” on these picture-like writings. Every picture element is needed for their decoding.

2. picture-writings or hieroglyphic writings can be enlisted in two subclasses,
   a. plane-writing (two-dimensional writing) which gives preferences to glueglyphs (relational suffixes and words describing the notion/aspect/shape of writing). The Minoan hieroglyphics is a variant of picture-like writing heading towards standardisation, it is characterised by the reuse of certain picture elements, and the hieroglyphisation process is in progress. As the research of these writings is done from the alphabetic side and bases, typically the researchers see only the hieroglyphs (even those only selected). They won’t notice the picture-like utterances, the glueglyphs such as one element in another, or on another, one covers the other, etc. Or (disdainfully) they hold the scribe unable to keep the line of writing.
   b. row-writing is characterised by setting the hieroglyphs in orderly rows and the gradual abandonment of purely pictorial utterances.

3. linear writing, in this case the Linear A writing, which is characterised by the restricted number and authorized use of signs.

To employ the concept of evolution on the above specification is unjustified, because the Cretans simultaneously and at the same time (sometimes in the same inscription) used these writing types. (Indeed, the pictorial and hieroglyphic writings are still present in Magyar folk art.) The classification is not 'scientific'; it seems to couple together the glottographic and semasiographic writings, namely the speech-based and the ideas directly representing graphical notations. The latter is not a coherent, definable category; it is rather the generic noun for all graphical representations outside the former.

What is the criteria for glottography? First of all the phonography, writing down the sounds of speech with graphical signs, which follow each other in a row – looking it from our own point of view! Already on the bases of these formal features the plane-writing is not fit to write down the speech whose sounds are following each other in a row – the researchers are saying and with rows of examples they are “proving” it. For example, the preschool children, when they asked to write, then they will draw scribbles in rows with word-spacing (imitating the adult users of alphabetic writing!) – says Malcolm D. Hyman, the researcher of the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science in the article titled Of Glyphs and Glottography, referring on Tolchinsky. (The Mongolian children would probably draw small square-like scribbles one under the other!) I have myself a similar example: The Serbs have seen the writing first in church as black scribble on white paper, which remind them of pissing in the snow (pisati ‘to write’ and pišati ‘to piss’) and the reading they interpreted as the meaningless recitation of their pope in the artificial Slavic, so they experienced it as a rumble of a battle (čita).

The #139 text, farther below, is such plane-text, consequently it is unsuitable for writing down as a speech, and the hieroglyphs for L and M stand out from the row. It would be really disturbing if they were only passive notes, however these two hieroglyphs are acting, L touches M: „L éri M-et” and the description of this act is linear, it is done with the sounds of speech! The vowel-substitution is done on the
linear description, that is what we read, by the time we get to reading, the plane-writing changes to line-writing.

How definite is this writing? Is it reading or only verbalizing a picture? – asks M. D. Hyman. In Magyar we can rearrange this „L éri M-et” narrative in six different ways, but only this one renders an intelligible sentence. Bluntly, this plane-writing can be read in only one way, therefore it is not less definite than an alphabetic writing – in this case. Of course, this writing (also) has some kickbacks: it is not suitable to write standalone words, names, indeed there is not one personal name in the whole corpus of Cretan hieroglyphic writings. A consonantal word-frame usually has more than one legitimate reading, which is not typical for personal names ... today, but think of the Hungarian kings András-Endre, maybe it isn’t from the devil if a text has more than one intelligible reading.

The reading of hieroglyphics

The hieroglyphs written next to each other in a row are read exactly as the alphabetic writing: we articulate the fictitious sound values, the ones we see on the surface of the hieroglyphs, but we treat the vowels loosely, let them change and harmonize, until the text becomes rationally suited to the context.

From this formulation follows that hieroglyphics is not an adequate writing, since it gives a free hand to the reader, who can read a group of signs anyway s/he wants. But that is not exactly the case: we have seen earlier that the spelled out word bass has at least two different meanings, but in a clear and intelligent speech, the context we use the word in, will render unambiguous which meaning of the word we fancy. It is exactly the same with hieroglyphic writing too. Here is an example:

#097. MA/P Ha (HM 1402 [ÉM, H. 6]), crescent (4 x 1.7 x 1.1 cm)

The first sign from the right is J/L, a door (aJtó) that stops (áLít/áJJít) outsiders and darkens (éJít) the room. (The door turns around a corner lath, which is lowered into the threshold and the lintel rather than on a today’s hinge.)

The middle sign is R, one stick on the other (Rá), or carve (Ró), write (íR), divide (Részekre oszt). (The point means that the line open, continues in that direction!)

On the left is a linear drawing of a GáLYa (galley). The 040 hieroglyph is no doubt a lifelike drawing of a galley, its name in Greek is γαυλός in Italian galea, galéra, in French galère, in German Galeere, in Magyar GáLYa and is in the same word family as the word HaJó (G>H, LY=J) ship/both/vessel! This word-family also contains the words GuLYa (herd of cattle) as the galley’s personnel consists of a ‘herd’ of men moving in step (see galley .goBack gallery), GóLYa (stork), when they are in passage they move like a row of oars, their strokes(!) are synchronised.

Note: These are regularly used signs; they turn out also in nicer, better recognizable handwritings, so there is no question what they depict.

| 038-070-040 | J/L R G_L_ G_L_ R J/L | Jó ReGéLő GáLYáRa Jó | Jó regélő gályára jó. |
| 040-070-038 |

Jó regélő gályára jó.

Good storyteller is good for galley.
There are a couple of alternative possibilities for filling in the vowels, like gályára/gulyára, regélő/ragály/rúgáló, but only the above reading makes sense. The context adequately delimits the number of readings and interpretabilities. The longer the text the more this is so. Here we had a relatively easy task, however not in every picture-writing are the signs like this in a row, the writing may include some pictorial utterances, like one sign is under the other or touches the other, the sign can be in lying position or it can be dusty, etc. Practically, we only just now come to the examination of real pictography. Here is the above already mentioned example:

#139 KN Imp DoN: CMS II 8.80 on HMs 107 (nodulus, DoN)

The reading starts at X, with the 009 KeZeS (glove) hieroglyph. The 077 L (Lung) touches the 013 M (bear) hiero. The 020 B (Bug) seems to fall on its back.

Researchers accustomed to the alphabet will list the objects seen on the picture (here they missed out only on the dot, ’10’) and for them the job has ended. Would they, by any chance, hear this text read back by the scribe himself, they would conclude that the writing does not cover the spoken language, as they did the same with the Na-khi or Naxi hieroglyphics. One typical text, to illustrate this, is from Seaver Johnson Milnor (A Comparison between the Development of the Chinese Writing System and Dongba Pictographs): „Naxi xiangxing wenzi texts, omitting many words from the rites they record, do not systematically represent speech and thus do not constitute a writing system by Boltz’s definition. One could learn the spoken Naxi language, memorize the meaning and pronunciation of every pictograph in a given manuscript, and would still be unable to recite the ritual in its entirety without having first studied it under the tutelage of a Dongba.” Yes, they perceive only the discrete pictograms, without any mutual effect. In their opinion the signs have only formal values, they have no bearing on each other nor with the big picture, no action can be connected to the sign, they cannot lean, touch or cover each other. To be more exact, the researchers won’t take any notice of these narratives, although these are part of the reading. These researchers, though in their mother tongue cannot compose a single sentence without a verb, they hardly ever query where the plot is in logographic writings, since on logo- and pictographs there are only objects, in Milnor’s words: „a graph can stand for a word, the name of an object, rather than the object itself.” He uses in this sentence-fragment the word object twice, while in the whole essay the verb comes up only once, in connection with a homophone word. Let us turn back to the inscription: the intention of the scribe is clear, he made sure that we notice: L is touching M, a ’10’ is in the recess of three others, implying the proper reading and one cannot miss
noticing that the bug is abnormally falling on its back. The scribe not only lists the hieroglyphic signs but also assigns roles to them, he makes them pose. One cannot and should not leave these pictorial modes of expression unnoticed, these events, narratives are the same parts of the graphical representation of speech as the physically separable hieroglyphic signs. It is interesting, that such, from the letters inseparable graphical signs are used in the alphabetic writing as well, but for some unexplainable reason the researchers would like to remove that from hieroglyphics. In a couple rows higher up there is such a sign: two letters are slanted (italics), when reading this syllable is stressed, thus it is pronounced differently. And now a surprise. Although the X marks the direction of reading, the text is also meaningful by reading it backwards. From this direction, first we encounter the M sign of the \{L, M\} pair, but that is not a problem, because the word-order in Magyar proposition is free, we follow the natural direction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impression</th>
<th>Transnumeration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;{\text{borul } \circ }\text{\textsuperscript{+}}) {\text{-et ér } \circ \text{\textsuperscript{+}}}</td>
<td>{\text{B}_R_L \text{020}\text{\textsuperscript{+}}\text{‘10’} {013_T \text{R077}\text{\textsuperscript{+}}\text{009}}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

borul : B\_R\_L : BíRáL : judge  
\( \circ \) : B\_T\_S/Z : Bó’ToS : shopkeeper  
\( \circ \text{-et ér } \circ \) : M\_T\_R\_L : MiT áRuL : what sells  
\( \circ \) : K\_Z\_S : KeZeS, lopkódó : light-fingered

\textit{Bírál bó’tos mit árul kezes.} \hspace{2cm} \textit{The shopkeeper judges what the light-fingered sells.}

The sentence is of double meaning: the shopkeeper criticises the items that were stolen from him, but it can hint that the shopkeeper is light-fingered as well, in the better of the two, through the goods acquired under the counter. This reading doesn’t make the preceding any lesser, on the contrary strengthens it, after all it is obtained with the same sound values of the signs.

**Scene record and reading**

A picture, and therefore a picture-like hieroglyphic writing, can have several types of interpretations. The viewer has to know the circumstance of the picture’s creation and the innately flimsy rules of the visual art to write down with appropriate accuracy the narrative visible on the surface of the picture. For an approximately exact description of a picture, it is not enough to list the distinguishable elements of it, still less sufficient to point out just a couple of – at will selected – elements: every element of a picture, in their interdependence and in logical order, have to be taken into account, a scene record has to be prepared with such elaborateness, conciseness and with unambiguous naming of the correlations, as if the picture would be described to a blind person.

The task is not simple, what more it is outright impossible, as it is shown in C. D. Cain’s Dancing in the Dark essay. The miniature picture, in fact every element of it, of the famous/notorious Isopata ring is interpreted by many researchers in even more ways. Based mainly on this ring they created (subsequently!) the Minoan religion, their body of beliefs and their ideology, as it turned out, all these from an engagement ring.
that lacks every allusion on religion. (See its reading by MM in the Journal of Eurasian Studies number 0111.)

The most elementary question about a picture is what happens on it, what event or events are taking place on it? The train of events, on the depicted scene, forms the narrative and the story of the picture, which is never only a simple listing of the picture elements, but the narration of the characters and events of the depicted scene.

The same picture-tale can be told in many different ways, the picture only serves as a mnemonic tool, it reminds the person, who from the outset knows the plot, about the flow and the details of the tale. This is not writing and reading yet, but only a tiny step separates it from that: the application of the rebus principle. It is not sure, that “the sign for a bee necessarily represent the word ‘bee’; it may just represent the object, a bee. But if the sign is now appropriated to represent the verb ‘be’, the sign has become a word sign, a logograph. The principle involved in this case is that of the rebus, the use of a sign which normally represents one thing to represent a linguistic entity that sounds the same; this entity is a word. What needs emphasis is that the rebus principle does not merely play upon pre-existing word knowledge; the substitution of the signs on the basis of their sound is what brings words into consciousness. A script which can be taken as representing both syntax and the words combined by the syntax produces a canonical writing system, one which is capable of representing everything that can be said.” The quotation is from David R. Olson’s essay How writing represents speech.

With the appearance of the rebus principle the picture becomes picture-writing or hieroglyphics, the picture elements now denotes words in coherent syntactic structure.

The word is not a property/attribute of an object, nor is of the object’s hieroglyph, but a standalone object, namely a notion/idea/concept; word consisting of sounds, an element of speech. The structure of the hieroglyphic writing, the applied rules and methods give an insight inspection into the syntax of the language, but the two is not the same, one is the face while the other is the back-side of the picture. In Barthes’ classification: one holds the iconic message, while the other linguistic message and Barthes stops there, although the logical requirement is the connection of the two; the two messages are tied together with a codebook called rebus, charade, or ancient Magyar vowel-substitution. In János Borbola’s wording “The rebus system denotes a variant vocalisation of the original phonological form of hieroglyphs. With this the same hieroglyph (keeping its consonantal frame unchanged) by substituting its vowels receives a new meaning.”

It should be noted that the rebus principle is not only switching the vowels in a word, but it is also agglutinating (similar to but not inflection/conjugation/declension) and compounding of words: ēV (arch), {ēV} = {ēV-ek} (plural) > éVeK > évek (years); {ől (sits)}* = ūL+ēV > ēVüL > ēvül (laps)> (ével (lasts for years) > avul (becomes obsolete) > ível (arches) > ívül (becomes arch-like) > ivolya (Ibolya) (Violet) > ovál(is) (oval) > övély (Tatu Dasypus).

Just to note, the rebus system is not a dinosaur, it is present in our life in two ways, says Daniel Kies:

“The rebus principle we discussed initially re-emerges in two ways. First, in our initial experiences with literacy, we all went through a stage in which we employed the rebus principle to learn to read and write. Witness my daughter Emily's pre-literate attempt to write "I love you" using rebus figures for I, love and you. Second, writing onscreen, as participants in text chats, email, and other conferencing systems, frequently employ icons (themselves a form of rebus) to represent syllables, words, or clauses in the spoken language. I can use an asterisk [*] or underscore [ _ ] to show emphasis, for example. I can use an emoticon [ ;-) ] to show that I am not serious, etc.”
We can talk about writing, especially hieroglyphic writing, when the scene record, namely the events seen on the surface (the story of the objects and events) are separable from the hidden, coded message of the scene record; in this case the structure of the picture models some of the elements of the language. “only when it becomes possible to differentiate the activity of describing what a picture shows from reading what a text says, can the graphic structure be seen as a model for the syntactical properties of language.” Olson.

This should be alright, except that the boundary between the picture, picture-writing and the text is not evident, so the boundary between describing, verbalizing and reading is not self-explanatory. The question can be considered externally, without the context and the texture (the material the text is written on) the question cannot be considered. It depends on the scribe’s intent what texture he will choose for the text, would he present his message purely pictorially or verbally?

We would not appreciate with more than a pitying smile the ‘scientist’ who from the type of the letters (chiller or Arial) or from their distribution (say from the delineation made up by letter ‘a’) would draw inferences about the content and message of Shakespeare’s Othello. The same belittling smile is due to the researchers, who from the apparent elements of hieroglyphic reconstruct (as a matter of fact construct, invent) religion, ideology and whatnot; namely, the essence of the sent communication of the writing is in the coded/written linguistic message that can be melted/read (olaszt/olvas) out from hieroglyphics with the help of the unbelievably simple, easy to learn and brief rebus.

The vowel-substitution or verbal quibble is an organic part of the Magyar culture. Examples from the Czuczor-Fogarasi dictionary: Átlátni a falon (‘Seeing through the wall’; seeing a letter á on the wall); A cigány nem hal (piscis) a vízbe (‘A Gipsy is not a fish in the water’: a Gipsy won’t die in the water); Kása nem étel (kásanem étel!); Acéla jó, de tűzköve rosz (a cél a jó …). And a very clever Minoan example:

\[\#124 \text{KN Imp Cres (CMS II 8.89) on HMs 206 (Crescent, #013) with #167}\]

\[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline
\text{impression} & \text{transnumeration} \\
\hline
\{\text{-n} \}^+ , \{\text{-n} \}^+ & X \{029{-}_N{-}023\}^+ -040 \\
\{\text{-n} \}^+ & \{029{-}_N{-}023\}^+ \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{-n} & : \text{M{-}N{-}T} : \text{MiNTa}; \text{MeNTő} : \text{model, sample; life-saving, rescue} \\
\Rightarrow & : \text{G_L{-}} : \text{GÁLYa} : \text{GaLLeY}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Minta gálya-mentő.} & \quad \text{Model galley rescuer.} \\
\text{Mentő-gálya minta.} & \quad \text{Rescue-galley model.}
\end{align*}
\]

The X sign marks the beginning of the text or a word; it was used only in special, unavoidable cases. Here it is relevant to start the reading at the M hieroglyph.

The 029 **M, Mally**: Mall, the area between the wall and the overhanging roof, in Magyar its meaning is wider, including the joining area between the stem and a branch as it depicted. On the picture above it, namely on M (M-en) is a 023 **T**, a Tulip: it is the basic motif of Magyar folk art. Probably many a man ‘knows’ that the tulip was distributed in Europe by Holland and its name comes from Turkish turban by a misunderstanding. The Dutch did ask for the name of the flower attached to the turban, but the Turk misunderstanding the question named the turban. It’s a nice story, but the Magyars have been familiar with the tulip for more than four-thousand years so well that they made this flower the sign for the T
sound. Its likely origin is in the describing compound word tő+lippan/lippant (tő ‘stem’+ lippan/lippant ‘hiding’); hinting that from the hidden, underground stem (onion) directly grows the flower. In Magyar there are two variants of the word tulipán and tulipánt, this theory explains the origin of both.

The hieroglyphs
It is time to define the hieroglyphs from the semantic viewpoint in general, and specifically the ones used in Minoan writings. The graphical signs are by the scientific literature preferable put into the picto-, logo- and ideo-gramma pigeonholes, without answering the essential questions. “It is an anachronism to attempt to explain the evolution of graphic signs as the attempt to express ideas via ideographs for there is no reason to believe that early writers had any clear notion of ideas prior to the invention of writing either”, as stated by Olson. The Minoan texts do not make difference between signs. Every picture element represents a row of sounds, a word, a word-ending or only a singular sound and exactly that: the picture elements represent only sounds; the reading, the forming of words and sentences gives those sounds syntactic roles and not vice versa. Consequently, there is no picto-, logo-, and ideo-gramma, there are only picture-signs and the words evoked by them have syntactic roles: noun, verb, object, etc. And there is no word and letter sign, because we cannot tell what would be 049 áR/_R/R: it is both (áR is awl). The case for M09 1 J (uJJ ‘finger’) is even harder, because it also stands for number one (eGY), and this is perfectly normal, after all for counting one does not have to know the numbers, the fingers are always at hand for that: one only needs to pair them up with the objects to be counted.

Neil Thomas Cohn, relying on the works of Charles Sanders Peirce and others, charts the picture-signs onto the surface of a triangle defined with iconic, speech sound based and abstract vertexes. He dumps the graphical signs used in writings into the continuous domain between the three extremes. This continuous allocation has a defining importance on the concept of writing itself, as we will see it. The researchers, used to the letters of the alphabet, easily hang the ideogram attribute to a picture-sign, since on the surface this is what they perceive, that the signs denotes something, for example a ‘pear’, only a deeper analysis can tie the sounds of the word to the picture, and then digging even deeper we can reach the concept of writing.

N. Th. Cohn named his triangle the Cognitive Map of Graphic Signs (CMGS):
Neil Thomas Cohn: ¡Eye ♥ græflk Semiosis! A Cognitive Approach to Graphic Signs and “Writing” is the source of the above graph as well as the following quotation, which determines the writing in an entirely unusual, but very logical way.

“The gradation offered by the triangle also implies that writing comes from transference of one modality to another, as opposed to a full blown invention unrelated to cognitive apparatuses for graphic creation that already existed. In other words, the human mind was already predisposed with the potential for making such an association because of its capacity to create visual signs. Such a correlation has then been carried out by various cultures in different ways – making writing neither an “invention” nor a “progression” but merely an adaptation. Inherent to the perception of writing as an invention is the connotation that it can be improved upon – implicitly allowing such progressive value rankings to occur, again leading toward a upholding of one system (i.e. phonographic) over the others.” Therefore, the phonetic Greek alphabet is not the “invention” of something new, not “evolution[ary]”, just a revision: they only adjusted to the needs of the Greek language, an old, organically developed, consequently to the Minoan (Magyar) language perfectly suited writing. The Phoenician writing is also purely the adaptation and condensation. In Olson’s outline: “the evolutionary development of scripts, including the alphabet, is the simple consequence of attempting to use a graphic system invented to be ‘read’ in one language, for which it is thereby reasonably suited, to convey messages to be ‘read’ in another language for which it is not well suited.”

As we can see, the rebus principle puts the hieroglyphic writing into the same vertex of the CMGS triangle with the alphabetic writing, meaning the latter is no more “advanced”, furthermore, in our (Hungarian) case it is rather a retrocedence, after all it has detoured one or more alien languages before reaching us, and not as an outcome of natural evolution. We conquered the highly civilised Slaves and
Germans who inhabited the Carpathian basin as unlettered, barbarian Asiatic hordes, how could we obtain literacy in any other way but through adoption? Well this is the case: not one word is true in the previous sentence!

**The hieroglyphic writing is a Magyar heritage**

Let us take a profound look at the picture sequence below:

The first is a stitched pattern from Sárköz, the second and third are ‘written’ patterns from Kalotaszeg, the fourth is folkweave from Zemplén and the fifth is a written pattern, namely a seal impression: #280 MA S: HM/Coll. G. 3336 (4RPr of "chalcedony"). The resemblance is apparent enough. The first four patterns were most often seen on the coverlets of the pantry shelves full of compotes and other delicacies. The fifth is hieroglyphic text: between (-ben) the two 062 N-s, i.e. between the N-ek are the two undulatory M05 TaLoN-s, i.e. TaLoN-ok and on (-on) these are the 031 R-s, two on each, thus R-ek. The length of the text is not limited; the addition of any number of the ligature {TaLoN+R-ek} does not change the reading!

\[
\{(\text{-ek})\text{-ben}) (\text{�})\text{-ek}) (\text{s})\text{-ok})\text{-on}+ \{062\text{-K-B_N} 031\text{-K M05\text{-K-N}}\}^+
\]

This is a wonderful fries: in-between the 062 N hieros lay the undulatory M05 T_L_N-s with 031 R-s in every trough of the wave; the reading will not change by adding the same ligature repeatedly to it. But the really amazing about this is that the same needlework still can be seen on pantry shelves in Hungary.

The text starts and finishes with the 062 N hieroglyph. This picture-alignment is always expressed with the \text{-ek}-ben word-form. Of the 031 R sign there is two on an M05 TaLoN, this plural is expressed with the \text{�}-ek word-form. There are also two M05 TaLoN-s, one carrying on in the other and on these S-s (S-ok-on) are the R-s (R-ek). This description is what we call scene record, and this is what the talking ligature in \{}^+ expresses. The reading comes only after this.

\text{-ek} \text{-ben} : N\text{-K-B_N} : NőK BűNe : sin, crime of women
\text{�}-ek \text{-en} : R\text{-K T_L_N-K-N} : RaKaNLoKoN : on unloaded

\text{Nők bűne rakatlanok.} \quad \text{Unloaded shelves are the sin of the women.}

The question is to what extent the women of Sárköz and Kalotaszeg still understand the hieroglyphs in which they decorate their written(!) peasant embroidery. It can be that they treat these still (in Magyar) talkative hieroglyphs:

062 N, Nő(l) \text{grow, rise, increase}, the point on top of the stroke, like in every Minoan
sign, means that the line in thought continues in that direction. In Linear A, there is a level hatch \( \bar{1} \) it grows up to that line. On the Phaistos Disk, we can see it as ph23 NYēL (\textit{handle}), and amongst today’s writing symbols as the exclamation sign: ¡Ni!, in English: ¡Look!

031￥R, (fogas)Rúd, Rakó (Rack), a fork-like convenience, onto which branches the jugs are put out to dry.

M05￥TaLoN, unit of weight, the hanger hook of the two-armed scale (TaLeNtum), by vowel substitution it becomes TaLáNY (puzzle), what we exactly do by adding a dot to it (\( ? \)). One is really puzzled, how is it possible that nobody could see the connection between ￥ and ?

For how long have hieroglyphic writings and readings existed in the Magyar folk art? When did the talking hieroglyphs become symbols independent from their pictorial value? Whether the barbaric, peasant and other pooh-poohing of folk art knowingly, forcefully ejected the knowledge of the hieroglyphic writing into oblivion, or is it only the side-effect of the idiotic aping of the West, the self-surrender?

The hieroglyphic writing was for thousands of years an organic part of the high-culture of the Magyars. It was there on her peasant embroidery, embroidered vests, Székely-gates (Szekler carved gateways), firewalls, painted lockers (tulipános láda), Miska-pitchers, national symbols, etc. How could all this be unnoticed? Why is it that amateurs and ‘scientists’ equally look for the roots of the Magyar literacy in Orhon (China) – if at all – instead of looking at grandparents bequest, before renouncing and discarding it, as they do with their national symbols.

Perhaps if we would be lucid with the connection of speech and writing, we would highly prize the mighty treasure residing in our folk art. Since in the Magyar-homeland the vernacular is frowned upon, the “high” science does not want to know about our folk-literacy, I am obliged again to quote Olson:

“Awareness of linguistic structure is a product of a writing system, not a precondition for its development. If that is so it will not do to explain the evolution of writing as the attempt to represent linguistic structures such as sentences, words or phonemes for the simple reason that pre-writers had no such concepts.” By our luck, this is only partly true for the Magyar language, because the forced upon us alphabet with the belonging Latin-German grammar is like pants on a cow, therefore it could not really influence the already – with an organic writing – formed linguistic structure, the Magyar word-root system. The motives for development of the ancient Magyar hieroglyphic writing are bald and generic, not only to us attributed, in Olson’s words: “writing systems are developed for mnemonic and communicative purposes but because they are ‘read’ they provide a model for language and thought.” Indeed, our ancestors were fully aware of the word-root system of our language:

#039. KN He (HM 1270 [SM I, P86]), medallion \( \rightarrow \) (4.1 x 4.0 x 1.3 cm)
as on the medallion corrected by MM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Transnumeration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a.   | X □ {‘1’ ‘rák’-on} X ☐ ☐ | X 056 {‘1’ R_K-_N} X 043-070  
X 020-077-SZ_R |
| b.   | X ☐ ☐ ☐ X ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ | X 042-013  
X 057-{061+023 L_} (051-L_)+ ‘20’ ‘1’ |

**a.** Following 056 □ _G (éG 'burn/sky') there is a striking ‘1’ (eGY) on (-on) top of a crab (the claws or pincers and legs are drawn clearly). The 077 ☐ L (Lég 'Lung') sign is unmistakably pricking (szúr) (this sign is equipped with such a pricking torn on #045 and with similar meaning).  
**b.** One cannot miss the 061 ☐ _S/Z_T_ (uSZITó 'chase/r') sign as the stem of 023 ☐ T (Tulip) which is oriented downwards. The 051 ☐ K_S (KéS 'knife') hiero also oriented downwards.

| ☐ : _G : aGY : brain  
‘1’ : _GY : eGY : áGY : one; bed  
‘rák’-on : R_K-_N : RoKoN : relative  
☐ ☐ : SZ-R : SZóRa : on the word  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ szúr : B-L-SZ_R : BeLeSZúR : get a twinge of sg, get a brainstorm  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ A-M : AMi : that, which  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ le : K_S-Z_T-_T L_ : KéSZTeT Le : urge to go down  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ le ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ : K_S-L_–H_S/Z : KoSLóHoZ : to the one on heat |

The scribe puts the words agy [brain] and ágy [bed] in the same word-family. The “related words” expression is a grammatical term here, which sorts the two words into the same word-family, being both by word-form and by definition similar terms: the brain [agy] is the bed [ágy] for thoughts. In the Magyar language, similar ideas are always expressed with similar words. It seems the scribe didn’t believe in the Finno-Ugric theory, by which every Magyar word is a borrowed one, so there cannot be any correlation between them. The Unknown Scribe will not be honoured soon by the Magyar Academy…

Adding to the banter, on the basis of the sentence it is clear that the scribe’s experience in Magyar grammar is not in question. Here the word is not about the fact that the hieroglyphics brings into the consciousness concepts like ‘word’ and ‘equivalent words’, but the scribe already knows about the notion of related words, about the structure of the Magyar language. Forsooth this points far beyond the primitive, barbaric and similar characterisation of hieroglyphic writings the linguists like to use to make it not worth examining. This is a question of self-identity the Magyar academy proved to be incapable of handling.
If someone thinks that the above reading is not evident enough, presented below is a backwards reading of the text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>side</th>
<th>inscription</th>
<th>transnumeration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>{szúr le} + X ‘rák’-on ‘1’</td>
<td>{SZ_R-077}+020 070-043 X {R_K- N ’1’}+056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘1’ le : _GY-H_S/Z : aGYHoZ : to the brain
le : K_S-L_ : KöZeLi (S>Z) : close near
: _S/Z_T_ : éSZTü’ : from the mind
le 051-L_ : LoTYó : slut
: K M-A/E/O/U : Ki, iME! : who, behold!
szúr : SZ_R-L : SZoRuL : burn one’s fingers
: B : eBBe’ : in this
: R-SZ : RoSSZ : bad
‘rák’-on : R_K- N : RoKoN : relative
‘1’ : _GY- G : GYaGYa : mad

Hieroglyphics has its roots in analogy
The diagrammatic structure of hieroglyphics models the language. Cohn outlined this as follows: “Visual language syntax is the study of the structural organization of a sequence of images… which features purely linguistic properties, though they may be tempered to its distinct visual modality.” The difference between picture and picture-writing is that in the latter the word represents the object, while in the former the name is an intrinsic quality of the object. In hieroglyphics the “picture” escapes from the object becoming a word/syllable: \( \text{two objects} > \text{ek} > \text{ívek (pl.)} \), one word.

Writing was born not to write down words, on the contrary the reading of picture sequence made it possible to view the language as a system of assembled words. The hieroglyphic writing is the model for syntax, since with rebus the picture turns from emblem, symbol, sign, representing the object into graphical/hieroglyphic sign for writing down words.

The writing and reading rests on two very plain and natural pillars: on phonography and vowel-substitution (rebus principle). With phonography – naming the picture elements: the hieroglyphs and the words/verbs of the scene record – and with its vowel-substitution the message is retrieved from the picture-writing and these two pillars are rooted in the analogy, which forms the base of human thinking. Writing and reading is as natural as seeing and hearing, in essence they are the unification of the latter two, their synthesis.

Before moving forth let us flesh out in greater detail the notion of analogy. By analogy we mean two unequal objects or situations/events, under certain abstract level perceiving as identical. The researchers...
usually stop at the examination of the analogy of objects, presumably this plays amongst the reasons why the researchers stopped at the level of the separable hieroglyphs, leaving out the analogy of inherences and systems. Lately this situation has changed, the researcher’s attention concentrates more on understanding the analogy. They realised that it can have enormous relevance in education, in the comprehension of words and their correlations, in the enrichment of the children’s vocabulary, etc. “There are two kinds of knowledge: based on facts, directly storable and employable, encyclopaedic knowledge, or knowledge based on correlations, capable to draw conclusions, details of which spread in the phenomena above the perceivable things (epiphenomenon). Researches are showing, that children are spontaneously seeking the correlations between words: the rules of word and sentence forming. A serious relapse (purple line on the diagram) is indicated by 3–4 year old children of inflexional languages, when they have to learn the irregular inflections, the grammatical forms derived with irregular change of vowels (go, went, gone). Only towards the seventh year of their life they grow out of this rule-seeker mode and accept the words declaratively. For Magyar kids this rupture does not have to emerge, since the words can be formed regularly from the word-roots, and the mapped words become rooted as facts. They never have to surrender regular word-formation: on definition/declaration and on word-forming rules resting knowledge cohabit in our language.” This is what the writer wrote a few years ago in the Magyar UFO, and the dear readers can object strongly for the writer’s foolishness: “there are no word-roots” declared one of the agents of Alexander Bach after the lost revolution of 1848, and this dictate is still in force. However, Gentner, Christie, and many others are saying that “Linguistic structure invites corresponding conceptual structure”, in other words, the kids working with a named structure were 25–50% more successful than the ones who were not told the names of the structures they learned about. If the root-system of the Magyar language never existed than it should be invented!

A note needs to be made about the above quotation. It rests on Brian MacWhinney’s 1978 research, posing as a true Magyar (a derogative epithet of people the ruling class do not like), in which he showed what an advantage the Magyar kids have have as opposed to others until they learn in school that there is no language structure. Of course, MacWinney findings were suppressed by the authorities and even today is symptomatic of Mrs. László Nagy’s (Analógiai és az analógias gondolkodás a kognitív tudományok eredményeinek tükrében – “Analogies and the analogical thinking in the mirror of achievements of cognitive sciences”) approach to the subject – not one allusion in the essay about the favourable structure of the Magyar language. With this “political correctness” we achieved, for example, that the Mutual bootstrapping between language and analogical processing (Dedre Gentner and Stella Christie) and similar works refer to the Mandarin, Turk, Navajo and other experiences but the Magyar disappeared from their map. Almost every one of Minoan (Magyar) texts could serve as an example to the teaching of analogies.

The analogy between the root-structure of the Magyar language and the addition of natural numbers (see: The Post-system of the Magyar Language by MM) could also be an object lesson and the basis of a new lesson, in the teaching a promising paradigm shift. As D. Gentner and S. Christie say “the specific semantics and grammar of a language influence the cognitive conceptions of its speakers”. Of course,
they are reflecting upon the real science of language, not on the adopted, distorted, Germanized monster, the official Magyar grammar of today is.

Following are the two simple mappings taken from the above mentioned essay of Mrs. Nagy:

(1) *Elementary mappings*

The elements are mapped one by one, so in every mapping decision we weigh only one element. The mapping of an element to a structure based on its similarity or identity to another element: for example the representation of picture, an object or a word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) *Correlated mappings*

Two elements are considered in every mapping decision (for example man .R. house / dog .R’. kennel analogy). The mapping becomes legitimate by the analogue correlation in the source and the target. Here both R and R’ stands for the ‘live in’ relation.

| a ← R → b |
| †         |
| x ← R’ → y |

A fine example of the elementary mapping is the alphabetic reading, which can be done almost without the conscious mind, the correlated mapping is more typical of hieroglyphic writing, since even in the case of linear writing the message can be rendered only in its integrity, the interpretation of the words is possible only in the correlation. The correlated mapping does not require a higher degree of hardness compared to the elementary, only different and less studied type of mappings.

**The grammar of hieroglyphic writing**

The scene record in its essence is a small dictionary with the necessary and sufficient number of words for *description and processing* of an assignment. In our case, the task is to write down the complete Minoan (Magyar) vocabulary. The implementation of this goal was restricted only by the ability to draw things, that is the graphical system’s capability to unambiguously denote the vocabulary, but not perforce into dictionary form, broken into words. The evocation of speech moves on a rather wide scale, from the enumeration of signs in linear writing to the picture-like representations’ “character-paintings”. The scribe could freely choose the texture of the text and the Minoans used this freedom: they could and did simultaneously use the whole repertoire, after all the border and the ranking between these ways of writing are artificial and posterior, chauvinistic, backward projections.

I would like to stress once more that these words and suffixes are not the vocabulary of the message contained in the text, only the system of symbols/notations used for representing the message; we could say the “alphabet” of the hieroglyphics.

A picture is the spatial world’s planar projection, its depiction (the perspective is a late ‘scientific’ addition) and made with the intention to mediate a message to viewer of the picture. The hieroglyphic writing which (also) contains verbal message accomplishes its expression, its story with the toolkit of pictorial phraseology, which is the following:

- **characters**: the recording of the hieroglyph, picture-signs. The separable signs of picture-writing can be compared to already known signs, but if there is no such than we compare it to known things. When in one or the other way we recognize it we then vocalize it, name it. In the case of linear writing, the story compiles by loudly pronouncing the names of objects following each other in the row. If the sentence compiled this way is not rounded, not intelligently we then look for similarly sounding words until we find one fitting into the legitimate message.
- **scene-alignment**: the relative position of the characters, the hieroglyphs on the plane. (The picture is viewed in suspended position, so the far away is above, the near is under, etc.)
• **scene-setup:** the orientation of the individual characters, their size, quality, etc.

• **scene-event:** the events making up the story of the picture, the actions and movements, the description of effects on each other (narrative), most often the depicted event is expressed with transitive, affective and reflexive verbs.

I have to stress again: this is *description*, not reading.

**Scene-event:** One of the hieroglyphs manipulates another in some way or other:

1. **Objectivizing (P × Q~t):** The simple narrative, in which a picture’s P element covers the picture’s Q element can be expressed or read in six different ways:

   \[ P \text{ fed } Q \text{ -t; Q-t fed } P; \text{ fedi } P \text{ Q-t; fedi } Q \text{-t P; } P \text{ Q-t fedi ; and } Q \text{-t P fedi.} \]

   Similarly to the ‘fed’ transitive verb many other verbs and actions can be drawn. Examples: B ér L-t > B- _R L-_T > BérLeT > bérlet/bírálat; B-t ér T > B-_T R T > BetéRT > betért/bátorít; ér D-t S > _R D- _T S > oRDÍTáS > ordítás/erődítés; (et fed ‘7’ > _V T F D H_T > óVőT FeDHeT > óvót fedhet.

   The above examples are equivalent to the syntax’s *subject-verb-object* trio and – as we can see – this one comparison of the pictorial and the verbal structure excludes all the possible contender languages from the race for the Minoan language. Only in the Magyar language can the S-V-O syntactical trio take up any possible order, mirroring pictures 100% with this quality: the picture does not differentiate between the above six interpretations. The hereto attached picture is not discriminating, everybody interprets the depicted event in his/her language. In most languages of the world, it can be done with the help of three words: a subject, a verb and an object, in the language determined unique order. In Magyar, all six possible descriptions are permitted: the word-order is free.

   The picture is neutral in respect to where one starts the description, on the other hand very categorically and clearly indicates the direction of action → the *subject acts on object*! and this direction is plainly indicated with the ~t case-ending, which is the shortened verb *tesz* (does). The object suffers some kind of deed, for example to be jumped over, this is what makes it objectivized. By self-reflection the action itself can also be objectivized, what is expressed with the addition of the same ~t ending in the description. (In English the case-ending is replaced with a strict word order.)

   The scene records the most regularly occurring transitive verb, the ér/i (P éri Q-t) ‘touches’, but there are many others (the verb is followed with the CHIC number of the text in which it occurs):

   akaszt 219; át-ível 164; borít 042; csével 250; együtt gongyít 236; el-ér 206; el-fed 225; el-rúg 258; emel 304; érik 267; érint 130, 225, 240, 268, 305; érnek 304; fed 101; fűz 206; hajt 293; ivel 278; kerül 308; köt 182, 293, 298; lep 192/312; nyilal 145 ölel 183; övez 308; ragad 228; rúg 298; sakint 250; szorog 238; szűr 045; teker 284; tol 242; tollász 243; ugrik 205, 256; véd 280;

   In the scene record initiating the reading, besides listing the event-describing verb in the row of hieroglyphs, the ~t case-ending must be added to the object.

2. **Self-objectivizing (xt P):** the action itself becomes an object and takes up the ~t/~tt word-end (the English past ten’s ~t or ~ed ending also objectivizes the verb, which we can take after that into possession: I have burn/burned a finger).

   In the scene record initiating the reading, to the event-describing verb adheres the ~t/~tt glueglyph/word-end.
In Magyar, the accusative is not a lexical “case”, but an event, an action that can be drawn! Although he does not talk about the capability to be drawn, professor Végvári shows the objectivisation as an action: “Not only for us, who – in the exploration of the organic system of notation – profess the full interpretability of the sign, but even the ones who accept Saussure’s thesis, moreover the official linguistics who loudly preaches it, also gives some ideas to this. Namely they connect our -hoz (to) ending to a Hanti word with ‘közé’ (close) meaning, in which we conversely can notice the relationship of the consonantal frames for HoZ (to) and KöZeL (close) words, in addition that our HoZ word is a homonym pair of words, since it can be also a verb: when I HoZ-ok (bring) something to the talker, than I take or place it KöZeL (close) to him. A good deal of our nominal-case-endings can be interpreted this way, but here we explain only the -t accusative ending, on the hint of Gábor Pap’s suggestions, as one of the finest example of transparency and interpretability. One only has to pose the question: do the -t ending plays a role in conjugation and derivation? Yes, it plays, in fact in four places:

1. in the past tens: írt, hoztál etc., that is the past objectivized.
2. in the causative verbs: megírat, hozat, fürdet, etc. which are expressing a very strong orientation towards objects.
3. in the rendering of intransitive verbs into transitive: épül – épít, javul – javít, etc.
4. in the present/past participles: használt (ruha), lejárt (jegy), riadt (állat), talált (pénz), etc., in which the verb from process changes to state, or expresses an objectivized action or happening.”

(Végvári József: Ragozó rügyező nyelvünk)

For the fifth point the writer would rank the imperative case’s ~d suffix, with it we call upon objectivization: írd meg a levelet, hozz ide, fürdesz meg etc. (t>d) The English: do write the letter! is proof that the imperative and past participle case’s formative is the do=tesz verb’s te root shortened to the one ~d or ~t consonantal sound.

Is it an extraordinary coincidence(?) that the English (and German) with the same -t, or with its voiced pair the ~d makes the verb into an object, then takes it into possession: I have smelt/smelled a rot.

3. Affection (P x Q-r_): Likewise, the row of events in which one element in some way or other affects another element can be read in six different ways(verb + ~ral/~re), example: ív borul ív-re (arch falls on arch).

Further verbs (v = valami): borul v-re 265, 274; -ra dől 065, 264, 293; emel v-re 304; hájlik v-re 299, 303; jut v-re 145; terülf v-re 203

In the scene record initiating the reading, besides listing the event-describing verb in the row of hieroglyphs, the ~r_ glueglyph always have to be added to the affected hieroglyph.

The affection of the verb is oRiented (oRdered) against something (iR~ányul). The orientation is actually a line which proceeds towards a target, the same way as wRitten or carved (iRott, Rött) line. With the suffix ~R_ we express the oRientation of the action or the verb and it can easily be represented with wRiting, carving, drawing (iRás, Rovás, Rajzolás).

Also relevant here are the ties and touches verbs: valami-hez köt #182 and v-hez ér #295. (See the Végvári quotation above.)

4. Reflection (P x or x P): besides the reflexive verbs, the participant participles are also listed here.

alá-á’nak 267; áll 262, 299; állít 305; beleső 217; bolygó 261; borul 139; bukó 294; cica-rákó 283; csukló 272; dől/dülo 023, 043, 073, 104, 158, 182, 242, 254, 255, 256, 262, 274, 284, 290, 296, 301; 308, 312; el-fed 298; faragó 258; forog/forgó 216, 238, 247, 248, 264, 301; forduló 167; hajlik 302; illeg 277; ingó
In the scene record initiating the reading, the reflexive verb is listed as a hieroglyph-like sign in the row of hieroglyphs.

The action of the picture element is oriented on itself, not affecting others, for example: ‘éG dől’ the éG hieroglyph is drawn deviated, from its normal vertical position, it falls; ‘áR ül’ the áR hieroglyph sits on its handle, ‘pergő íV’ the íV is turning around its tip, etc.

**Scene-alignment**: the picture elements relative position to each other in the plane:

1. **Enlisting**: the grouping of identical elements has two subdivisions:

   1. a. **Pluralizing** (PP$\rightarrow$P$k$): the plural is expressed with the doubling of the hieroglyph, in description the second hieroglyph is replaced with the $\sim_k$ suffix.

   For example: B+B$> B\sim_k$ $> B\sim_K$ $> B\overrightarrow{\text{éK}}$ ($béka$, béke, bukó, bakó, etc.) In the inflexional languages this is not always the case, for example *foot+foot* in English is *feet*.

   In the scene record initiating the reading we discard one of the two identical signs and add the $\sim_k$ glueglyph to the remaining hieroglyph.

   1. b. **Lining** (PPP$\rightarrow$Pszer/Psor): three identical signs one after the other is a line, which is expressed with the addition of the $\sim_szer$/$\sim_sor$ glueglyph to one the signs, while the other two discarded.

   For example: M+M+M $> M\sim_szer$ $> M\overrightarrow{\text{szer}}$ $> M\overrightarrow{\text{sor}}$ $> M\overrightarrow{\text{Sor}}$ ($műsor$, $vásár$, vasárú, vasér, viszér, etc.)

   In the scene record initiating the reading we name only of the three identical signs and add the $\sim_szer$/$\sim_sor$ glueglyph to it.

   Seemingly, the pluralizing and lining have nothing in common, but only seemingly. The plural in the Indo-European languages is a lexical item, says Chomsky. In Magyar, the plural is composed by gluing the *iK* word-root to the end of the word. Good, but how can we draw it? Easily: we file it (iK-tatjuk), we range/rank/catalogue it among a class of identical or similar objects or persons. Ötöd~iK (fifth): the one standing on the fifth place among similar objects (see the formal system of natural numbers by Peano, Hofstadter and others). Úsz~iK (swims): repeats the movements of swimming. Esz~iK (eats), játsz~iK (plays), etc. – before all the verbs were formed this way, every verb (iGe) was iKes, repetition or process(ion). Jobb~iK (better), szebb~iK (nicer) marks one from a group of objects. Könyv~iK, könnyveK (books): a sequence composed of more single things, a row (sor!) of filed books, just the same way as the row of single swimming laps. (More about this in the writer’s essay titled *The Post-system of the Magyar Language.*)

The hieroglyphic writing aspiring for compactness needs only two identical signs to express plural with $\sim_ik$ suffix, two is necessary and sufficient for the purpose. Three identical signs already constitute a row or SeRieS ($\sim$or, $\sim$szer/szeres).
2. **Onsitting** ($P^O \rightarrow Pn Q$): when one sign is on top of the other, the bearer gets a $\sim_n$ suffix. For example in #172, the otherwise very symmetric 092 L hieroglyph has a dot standing for ‘10’ (TíZ), so it’s L-en TíZ (N-NY; S-SZ-ZS are interchangeable, related sounds):

In the scene record initiating the reading to the bottom hieroglyph (which does grow ‘nő’!) we always add the $\sim_n$ suffix.

The action here is the growing ‘nő’: the height of the table grows with the thickness of the book put on it: asztal Nő könyvve’ > asztaloN könyv! The drawing and recognition of this sign-alignment is not a worry for anyone.

3.a) **Insetting** ($\circ \rightarrow R$ Oban): when one hieroglyph is in the other than the other gets the $\sim_{b_n}$ suffix in the description. For example in #296:

In the scene record initiating the reading to the recipient hieroglyph the $\sim_{b_n}$ glueglyph is added in the description.

3.b) **Betweening** ($PQP \rightarrow Pkben Q$): this is the case when between two identical signs is a differing third one. The two identical signs are marked the usual way by discarding one and adding the $\sim_k$ glueglyph to the other, which is followed with the $\sim_{b_n}$ glueglyph closing the description with enclosed sign. For example: B+L7+B > B$_k$-b$_n$ L7 (Bé-ben L7) > B$_k$-K-B$_n$ LHéT > BékéBeN éLHeT > békében élhet!

In the scene record initiating the reading, one of identical hieroglyphs is discarded, and the following is added $\sim_k$-$b_n$ compound glueglyph followed by the third hieroglyph.

It should be noted that the $\sim_{b_n}$ suffix in Magyar can also stand as a standalone word (ben/e ‘inside’), thus the Minoan scribes treat it as a standalone word, so in decoding it can be detached, for example in #280 text:

The $\sim$_par-ban (in the pair) or $\sim$_par-ok-ban (in the pairs) variant also turns up quite a few times, the között (among) and közé (betwixt)(#045) is used less often.

Actually, to date this -ban/-ben (in) suffix has gone through a serious change of meaning, in the Minoan literary records it stands for the in-between, which is között in today’s Magyar, but it is a recent change. In the alphabetic writings of the 15th and 16th centuries it still used in the Minoan way, even today it is used sometimes that way: “a juhokban sokat megölt a farkás”.

The drawing and its interpretation is unambiguous, self-explanatory.

4. **Comparison** ($P y Q$):

ajján 309; alá 172, 254, 298; 305; alanti 240; alatt 058; 122, 131, 228, 247, 255, 300, 308; alá-való 225; bal 152; fel/föl/fölé 206; fölül 240; felett/föltött 172, 268; ellenü(l) 135; előtt 040, jobb 152; 247; körbe 131;
körül 131, 262; kívül 137; kör-beli 053; le; lenn 001; mi’ (mely) 206; mögös 302; né(l)kü(l) 128; rajta 272; után 141, 225;

In the scene record, initiating the reading the comparative word (postposition in Magyar) performs as a hieroglyph.

It would be hard to summarize briefly these distinct pictorial circumstances, but when the text is in front of you than the description arises from itself.

5. Association (P-s Q): the hieroglyph-depicted object is tied together with one of its properties by adding the ~_s gluegliph or the s/és (and) conjunctions, for example: csík-os balta → csík és balta (striped axe → stripe and axe), por-os korsó → por és korsó (dusted pitcher → dust and pitcher).

In the scene record initiating the reading, the conjunction acts like a hieroglyph.

The basic meaning of association is “joining, fusion, which at the same time often regards multitude, plurality. Namely it binds together 1. possession with possessor: pénzes ember; 2. content with container: boros hordó; 3. the whole with its part: szarvas, tollas; 4. thing with not essential adjunct: poros ruha; 5. with outfit: tőrös; 6. with a made artefact: asztalos, kalapos, as homonyms meaning the makers also; 7. occupation with its object: gulyás; 8. meal with ingredients: almás, makos; 9. with action: magasztos; 10. with participle it expresses quality, ability or practice: nyúlós, ugrós” etc. shortened from the Czuczor-Fogarasi dictionary.

Scene-setup: the orientation, size, quality, etc. of the individual hieroglyphs.

Limitations: from what to what time, with what, what and how many times?

~ig 040, 283; túl 308; ~tú(l)/tól 057, 089, 109, 206; ~va(l) (hasonló v-vel) 137, 145, 303, 304; két~szer 293; támlá~ja 250;

Qualification: in what capacity is the hieroglyph figure?

eyegyen 310; lábként 217; tézlatóként 238;

Attribution: what characterizes the hieroglyph?

felemás 303; ferde 137; görbe 080; hasonló 203; hosszú-orrú 130; kis; közti 206; nagy 152, 206; ócs(ka) 090; srég 312.

Modification: how is the hieroglyph altered?

álva 277; bekerítve 309; bevésve 180; (-nak) dülőn 016; dő(l)ve 266, 299; (-re) érőn 297; fácolva 242; fekvő/ö; egybefogva 219; ivesen 305; kerítve 305, 309; körbű’kizárva 123; közé tetten 243; rászegülve 242; szorultan fekvő 206; térhajtva 254; (-nek) téve 297; (-ra) téve 308; tőrve 263; el törvént 280; (-en) tükrözön 226; ülve 283; 305, 312.

In the scene record, initiating the reading the word/suffix describing the scene-setup is acting like any hieroglyph.

I cannot undertake the detailed drawing of the grammar for picture/picture-writing. Because only a linguist with an Hungarian mother tongue would be able to at least outline such a grammar, therefore in the near future we cannot count on one, even though, rather even less if such an organic, pictorial
grammar would be a super benefit for Hungarian children. I entrust readers that just relying on their sober mind, they can follow the natural, to the picture organically linked grammar.

Characters (hieroglyphs): agy 288; alma 225; ártány 256; átló 191; átvető 297; ’ázott rev fa’ 228; bolha 310; bot 216; cica 283; csík 312; csirke-fő 187; csirke 256; csónakostár 228; dűlem 305; ék 180; ék-mente 272; elme 257, 280; evező 171; fal 135; fa 182; fedő 301; félkör-pár 079; fog 130; fok 203, 248; fok 314; főka 133; fokozat 130, 137, 171, 196, 202, 203, 263; föld 263; fül 193, 196, 308; haj 280, 297; hal 282, 290; halál 284; háló 193; has 290; hátsó 243; hegy 249; hernyó 133; húr 080; irány 147; irimány 193; kád 308; kalap 277; karika 288; kas 202; kácsa 192; kis 202; kis 280; korona 262; kos 228; kosár 228; kötött 310; kő-sarló 180; küszöb 305; láb 217; (orosz)lán/lény 236, 240; lapát 180, 300; lép 236; lénya 295, 309; lépcső 191, 277, 305; levél 216, 262; lik 254; lúd 238, 243; lyuk 300; macska 257; mák 294, 310; mérő-csík 267; méta-kör 295; meg 203; musta 305; NAP 261, 322; nyelő 228; nyil 145; örr 253; öl(e) 236; (szem)ő(l)dök 254; örv 133; ozz 205, 240, 256; pálka 294; párhuzam 263, 278; párna 077; pénz 265; pólya 263; rács 130; rák 039; ravasz 309, 310; rekesz 206; rovás 254; rovat 202; ’rott kan’ 218; sarló 180; sarok 312; sáv 137; semmi 089, 112; sertés 256; sörte 242; szárny 172, 186, 243, 297; szél(e) 182, 268; szögellő 217; szögellő-mérő 309; szügely 304; szür 238, 259; takarás 302, 303; takaró 109; tábl 080, 276; támla 250; táska 294; térd 253, 293; térgy 272; terítő 288; test 310; tojás 192; tok 304; tonk 265; tő 049, 261, 262, 298; töl 301; tőrő 310; tű 077, 080; tükör 304, 312; ügy 190; ujj 128, 314; uszony 290; út 023, 195, 263; üllő 271; üres 057; üveg 271; váza 271; vissz 206; vizsla 205; vonulat 263.

Every numeral can act as a hieroglyph just like the numerical adjectives: pair; many (sok 077).

These hieroglyphs are totally equivalent with the hieroglyphs in the hieroglyphic grids (including the Phaistos disk’s signs too), and with all those on the rings and other inscriptions. Accordingly, this is not a complete and definite list. Here we have 127 hieroglyphs, in the sign-table 113, altogether some 250 hieroglyphs can be separated on the circa 350 inscriptions of CHIC list. On the Phaistos disk, there are 45 signs.

The number of, from the picture-(sign) inseparable, descriptor words/endings is 170-180. Consequently we can talk of some 480-500 hieroglyphs or picture-elements overall, roughly moving around the same level as the Egyptian and the Chines basic set of hieroglyphic signs.

The common feature of graphical structure elements is the progression from the whole to the detail, the pictorial element is followed by the comparative suffix/word/particle. The hieroglyphic writing can be never split from the picture, there are always unique pictorial solutions, and beside our ancestors never took it dead seriously, it remained a word-scrambling play (szórakó játék), or recreation (szórakozás!). It would be hard to say, did the word or picture give the idea for subjoined striking accomplishment: 4 = négy, ∅ = KöR (circle), egyben (in one block, as a whole); ‘4’ ∅ egyben : NéGY KöR eGYBeN : NaGY KáR/KúRó áGYBaN : big harm/fucking in bed. It is very hard to frame this into a system whereby the solutions are similar to this, and there is no need for that, the magic of picture writing is in the charm akin to this. Today SMS and internet chat brings up – although in restricted extent and output – analogue casual, one-off solutions.

Most of the pictures are messaging with rebus, the verbal message organically tied to the picture, the speaker of the language can disentangle it by himself, while the symbolic writing’s characters have artificially, by proclamation, established meaning which has to be distributed. The B letter is the symbol
for a sound. Why this and why exactly for this sound? Just. Contrary to this, the pair reading of the ‘pear’ hieroglyph is natural and logical. Why? Because they sound likewise. For this, one does not need a knowledge of phonetics, nor lexicology or syntax: analogue sounding is as natural as analogue looking. The identification of analogy does not have to be taught, without pattern recognition the animal kingdom could not have started the journey of evolution. The intelligence is a row of relative inheritances: built on experiences, we are comparing the new empirical impression to an established system.

We have learnt in infancy that the speech carries information. Our mother’s verbal sounds were joined to some kind of action, for this reason by hearing her voice always started a search for understanding its reason and its imitation. While the identical or analogous words, elements of speech were followed by identical or analogous activity, even an infant has no problem understanding this. By mastering the most basic words this way and imitating, one develops an intellect-seeking mechanism, which interprets the heard words, making them conscious.

How can one learn the words with more abstract concepts? Let us try understanding the following sequence. What is the next number?

1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34, 55, …

After a sufficient enough number of possibilities suddenly the realization occurs that the subsequent number of the series is the sum of two numbers right in front of it:

1+1=2, 1+2=3, 2+3=5, …

Where did this interpretation come from? From the brain or the message itself? The interpretation is the result of the big number repetitions, follows from isomorphism. Those that doubt this or could not identify the next number in the series should try again using the following set of numbers and see how much more rapidly s/he will understand it:

1, 3, 4, 7, 11, 18, 29, 47, …

The interpretation of words also becomes “self-explanatory” from the big number of similar examples. For the words the roots are the addenda, the elements of the sequence are the words, and the sequence is the word-family:

KöR, KöRet, KöRül, KeRül, KeRet, GöRbüül, GöRbület, …

The letter B does not resemble the ‘be’ sound! Neither does resemble the sign-group p-e-a-r, one could say rightly. That is true, but … you do not have to teach the recognition of the , it is a natural human faculty. likewise it is natural in the light of mother tongue to call the ‘pear’ pear. The hieroglyphic writing using the rebus principle is a consequence of organic development, the alphabetic writing is adopted and adapted in every language, even in the Phoenician and the Greek!

Visible writing

Let us stop here for a moment and scrutinize this matter a little deeper with the help of Susan Sherratt’s Visible Writing: Questions of script and identity in early Iron Age Greece and Cyprus. The literature appears again on Greek territories after a few hundred years of silence following the Minoan and Mycenaean period “when the time was right, the Greeks (ironically as it turns out) adopted and adapted the Phoenician alphabet, … mainly because it was the only form of writing of which they were aware.” In other words, the Greeks did not know the Minoan and Mycenaean writings! The “decoding” of Linear B is full of Gods, sanctuaries and names of persons, since they make names of those words, which they cannot admit not even to the proto-Greek, although in a proto-language one can pound in nearly everything, it cannot be checked upon (see the Finn-Ugrians). In the same time with the Greeks and the Phoenicians, the Cyprians also felt the need to mark their presence against the Greek and Phoenician expansion and on their muster in stone carved, therefore with lasting writing manifest it, but
they used their organically developed writing. *Because they had such!* And it lasted another five hundred years. The last Magyar town, Amathus as it’s known by its Greek name fell into Greek hands in 311 BC. On the marble tablet, commemorating the conquering Greeks, carved after the event, against the self-glorifying occupiers, this political graffiti as the swansong of the Cyprian Magyars:

*Annyi métely eméssze imígyl illősen, Arisztonosz arató/árto főnök/fenék, szűkos karikára tétessek, tőke nyár-sütő álá kitépető.*

*Let you be digested by a lot of rot as it fits rightly, head/arse exploiter/malefic Aristanos, be put on a tight-fitting ring, your balls to be torn out under a spit-roaster.*

S. Sherratt did approach the question from the side of the writing, *R. S. P. Beekes* in his essay entitled *PRE-GREEK The Pre-Greek loans in Greek* ([www.indo-european.nl/jed/pdf/pre-greek.pdf](http://www.indo-european.nl/jed/pdf/pre-greek.pdf)) from the language side and points out that the Greek language has a big non Indo-European substratum. Perhaps sometimes in the future will come forward a forthright Magyar linguist, who will have the guts to dissect this question from Hungarian, or at least a Finn-Ugrian point of view…

**Writings and characters**

Given that in a single step, - with the discovery of the principle to mark the identical or analogue words with identical pictures – changes the mnemonic sequence of picture into picture-writing and man becomes aware of the elements of phonetics and syntax, mirroring the pictorial mode of expression, for this reason it is unbelievable and illogical that one would assume the appearance of symbolic signs before the hieroglyphic writings or independently from it. The only possible and therefore actually realized method to today’s writing is excellently illustrated with the well-documented Egyptian writings. On the image of the well-known hieroglyphs evolved the hieratic, a cursive version and the two run in conjunction: in the light of the hieroglyphs and parallel with them, it is easy to recognize and memorize corresponding hieratic sign.

Character L in itself is an abstract symbol, its sound value has to be learned in the framework of organized education, in school. If I regularly see this L together or in the same situation as in the attached picture-sign than I can myself realize that this L is the linear drawing of a Leg or Leap, I can learn its sound value through self-education. The sound values of the adopted L character and his fellows B, C … have nothing to do with their shape, so only the privileged can acquire it in special institutions, in schools. To restrict literacy to the circle of those using a graphical codebook, which has turned or rather, made compulsory, is a very shallow attitude. There is also literacy outside the “literate” using the conventional characters learnable in the school system. Certainly, the gild is trying to liquidate, destroy, put outside the law the dilettantes or amateurs, however in this haste he undermines and denies the essence of his profession, the basic pillars of literacy. A typical example for this is history of writing, which cannot give an explanation for the beginning, namely it starts the story with a ready-made alphabet. It is true that all the big “civilized nations” of the day received their lettering in full-blown state; all the same, it would of no harm to understand the essence of literacy, to dig down to the roots. Some people already did that (see the authors of the bibliography at the bottom), making even more blameworthy the attitude of un-Magyar Academy to the folk art, in which still can be traceable the welt of organic picture-writing. These are not only the traces of the Magyar organic writings, but also of the universal human culture.

Symptomatic in this regard are the pursuits to solve the Phaistos disk, from these efforts at least a hundred is accessible on the World Wide Web. Most of the “solutions” are idolizing the hieroglyphs; they want to identify them with signs of other writings by sheer force. The essence of hieroglyphic writing is not in the hieroglyphs itself but in method in which it was scribed. The scribe, for the sake of easiness looks for easy
to draw pictorial elements with similarly sounding names. On the disk for the graphical representation of
the words áCSoLNaK, CôLôNK, CSaLNaK, CSaLoNaK, CSeLNeK, eCeSeLőNeK, kaCoLNaK and
szegeCeLNeK the scribe had chosen the picture of an easily recognizable object and similarly sounding
CSoLNaK (boat), reducing by a good deal the number of signs to be employed, for the more economic
utilisation of the always physically tight writing surface. The scribe maintained the same principle also in
choosing the rest of the signs, not knowing how much mental strain he would inflict on posterity, which
cannot use the rebus principle.

The scribe merely followed the logic every tradesman did in his time and until now, namely that a
carpenter for every work process uses the adequate tool, the saw, chisel, borer or hammer, identifying
what is needed and for when. If he has to, the carpenter will make himself a special, ad-hoc tool. The
scribe for the graphical representation of the messages of the Phaistos disk has selected 45 signs, he finds
these the most appropriate and the most economical for the task – even with this the disk is a bit
oversized.

Nothing proves better then the scribe is a master, in his own words ‘míes’ (smith) of his trade with the
242 imprints of the well selected 45 hieroglyphs he managed – with field-initials and field-closing
acrostic poems – to write down 497 words! The number of written down words are more than the double
of the number of imprints, although out of the 45 hieroglyphs only 15 marks consonants.

For the makers of the disk the economical utilization of the writing surface was an important viewpoint.
This objective they achieved with the most appropriate selection of the hieroglyphs. The hieroglyphs are
not God or Academic given symbols, but freely selectable miniatures, small pictures, which only serve the
graphical representation of the text, for this reason they make trouble only for those, who want to treat
every picture as a symbol, not as a semblance of a talking, nameable object.

It is interesting that the recognition of a picture is not a superstructure of civilization, since the native of
the Kalahari desert who never seen a newspaper, book or photograph, enthusiastically recognizes the
digitalized picture of his cow on the researcher’s laptop. The same native did not react in any way on
swastika or any other symbol turning up on the same screen.

The symbolic writing systems far from evolve unpremeditatedly, as result of organic development, they
require institutional education. The Vinca, Tatárlaka and other emblematic/symbolic writings are either
adopted (from where?, from whom?) or had/have a hieroglyphic equivalent thanks to where they were
readable, and could be readable again. By itself and from scratch they cannot originate a full-grown,
complete set of characters, not even the Szekler-Magyar runic writing. We could convince the half-
hearted, but how could we convince the folk-enemy intelligentsia that the roots of runic writing is in the
folk’s culture, in folk art, that the runic writing is the Magyar hieroglyphic writing’s ‘hieratic’ or
‘demotic’ script. There is no other choice, but to try:

Because of the essential discrepancies in time and space, but mainly in the carrier of writing, it is not
expectable that the today again fashionable Szekler-Magyar runic writing would exhibit much
resemblance to the Minoan characters, despite all this, there are some semblances one should mentioned:

- eD [and eT]: LinA 1, DA (Duggancs, branched stick used for planting), its sound value is D.

The parallel lines of eR (Rovás, Rovat) and the eCS (CSő) are marking the edges of the notch or the wall
of the pipe and the lines between or the x-s mark the lack of material:

- eR: LinA 76, RA 2, its sound value is R; Phaistos disk 45, its sound value is RéS.

- eCS: LinA 56, PA 3, its sound value is P; Cretan Hieroglyph 039, its sound value is P
[Pipe(szár), Pipe in English].
The aK is the plainer version of the 057 Kulcs (Key, Clef):
- aK  /: Cretan Hieroglyph 057  K; LinA 67, KI  /, their sound value is K.
- eG  /: LinA 304  ÉG, its sound value is _G. By their shape, here belong the eS (Sátor), the eG (as Góc), the eL (Lak) and the eK(Kuckó=sut!), all linear drawings of roofed, covered, closed
rooms:  . The 036  S hieroglyph is sale tent (Sátor), the 156  Lé is the linear drawing of a (wine)trellis (Lugas), and they exhibit quite a conclusive resemblance.
- eF  Ó and eB  X: LinA 47, FA  X, its sound value is F, with DA it is Fő’D = fold (earth).
- eV and U  W: LinA 54, WA  W, Vég-Vászon, its sound value is V; LinA 61, O  Ő, Olajmécses (floating light).
- eLY  Ő: LinA 57, JA  Ó Járom/Lóiga (yoke), with J/L sound value. The eLY (LYuk) is the drawing of a hole, but could be that of a rounded yoke, the 57 JA sign simplified. More likely the whole eN, É, O, eNY, eH, … series:  are the variations of 092  L (segg)Luk (arse-hole) or the more mannerly Ő as öl (lap): Ő is the Öl, the touching two thighs, eH is the Has (the stomach with a hole!), eNY the NYövekvő (growing stomach), etc.

**Comparison contra “comparative” linguistics**

There is a saying “The Magyar is thinking in pictures”, but this is only a projection of the truth. Man, even the animals, looks for analogy in everything: the thunder-like, rumbling mountainside, river, economy(!) is dangerous; the gentle sounding things are good. We are comparing objects, pictures, signs, words to the ones we have already seen, heard – this is the basis of our knowledge. For this reason, it is a capital misdeed to deny the existence of the root-system and the word-families, after all the basis for all knowledge acquisition and erudition is comparison. The RáG (chew) not only resembles the RaGad (stick, adhere) word, but the first RaGasztó (glue) was made by RáGás (chewing). Now, the comparative attribute in the so-called “comparative linguistics” is deceiving, because their goal is to deny the analogy and the knowledge based on analogy. Our linguists are denying not only the affinity between RaG and RáG, but even between RaG and RaG, their aim is atomize, disunite our language. In their opinion the first RaG [’fgr tőből ‘from a questionable Finn-Ugrian stem’] diverges from RaG [szláv ‘of Slavic origin’], both with the same meaning: a sticking or sealing down implement, so they cannot be homonyms. Why than? Just to show that our ‘barbaric’ ancestors did learn house building from the “highly civilized” Serbs. By learning the trade, they took over the technical term from the Serbs – the linguists are saying, concealing that the Serb RoG (horn) is about the shape, while the Magyar RaG is about the beam’s role, about tying down the roof.

Ascertain yourself with the naturalness of hieroglyphic writing and reading, that our ancestors could write and read without the knowledge of phonetics, lexicology and syntax. *Humankind did not invent writing but discovered it, bumped into it. One realized that if one brings together drawing – which has its roots in analogue forms – with analogue sounding, than the speech can be frozen into a picture-document and any time later, even in the absence of the message-leaver, can be called out, it can be made legible, readable!* For this, one did not have to be a genius; common sense was and is sufficient. Today a quoter of the students leaves the school as a functional illiterate, if we could have insight into the roots: the structure of the language, which formed together with an organic way of writing, if only we could dip in the ancient spring…
The Practice
The precondition for the reading of the Cretan hieroglyphic writings is, in practice, to get the appropriate photographs and facsimile drawings. The best collection of Cretan hieroglyphics is the CHIC (Corpus Hiéroglyphicarum Inscriptionum Cretae, edited by J.-P. Olivier and L. Godart), which is available from the http://cefael.efa.gr/ homesite of the Études Crétoises.

John G. Younger made a comprehensive analysis of the pictographs and put the signs of the individual texts into a related table. The writer starts the decoding with these tables, keeping the photograph and the facsimile drawing together, to scrutinisingly examine. In the “inscription” column Younger places the picture-signs selectively, choosing only the ones the authors of CHIC and himself liked, which fitted their preconception. Consequently, the first step is to take into account all the hieroglyphs and entering them into the table with the “decorations” as well. The next very important step, requiring an in-depth careful examination, is to take into account the glueglyphs, the description of the narratives. What is the outcome? How do the individual signs relate to each other? Example: 

neither-how. > (|{[|]])-ban ‘tükör’ }+ > the handle of the mirror (tükör) is between two dots (in twenty: húszban) > HúSZ-ban ‘tükör’. The glueglyph is added to the table in red, and the hieroglyph, which is treated by researchers as “decoration” is in quotation marks and in ‘green’ is also added. Also in green, but without quotation marks, the scene-events are added.

We should not forget, that the description in { }-brackets is not reading yet, it is only the making out of the lettering; the reading is done with rebus or vowel-substitution. For control and identification purposes, in the “transnumeration” column the lettering is recurring with all the mending in green, leaving black only the signs from the original Younger-table. In the box below with smaller characters is only an explanation to the narratives set out with the help of the hieroglyphs and glueglyphs.

In dictionary the { }-brackets are omitted, because they only assist to encircle the correlating hieroglyphs, which are with each other in some pictorially expressed terms, or a hieroglyph and its feature expressed pictorially, or the characters and the role they play. The second item of the dictionary, the consonantal frame can be useful, but it is not essential for the reading, to reading through to the message of hieroglyphics. The message is obtained by the use of vowel-substitution on the scene record composed of hieroglyphs and glueglyphs.

Hieroglyphic writing, even though has a sign for every sound, for shortness-sake very often will not differentiate between the sounds: a c-cs; g-gy; j-ly-l; n-ny; s-sz-z-zs; és t-ty, and it does not mark the double consonants. The syllable-ending and the consonant-preceding ‘l’ often dissolves into the preceding vowel.

The first example shows the graphical association, its verbal and grammatical use:

#077. MA/M He (HM 1659 [ Mu I, 13]), medallion [<--]; from Mu III 3b, angle I 17 (3.3 x 3 x 0.5 cm). MA/M Style 2
The first picture-sign 081 is a cushion (párna) for needles (tű), and (s) with plenty (sok) of needles in it (sok tűs párna’).
The second sign is a ligature: it is 005 Z and in the same time 055 FőZeT, a VeSSel (VaSe, pot) in which 025 Tea is cooking (VaSe+T > FaZék+T > FőZeT): a cooked medicine (‘főzet’) is prepared. The third sign 031 R, somewhat unfinished, to remind the readers of needles, tűs-R (needled-R = needles and R!).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>inscription</th>
<th>transnumeration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= sok tű s párna’</td>
<td>081=’S_K_T_ S_P_R_N_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ és } { ’tű’-s}</td>
<td>{005+055}{031-T_S}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= ‘sok tűs párna’ : S_K_T_ S_P_R_N_ : SoKaT SPóRo’Na : want to save a lot
= Z F_Z_-T : eZé’ (ezért) FiZeT : therefore/for this reason its pays
’ ’tű’-s : R T_S : RáTeSZ, kockázat : place sg on sg, bet

Sokat spóró’na ezé’ fizet, rátész. One wants to save a lot, this is the reason for paying, betting.

But the ’to spare’ verb is of German origin, sounds German, and refers to German character. Well, it is not so! Who spares (SPóRoL) his money multiplies (SZaPoRuL). The spare verb is a member of a large word-family, a genuine Hungarian word. He who spares does separate (SZePaRáL) money for harder times, and so on.

The scribe scratched the text into a doggish clay nodule, with a somewhat uncertain hand, but with amazing ingenuity, he solved his task with a mastery utilization of picture and word. The first hieroglyph, ’sok tű és párna’ uses the ’és/s’ conjunction, the last hiero draws the ’-s’ formative and with it the Magyar grammar finishes here. Let us look again into the text: on the first hieroglyph there are many needles and (és) a cushion, on the last one there are three needles and (s) an R displayed with these needles (the order in Magyar is free: rátész = tesz rá). The drawer/scribe represents the same way both the és/s conjunction and the -s formative. Who dares to contradict him? How did Olson say it? “Awareness of linguistic structure is a product of a writing system, not a precondition for its development.” Our linguists could learn a lot from these pictographs and they need it!
The notion on the inscription is original, but not so exceptional to necessarily warrant the use of unique and one-off signs and ligatures instead of the regularly used hieroglyphs. The question arises: why did the scribe use exactly these signs? Because with this selection the posed conception is brought to completion with the backwards reading of the text. Beside the double use of the writing surface, the word-scramble is the other motive behind this. The scribe is playing with words: szó-rakoszik (stacking words) and szórakozik (enjoys himself)!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>inscription</th>
<th>transnumeration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{ė’tų`-s Y}+ {ėortality }</td>
<td>{T_S-031}+ {055-005}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>081= { P_R_N_ S S_K-T_}+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tőzsér fizet, azé' parancsó' sokat. The merchant pays, therefore he commands to a lot.

In pictography the imagination can freely flip around, can employ such solutions the prisoners of alphabetic writing cannot even dream off. Who would think about to write down the word abroad with a broad A, like this: !

#128 MA/M Imp DoN on HM 1057 (nodulus, DoN); from Mu III 3b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>impression</th>
<th>transnumeration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{ ėortality-ban</td>
<td>018{ -B_N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{054 F_L_ SZ_G_T}+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{‘20’-B_N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{009 ’1’ J_N_’K’}+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On this nodule, one should look for the missing stuff! One of the handles of the pitcher, 054 K_R_S (KoRSó) is missing (füleszegett, lit. an ear cut off), also one finger of the glove is missing on 009 K_Z_S (KeZeS): (ujj nélküli ’without finger’). Both the pitcher and the glove are between two points, that is in twenty (húszban), in the usual word-phrase of the Minoans.

The sound value of 018 K (Kutya ’dog’) is not a headache. The answer to the question: why the sound value of this sign is not KuTYa similarly to the pattern on the other two, is that here we have only the head of the dog, so we take only head of its name, the heading letter.

Ki húszban keres feleséget, házában közösü’ aggulnak. Who looks for a wife in his twenties, will age in the house together (with his wife).
This is more than an interesting play of words, it is a good example to show how easy it is to make up a new word in Magyar. There is no need to declare or define the word felesség (‘shared ownership’; note: feleség ‘wife’, lit. half-ship, half of a unit, half of the husband-wife pair), the word is not in any of the dictionaries, but every Magyar-speaker will understand it, because it was regularly formed and included into a word-family. The writer really does not understand what they had to renew on this language, it was as new and capable four thousand years ago as it is today. No, this is not true, the Magyar language of the Minoans was more capable than it is today, they were not restrained by today’s German grammar.

### #256 CR S: AM 1910.235 (CS no.?; 3APr of burnt silicate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>side</th>
<th>inscription</th>
<th>transnumeration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.-b.-g.</td>
<td>038-043-049 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments by John G. Younger:**

There are 6 possible arrangements for this sign-group, for which Linear A provides 3 parallels; the most likely is the first, A-SA-RA₂.

Counter-comments By MM: As you can see, CHIC and J.G. Younger solved this sealstone very elegantly in three letters – as a matter of fact, there is much more to it! Say, by his own grid the reading is JA-SO-RA₃, and its reading by repeating the reading and in both direction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jó SZóRa Jó SZó éR; RoSSZaL RoSSZ éL (J&gt;L).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon good word you get good word; Bad lives with bad.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not bad at all what we could deduce from only three signs, but there is more to it.
A nice and cool message did rise out of the initial three characters! Is there any more in it? Let us try!

A hussar is too clumsy, deer scatters harmingly for a horse.

Besides the enlightening readings facilities, I have chosen this text, because a publicist and moralizing intellectual, after minutely explaining to him the essence of the rebus principle, came back to saying that the reading has to be wrong because the name of the pig (sertés) is of a different root than the assault.
(sértés). That maybe true, but the 'sertés' here is a character only, which graphically represents a word or group of characters; the meaning of the word, its role in the sentence comes from the rebus principle, from vowel substitution, with its rendering out of the hieroglyphs, bluntly with reading. We should not mix the two. *The word and its meaning has no semantic relationship with the signs it is written down with, neither would it have anything common with the diskette if the word were saved to one.*

***

**#261 CR (?) S: CMS XII 110 (3APr of burnt silicate)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Inscript</th>
<th>Transnumer</th>
<th>Interscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>{ {{4}4} {4} } 'pár'-ban</td>
<td>{{‘10’+M03} {‘10’+M05} P_R-B_N}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{{4}4} {4} 'pár'-ban ér</td>
<td>{{044+‘10’} -_T {M05+‘10’} P_RB_N_R}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{044+M05} P_RB_N_R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>{sergő -ér 4-4-ban}</td>
<td>{S_RG_M06- T_R 038 ‘20’-B_N}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{4-pár-ok-ban}</td>
<td>{010-M08-P_R-OK-B_N}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{4-éré-}</td>
<td>{032 ér 047-}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>{{4}4} et ér 'NAP' körül bolygó ‘nyolc’-bú’</td>
<td>{{044+M08} -<em>T_R ‘10’ NAP K_R_L</em> B_LYG_NY_LC-B_}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{049_L}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. – g. – b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The ‘10’-s are tied to the hieros, making with them ligatures. In-between/inside (-ban) the {4} ligature-pair (pár) is the {4} ligature, and in the {4} ligature-pair is the {4} ligature, here the {4} is touched by the {4} ligature. Each of these ligature-complexes are standing on two M06 stumps (S-tő-kön). (In a ligature the order is invertible.)
b. The rotating (sergő) M06 S (Spiral) sign touches (éri) the 038 J/L (aJtó) hiero, which is between two dots placed on its shaft, that is in (-ban) ‘20’. The 010 L (foot) is between two pairs of M08 íV-s (arcs). (The arcs make up a pair turned from each other by 180°.) The 032 RéSZ is touching the 047 T (Trap, lasso) hiero.
g. Next to the 044 áR hiero there is a little M08 íV, their ligature (áC) is touched by one of the eight ‘10’-s, which are wandering (bolygó, also means planet) around (körül) the Sun (Nap) of eight rays. Number eight (nyolc) is here not by chance, it is the number of the seven planets and the Moon together. Our Minoan ancestors had a very good knowledge of the solar system, even today the number of planets is still eight, after taking out the Moon and one of the only two planets discovered since than. The 044 áR sits (ül) that is oriented downwards (le).
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Tűz hagy tiszta lón porában, így tisztatlanság porban eresztéken. Égővet ér tűz, NAP-király bolygó nyolc-bú’ ül: B_LYG_NY_LC-B-_R-L_: BoLYGó NYoLCA/NIyLaSa; BfRaL: his wandering eights/archer; judge

Fire leaves purified in its dust, this way becoming soiled in dust is allowable. The Zodiac is reached by fire; the SUN-king’s wandering eights/archer judges, sin/crime reaches the good in large numbers, with the Living in quarrel bad has to be destroyed.

Ugyanez visszafelé olvasva:

The same in backwards reading:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>side</th>
<th>inscription</th>
<th>transnumeration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>{ér t}+ {‘pár’-ok-ban}+</td>
<td>{S_RG_M06-T_R {038 ‘20’-B_N}+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{n-em ér}</td>
<td>{010-M08-P_R-OK-B_N}+ {032 ér 047-T}+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>{üll}+ {NAP’ körüli bolygó nyolc-bú’}</td>
<td>{‘NAP’ körüli bolygó nyolc-bú’}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{éR}+t éR}+</td>
<td>{‘NAP’ körüli bolygó nyolc-bú’}+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>{‘tő’}-k-ön}+</td>
<td>{10’+M03} ‘10’+M05} P_R-B_N}+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{‘tő’}-ban }{éR}+t éR}+</td>
<td>{‘10’+M03} ‘10’+M05} P_R-B_N}+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I have chosen this inscription deliberately, seeing that most of the researchers with preference read religious allusions where there are none. Well, this inscription is uncommonly religious, but the reading does not bring the message befitting the expectations. The text is about heavenly judging done by crowned head, but today He is not called Sun-king anymore, who escorted by heavenly fires and trumpets ‘will come to judge’. The most rugged part of the inscription is the reference on the Élő (Living), it is hard not to notice the name of the Hebrew Él/Éli (Elohim in pl.) or the Arabic Allah. Because the Minoans did not mark the double consonant, the Élő (Living) is in the same time Ellő (Life-giver).

After invoking the name of God, here is another thought-provoking example:

#236 MA/V S: CMS II 2.78 (3APr of dark blackish steatite)
The 091 T_R_J is really small (kis) in size, relative to the other three hieros and sits in the lap (ölén) of the three bigger ones.

The striped 077 L (Lung) rolls up the two M18 _SZ_NY- K-_T (pl. & accus.) together.

In-between (-ben) the two beings (LÉNYek > LioNs), on (-en) an unmistakable 061 _S/Z_T_ hiero there are two fings, M18 _SZ_NY in pl. (uszonyok).

In the girl instincts slumbers. The slumber to weaken is a kiss-full date, that is what makes the gap in her lap slightly to open.

Instinctive is what we do unconsciously, on the influence of an, we could think, outside influence. If it is good what we do this way, than it is transpired by God’s will, if it is bad than on the teasing of the Satan. We could say that God (iSTeN) and SaTaN are in us and they declare themselves in our inSTiNct (öSZTöN). The inscriptions #181, #254, #301 are also interesting as they talk about the kneeling down before dieing, about a repentant settling of accounts.

Here is the backwards reading of the above text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>side</th>
<th>inscription</th>
<th>transnumeration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>{{ kis }^{^+}} { le } { \text{'ölé'-n} }^{^+}</td>
<td>{{ K_S 091 {012-L_}^{^+}} 070 048 _L_N}^{^+}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>{{ 'csík'-os }^{^+}} { együtt göngyít { ok-at }^{^+}</td>
<td>{{ CS_K- S 077 { G_Y_T G_NGY_T M18- K-_T}^{^+}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>{ _N M18- K L_NY_K-B_N}^{^+}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a. – b. – c. |

kis \{ le \} K_S T_R_J-M_L_ \{ KiS TüReLeMMeL \{ J>L \} : with some patience |

\{ R-NY_L_S \} \{ eRéNYüLés \} \{ erényesség \} : virtue |

‘ölé’-n : _L-_N : öLeN ; eLLeN : on her lap ; against |
With the growing number of deciphered text, it becomes unambiguous that the Cretan hieroglyphic texts, above all the so called seals and ones carved on (semi-precious) stone cylinders/prisms, are indeed readable back and forth word-plays, riddles and palindromes. As they do not include personal nor geographic names it is questionable were they were ever used as identifying “seals”. This fragment of the #305 inscription testifies otherwise:

This text seems to be the answer to the role of seals-sealants: People used to ask/solve word-puzzles for entertainment while drinking with friends. Well, humankind has improved enormously in the last for four thousand years! Today, if one wants to entertain oneself, he/she can leave their brain at home: for the activities of bingo and pinball are to satisfy our gaming interests alone. However by the moral of #205: *In word puzzles the mind is blessed, the syllable is a treasure.*

Closely related to this essay is the reading of Isopata ring, which is available in English on the pages of *Journal of Eurasian Studies*, [http://www.federatio.org/joes.html] number 0111, and on the pages of *Ősmagyar nyelvek* [http://osmagyar.kisbiro.hu] in Hungarian.

Being the language of the Cretan inscriptions Magyar, it would be logical to assume that there are such inscriptions in the Carpathian basin as well. There are, indeed, the rock-inscription of Szertő-tető is splendidly and demonstratively unites Cretan hieroglyphics, Linear A and Szekler-Magyar runic writing. The three kind writings interweave into one single harmonious unity and the message of it could be source-material for digging into the roots of the pilgrimage of Csíksomlyó ([A szertő-tetői kép- és rovás felirat olvasata](http://osmagyar.kisbiro.hu/modules.php?name=news)).

And now hush, a big, mute silence is following!------------------------------------------

Since it cannot be proved that with a simple transcription decoded, or rather deciphered Cretan texts are not meaningful and only possible readings, than by simple logic follows that they were written in Magyar. It is a hard fact to swallow, and there is no other way out but to observe a deep silence…
What is the purpose of this? – a professor questioned. The question startled the writer. Without any objective, the writer realized by chance that the Minoan texts can be read in Magyar. This fact is disturbing, it may ruin certain people’s reputation, it may even challenge a whole nation to revise its values. Where do we go from here?… The mystery has come to light, there is no other choice but to live with this, this so far hidden knowledge.

Let the last word come from professor Végvári: “as long as the Hungarian speakers earlier believed-knew it that their language is able and fit for the formulation of the universe’s totality – yet we certain that our folk-tales, folk-poetry, habitue-plays, folk-songs creators knew it that way – than make them gradually give up this believe, and with this lower them to the level of other consumer languages. This objective has been reached successfully, and somewhere surely they rejoice to this. Let us grieve a bit their joy with the remark that this ability of our language practically cannot be eradicated, on the worst from time to time can be forced into background, coerce into lurking.”

The realization that the Minoan texts on seals and imprints have nothing to do with the seals for verifying one’s identity started to settle in after deciphering the Phaistos disk, only then did it became clear that the overwhelming majority of the inscriptions are puns and/or palindromes. All the backwards readings in this essay are subsequent insertions. In the haste the backward reading of #280 somehow had been omitted, although it is worthy of consideration: “Ételünkön/italunkon öröknek bűne. On our food/drink is the sin of eternity.” The writer is curious about the theologians’ and philosophers’ reply to this, what kind of inheritance, what sin is the word here about, since the inscription was made well before the biblical times.
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The Phaistos DiSCo-Song

Phaisztoszí DiSZKó-Dana
A phaisztoszi korong megfejtve

The Phaistos DiSCo-Song
The phaistos disc deciphered

The sound values for the signs of the disc:

Every one of the hieroglyphs is an acrophonic sign; they mark the consonantal frame of the name of the depicted object, with some qualifier: the signs do not differentiate between hard and soft sounds, for example the cleverly chosen 01GYaLogol ‘(he) walks’ can be both GY_L and G_L.

Since there are few easy to draw, open mono-syllabic words, the scribe used some tricks for hieroglyphs representing only a consonant:

- by taking the syllable-closing consonants in 07 Lejó, 12 Külü, 13 Veró, 31 Karoly, 32 Gerle and 35 Töl, the r, j, l and ly for vowels, the hieroglyphs become initial-marking signs, representing one consonant only;
- the starting & closing consonants in 18 Tört > Tő’T and 39 Dárda > Dá’Da are the same;
- the closing consonants are ignored in 19 áSZok, 22 SZék and 26 GYilok as they the same as the sign for plural (-k);
- the heads of 29 Macska and 30 Juh are marking word-heads, initials;

A korongon lévő képelek hangértékei:

A képelek mindegyike akrofónikus jel, a képen látható tárgy nevének mássalhangzó vázát jelölik, némi kikötéssel: a jelek nem tesznek különbséget kemény és lágy hangok között, pl. az ötletesen megválasztott 01GYaLogol lehet GY_L is meg G_L is.

Mivel kevés a lerajzolható, nyitott, egyszótagú szó, ezért az egy hangot, csak mássalhangzót jelölő képelekkel az írnok trükközik:

- a 07 Lejó, 12 Külü, 13 Veró, 31 Karoly, 32 Gerle és 35 Töl szótagzáró r, j, l és ly mássalhangzót önhangzóként érdemeztek, egyetlen mássalhangzót, a kezdő vagy záró mássalhangzót, az írnó karbantartja;
- a 18 Tört > Tő’T és 39 Dárda > Dá’Da kezdő és záró mássalhangzót azonosít;
- a 19 áSZok, 22 SZék és 26 GYilok záróhangjai többesszám-szerűségük miatt hagyhatók el;
- a 29 Macska és 30 Juh fők szófőket jelölnek!
- a 27 Ürű az ü/ö önhangzókat jelöli.
  Minden kép jelkép és hangjelzők szintézésére szolgál. Az ábrázolt tárgy nevének a mássalhangzó vázát jelöli, az önhangzó a szövegkörnyezetben illeszkedik értelmes mondanivalót formálva az értelmetlen és kiejthetetlen vázakból.

- the 27 Ürű stands for the vowels ü/ö.
  Every hieroglyph is phonographic; it purely denotes the sound of speech. It marks the consonantal frame of the depicted object’s name; the vowel shapes these empty and unutterable frames into meaningful messages interlocking them with the context.

Közben a próbálkozások eredményeként kikristályosodott a képirás és olvasás, természetes, képi és hangi hasonlóságra szervesen épülő rendszere, melynek alapján megszületett a Phaisztoszi Korong immár kétségbevonhatatlan olvasata. Ez az olvasat nem csupán Yves Duhoux, mérvadónak ítélt, How Not to Decipher the Phaistos Disc című dolgozatában felvetett kérdésekre válaszol, hanem olyanokra is melyeket Duhoux, saját előítéletei miatt, fel sem tudott vetni. De erről majd később.

A Phaisztoszi Korongról könyvtári, egymásnak és önmaguknak is ellentmondó, irodalom született; természetesen, hogy a korongon levő képjeleket is mindenki másféle látja. Mivel a fent megadott értékeket összefüggő és értelmes olvasat támasztja alá, a kérdés nem az, szabad a gazda módjára, hogy egy adott képjet ezt vagy azt ábrázol-e, csupán az, hogy lehet-e az amit a táblázatban megadtam.

Szeretném a lehető leghangsúlyosabban kiemelni, hogy az alábbiakban nem a Phaisztoszi Korong tolmačosolását kapja kézhez az olvasó, hanem az olvasatát. A képirás olvasása nem hit és nem tudomány kérdése, de főleg nem a csak beavatottak által művelhető ezoterikus tudásság.

A képirás grafikus jelrendszere és a beszéd hangsúlyozott kölcsönösen egyértelmű megfeleltetés áll fenn, magyarán: a képirás ugyanolyan fonetikus írás mint az abécés írásformát, de sajátosos olvasási szabályokkal. Megfeleltetésről csupán azért beszélünk, mert a minőszi műveltség népi anyaga a természeti és emberek-okoza katasztrófák következtében eltűnt a történelem súlyesztőjében, velük együtt a krétai képirás is feledésbe merült.

A Phaisztoszi Korong a minőszi műveltség leterjedelmesebb és egyetlen képjelenként nyomtatott szövege, egyike a magyar nyelv legnépszerűbb írott emlékeinek, és mennyire friss: fordítás, magyarozás nélkül érthető szöveg. A

Some of the hieroglyphs are similar to the signs of Cretan Hieroglyphic and/or of Linear A – though this is not important, it turned out to be useful. Torsten Timm went the furthest in comparison. In the above grid, under the line containing the sound values of the hieroglyphs, after the number of occurrences, are the corresponding signs of Linear A (LinA) according to Timm. These few signs did help me to get a preliminary decipherment.

In the meantime, as the result of trials and errors, it has become clear, that the system of hieroglyphic writing and reading is organically built upon the natural analogies of pictures and sounds, on which this final version of the reading of the Phaistos Disk was born upon. This reading not only answers the questions put forward by Yves Duhoux in his authoritative, How Not to Decipher the Phaistos Disc essay, but answers even the ones he could not come up with due to his prejudices. But about this later.

There is literature about the Phaistos Disk, contradicting each other and oneself, more than enough to fill a library, and of course everybody interprets the hieroglyphs differently. As the values in the grid above are supported by a relevant and intelligent reading, the question is not what a particular hieroglyph represents, but merely could it be the value given to it in the grid.

I would like to stress the most emphatically, that in the following is a reading of the Phaistos Disk, not its interpretation. The reading of hieroglyphic texts is not a question of believing or science, and definitely not esoteric dilettantism exercised by the initiates. There is a mutually unambiguous correspondence between the graphical system of hieroglyphs and sounds of the spoken language; blantly, the hieroglyphic writing is a phonetic writing just like alphabetic writing, but with a special set of reading rules. We are talking about decipherment only because the human fabric of the Minoan Culture, due to natural and man-made catastrophes vanished from the scenes of history, and with it the Cretan hieroglyphic writing sank into oblivion as well.

The Phaistos Disk is the largest and the only sign by sign printed text of the Minoan culture, one of the oldest written relic of the Magyar language and just how fresh it is: the text is clear without translation and explanation. Thanks to the denied root system of the Magyar language the text is still readable and enjoyable, after three and a half thousand years.
magyar nyelv letagadott gyökrendszerek közönve bárki elolvashatja és élvezheti a több mint három és félezer éves szöveget.
Megrögzött finnugristáknak nem ajánlom ettől tovább menni, ugyanis a korong minden szava magyar eredetű magyar szó. A korong megírásakor a hellének még csak rombolnak a Balkánon, párszáz évbe telik mire átveszik és újra virágzatjak azt a műveltséget amit épp tönkretettek, szláv szolgáik pedig még sehol sincsenek, az őbi “ősiöket” le-ugratni a Mediterránumba palotákat építeni merész vállalkozás lenne, így hát nincs kitől eredeztetni ezeket a szavakat.
A fenti táblázatba szedett képjelek hangértékeinek részletes kifejtése a dolgozat végén található meg.
A csigavonalak közé írt szöveg mezőkre osztatott, melyek nemzetközileg elfogdott számozását követi az alábbi táblázat. Az olvasatot ezekre a mezőkre tagolva követjük. A mezőkre osztás értelmét csak késsel megérteni csak azt látjuk majd, hogy szavakat nem törnek kettőbe, de több szót is tartalmazhatnak. A képírásban a szavakba tördelés az olvasó feledata, itt a mezők adnak egy kis segítséget ehhez.
A képírás olvasásának szabályai A képírások rejtjelkulcsában ismerkedhet meg részletesbben a Kedves Olvasó.

Confmed Finno-Ugrians better turn back from here, because all the words on the disc are Magyar of Magyar origin. At the time of the writing the Hellenes just started to ravage the Balkans, it will take a couple of hundred years for them to take over and make the culture thrive again, their Slavic slaves are nowhere yet, and to move the Ugric people from the Ob to the Mediterranum to build the palaces would be a risky business, so there is no one to originate these words from.
A more detailed explanation of the phonetic values given in the above grid can be find at the end of this essay.

The numbering of the fields, into which the text, written between spiral lines is divided, follows the accepted convention. We are tracking the reading itemized into these fields. The reason behind this division we will grasp only later, for the start we will find that they never break up words, but they can enclose more than one word. In hieroglyphic writing the breaking into words is the task of the reader, here the fields give some hint to this.
You can find the detailed rules for reading hieroglyphic texts in my essay titled The Codebook for Hieroglyphic Writings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A06 | ÚRöS LuK  
loaded hole |
| A07 | ÚSZöGüK TuZe  
cinder’s fire |
| A08 | iLYeNKö’ BeVáLTi  
at such a time cashes in |
| A09 | KeGYéT  
hers grace, *in accus.* |
| A10 | LYáNY KaMaSZ eSZéT  
girl, adolescent’s mind, *in accus.* |
| A11 | GYúLó MáZZa’/MéZZe’ PáRoLJa  
with fire-catching veneer/honey she braises |
| A12 | LYáNY Ka GúNYoL, RoSSZ  
girl mocks, bad |
| A13 | DéVaJ  
aughty |
| A14 | iLYeN Ö, eCSeLöNeK ToLi NYeLëT  
she is like that, she pushes the comb’s handle |
| A15 | TaSZiGáLi  
keeps on pushing |
| A16 | iLYeNKö’ KiGYó  
at such a time (she is a) snake |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>LYáNY Küü Úrú Ürú Töl GöCS NYü</td>
<td>girl she is, she should back down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>HoL NYíLó</td>
<td>where opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>iLYeN Ki KeGYe’</td>
<td>such is the one who shows grace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>LYáNY Õ, CöLöNK á’TaL eNYeLiT</td>
<td>girl she (is), by the aid of a clog she trifles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>TaSZiGáLi</td>
<td>keeps on pushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22</td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>iLYeNKó’ KiGYó</td>
<td>at such a time (she is a) snake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>LYáNY Küü Úrú NYüG Gerle Tört Ürú</td>
<td>the girl’s shirt is obstacle, she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24</td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>BúVáL, TeRiNGóS</td>
<td>hides, spreading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25</td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>KéGYeK</td>
<td>passages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26</td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>LYáNY Küü Veró GYaLo</td>
<td>girl at the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A27</td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>NYíL SZéT</td>
<td>opens up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A28</td>
<td>![Image](113x662 to 132x692)</td>
<td>TőLe LeGěNY RuZSa from it the lad is hideous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A29</td>
<td>![Image](146x662 to 165x692)</td>
<td>iLYeNKó’ Ö Ö’TőGeSSeN at such time he should stitch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30</td>
<td>![Image](193x662 to 215x692)</td>
<td>VéGGGeL by the rolls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31</td>
<td>![Image](113x606 to 133x636)</td>
<td>TőLe LeGYeN RúZSa from it to be a rose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B01</td>
<td>![Image](152x606 to 172x636)</td>
<td>LYáNY KéSZ PoRőLY aLá girl is ready for under the hammer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B02</td>
<td>![Image](178x606 to 218x636)</td>
<td>ÜReSüLT tempting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B03</td>
<td>![Image](221x606 to 239x636)</td>
<td>aLLYáN GeCi-NYeLő CSuPoR on her bottom a sperm-swallowing pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B04</td>
<td>![Image](334x606 to 356x636)</td>
<td>SZű-CSaLóNaK Ő to a heart-breaker she</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B05</td>
<td>![Image](113x494 to 132x524)</td>
<td>HáLóJáRa CsáBuLiK into the net seduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B06</td>
<td>![Image](146x494 to 165x524)</td>
<td>TőK-MoNY NYeLé Tű’ CSóK From balls &amp; dick’s handle, kiss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B07</td>
<td>![Image](190x494 to 212x524)</td>
<td>VáGYoLDó HoL desire-melting where</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B08</td>
<td>Lejó Veró GYaLo Tört</td>
<td>BétLoLó VáGYoLTó</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intestine-pushing desire-extinguishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B09</td>
<td>SzéCóSóLaK</td>
<td>SzéGeCCSe’ SzéGeCSeLNeK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with rivet they are riveting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Lejó JáRó</td>
<td>LejáRa/LejáRó PoRoLóT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on her funnel (vagina) duster, in accus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>LyáNY Gyílok GYöNGy RoRoLó</td>
<td>LyáNY aGYa GYöNGe PáRúL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>girl’s mind is weak to pair with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>Üre CSóLaK RoZSa GyáLo</td>
<td>Ö CSeLNeK ReSzÉ GüL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>she for the trick falls (drunk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>Macska JáRó</td>
<td>MáJáRa-JáRó CéBoLóT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pleasing to sy allurement, in accus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>ToKMáNY NüG Tört</td>
<td>TuKMáN NóGaT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on bargaining nags</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Macska HaL GyáLo</td>
<td>iMe, HoL GyúL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>look, where catching fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>BóVüL Tól Gerle Dárda HaL</td>
<td>BóVüL TaGoD, HoL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grows your limb, where</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>LyáNY SzüR</td>
<td>LÝeN SzRRé Ö GyúL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on such an implement she catches fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>Macska GyöNGy Lejó Tüzö</td>
<td>iMe, GyöNGü Ló Tüzé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>look, weakening its fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Macska TűZő Verő Me TőZ Ve MeTőZVe Cuttingly/incised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Macska RéS Lejó Me RéSZüL MeRéSZüL keeps burning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Szék Macska GYőNY GyőONGY éLő TűZe Me GyőNY GyőONGY éLő TűZe SZe Me GYőNY GyőONGY éLő TűZe her eyes (are) pearls’ live fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Ürü BáNYa NYéŁ CSoLNaK Ö BeNNe NYáŁ eCSelőNeK Ö BeNNe NYáŁ eCSelőNeK in her saliva (sperm) to the fluff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Lejó Tört Től Ju To TT JuToTT fell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Lejó RéS Lejó Jó RéSZüL Jó RéSZüL in good share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Lejó NYéŁ Tört JáRó LeNYeL Te JóRa Swallowed for good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B26</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Szék Macska GYőNY GyőONGY éLő TűZe Me GyőNY GyőONGY éLő TűZe SZe Me GyőNY GyőONGY éLő TűZe her eyes (are) pearling, fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B27</td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>SzűR Juh Dárda Tört Lejó SaR Ja Dó uTó Ja SaRJaDó uTóJa its sprouting offspring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B28</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>LYaNY BűV-öŁeT, NYiLaLLi LYaNY BűV-öŁeT, NYiLaLLi girl’s bewitched lap, shoot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B29</td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Macska BáNYa NYéŁ CSoLNaK Mi BeNNe NYőŁ CSaLőNaK Mi BeNNe NYőŁ CSaLőNaK what grows in her for the cheat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B30</td>
<td>RéSZüL for share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A Phaistoszi Korong Jelhű Átirata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of the Phaistos Disc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thanks to a girl get the worst at all who today participates in her sham/play, at such time a slave becomes hooked, where the fire of cinder of their loaded hole cashes in her grace at such time. The girl braises the mind of the adolescent with fire-catching veneer/honey. The girl mocks, she’s bad, naughty, she’s like that, she pushes the handle of the comb, keeps on pushing up-down, in such times she’s a snake. Girl she is, she should back down where her opening is, such is the one who shows favour. Girl she is, she trifles by the aid of a clog, keeps on pushing up-down, at such a time she’s a snake. The shirt of the girl is an obstacle, she hides, spreading passages. The girl at the end opens up, from that the lad is hideous at such a time he should stitch by the rolls, from it she should become a rose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>végült: végütt/végett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mimében: színjátékában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pórol: pór, szegény lesz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>üszögiuk tüz: tizző parazsuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dévaj: pajzán, csintalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eczelőnek toli nyélét: nyes fésűjének a nyelét tolja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taszigáli: tologatja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tágícsön: lazitson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cölösön: kolone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enyélít: tréfálkozik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lyáNYKa VégüLT JáR PóRuL,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ki Ma RéSZüL MíMéBeN,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iLYeNkO RaB PóRuL,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoL ÜRőS LuK-ÜSZőGüK TüZe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iLYeNkO' BeVáLTi KeGYéT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LyáNY KaMaSZ eSZéT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GyüLő MáZZz'/aszZz'e PáRoLJa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LyáNYKa GúNyOl, RoSSZ, DéVaJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iLYeN Ö, eCSeLoNeK ToLi NyeLéT,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaSZiGáLi, iLYeNkO' KiGYö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LyáNYKa Ö, Ö TáGiCCSoN HoL NyiLó,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iLYeN Ki KeGYe'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LyáNY Ö, CsLánK a'TaL eNyCeLiT,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaSZiGáLi, iLYeNkO' KíGYö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LyáNYKa ÜNGe GáT, Ö BúVáL,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeRíNgöS KeGYeK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LyáNYKa VégüLT NyiL SZéT,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TőLe LeGëNY' RužSz,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iLYeNkO' Ö ő'TöGeSSeN VëGGëL,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TőLe LeGYeN RúZSa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lyáNY KéSZ PőRöLY aLá,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ÜResSuLT aLLyán GeCi-Nyeló CSuPoR,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SzZ-CsALóNaK Ö HáLoJáRa CSábLiK.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TőK-MoNY NyeLeTü' CSÖk VääGyOló }
<p>| HoL BélToLó VáGYoLTó SZeGeCCsé' SZeGeCSelNeK LeJáRa/(LeJáRó) PoRoLoT, LÝaNY aGYa GYöNGe PárúL. Ö CSelNeK RésZeGüL, MáláRa-JáRó CSáBoLoT TuKMáN NőGaT. iMe, HoL GÝül, BőVüL TaGoD, HoL iLYeN SZeReRö O GÝüL. iMe, GÝöNGüLö TüZe MeTőZVe MeRéSZüL. SZeMe GÝöNGYöl, TüZe SaRJaDö uTóJa LÝáNY BűV-ölÉt NYiLaLi, Mi BeNNe NÝöl CsáLóNaK RéSZüL. | onto a heart-breaker’s net she is seduced. The kiss from the handle of the balls &amp; dick is desire-melting, where they are riveting a duster (carpet beater) with intestine-pushing desire-extinguishing rivets on her funnel, the girl’s mind is weak to pair with. She falls for the trick, pleasely to her allurement, in her bargaining nags. Look, where ignites, grows your limb, where on such an implement she catches fire. Look, her weakening fire cuttingly keeps burning. Here eyes are live fire of pearls, in her the saliva (sperm) fell on fluff in good share, she swallowed for good. Her eyes are pearling, here fire’s sprouting offspring shoots the girl’s bewitched lap what grows in her is a share of the cheat. |
| <strong>Faisztoszi DiSZKó-Dana</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hungarian Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A korongot 1908-ban ásta ki Luigi Pernier a phaistoszi palota romjainak MMIII rétegében, korát így 3600-3700 évre tehetjük. A phaistoszi korong sok tekintetben egyedi lelet: a kevés nyomtatott írások legszorvább és legtökeletesebben megőrözött példánya, az eddigi leghosszabb, hiánytalan minoszi szöveg.</td>
<td>Luigi Pernier excavated the disk in 1908, in the Palace of Phaistos’ MMIII layer, putting its age at about 3600-3700 years. The Phaistos disk is in many regards a unique find: the nicest and the most perfectly preserved copy of stamped writings, and the time being, this is the longest, complete Minoan text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Az elmúlt száz évben legalább száz megoldás született a bizarrtól a tudományosig: ókori kockajátéktól, kottajegyeken át, a párhuzamossági tétele tizennyolc módon megoldatlaná vált között. Csak három név említhető a komolyabbak közül. Torsten Timm tudományos módszereken kimutatja, hogy a korongon levő szavak szerkezetileg “követik” a LinA írás szavait – teszi ezt azonban a másikon kimutatná, hogy a szavak mettől meddig terjednek.</td>
<td>The past hundred years have given rise to at least hundred decipherments ranging from the bizarre to scientific: from ancient board-game through musical notes to the proof of the theorem of parallels, everything can be found among its “decipherments”. I will mention only three names from the most serious. Torsten Timm using scientific methods proves that the words on the disk are structurally “following” the words of LinA – he does this without showing on neither of them the extent of the words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Massey ikrek, a 17 “\” vonalkával megjegyzett szóról balról jobbra olvasva megállapítják, hogy azok görög számnevekre hasonlítanak. Ennyi. Mégis tartozom nekik, mivel egy nagyon fontos dologra mutattak rá: “ Más Phaisztoszi Korong tanulmányozók szintén ezt a (balról jobbra) irányt feltételezték, Evans-ot beleértve, aki a diszken levő vágás jelről a következőket írta ‘nyilvánvalóan olyan kéz róta aki a balról jobbra való íráshoz szokott’. ” De miért lenne 17-szer jelölve a balról-jobbra olvasási irány? Egyszer is elegendő lett volna jelölni hogy a központból kifelé haladva kell olvasni a szöveget. Annak semmi értelme, hogy csak a megjelölt jel-csoportok olvasandók visszafelé, mivel ezek nem sorvégek ahol fordulhatna az olvasás iránya. Egyetlen ésszerű magyarázata lehet ezenként a jeleknek: kiemelik az érintett képjeleket. A jelek, a jelölt írónyába, tehát visszafelé, külön üzenetet tartalmaznak:</td>
<td>The Massey twins conclude about the 17 words marked with the backslash () that they resemble Greek numerals. That’s all. But I owe them this very important reference: “Other Phaistos Disk students have also assumed this direction, including Evans who wrote that the slash mark on the disk was ‘evidently engraved by a hand accustomed to write from left to right.’” But why would be the writing direction from left to right marked 17 times? It would be sufficient to mark just once the reading direction from the centre outward. It would make no sense to read only the marked words backwards, because these are not ends of rows where the direction of reading could turn. There is only one logical explanation for these slash marks: they are highlighting and lifting out these hieroglyphs. These signs, in the marked direction, that is backwards, comprise a separate message:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TűZő-Lejő-TűZő-Lejő-TűZő</td>
<td>Fuel with fire ignites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TűZeLő TűZZeL TűZ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSíK-CSolNaK-CSöPoRi</td>
<td>The pot goes to the kiss-cheat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSőK-CSalőNaK CSuPoR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Töl-GYilok-GYaLo-Ta GGYüL,</td>
<td>Limb ignites, brain go blunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GYilok-GYilok-GYaLo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aGY Ga GYüL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘jel’ kimel</td>
<td>Bad, good (in accus.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JőL kimel!</td>
<td>well points out!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth sentence is not finished, to be exact, the thought rounds up by adding the message about the hidden message to the sentence; eventually reading the signs together with the instruction which signs to read, rounds up the sentence. A resourceful space and sign economizing!

### Kiemelés

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tűzelő tűzzel tűz.</th>
<th>Fuel with fire ignites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Csők-csalónak csupor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag gyúl, a gy ggyul.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossz jót jől kimel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lift out

| The pot goes to the kiss-cheat. |
| When limb ignites brain go blunt. | Bad emphasizes well the good. |

The drawing of hieroglyphs, or even their linear version, the LinA signs is too time-consuming for ending up just as abstract symbols independents of the objects the writer/carver/drawer is trying agony-bitterly depicting. To scrupulously depict the boat to make it the sign for, say R is unreasonable for two reasons:

1. If the picture of the sign does not imply its phonetic value, than it has to be learned and its use continuously practiced, otherwise one will forgets its meaning.
2. Only the few learned people would know to read the texts, but those prefer the simplest, the more rapidly writeable and readable signs.

In Egypt, the administration used the demotic writing, a kind of handwriting between them, but in the churches and elsewhere, where they wanted to approach the people, they used the easily recognizable, meticulously chiseled out
| 2. | Alaki elemzés: minden szó magyar, a gyököktől a ragóig. |
| 3. | A magánhangzók feltöltése önkényes tűnhet és az is lenne egyedi szavakkal. Hosszabb szöveg esetében a szövegkörnyezet fokozatosan csökkeni a különböző lehetséges olvasatok közötti választási lehetőséget, amíg egy egyedi olvasat be nem áll. |
| 4. | A hangadó (akrofónikus) és szórejtő (rebusz) képletek alapján készült el az eredeti szöveg átírása mai betűkre (transzliteráció). Ez az átírás pontosabb és önmagában sokkal nagyobb értékű mint amit Champolion a Rossetta kő segítségével elérte, mivel itt nem lépnek fel az egymástól idegen nyelvek különböző hangkészletei miatti torzítások és mivel a hangadó és hieroglyphic signs. These hieroglyphs were matched with a simple and by the people easily mastered reading rule: say out loudly the names of the objects and the narratives by handling the vowels loosely, allowing them to conform to the sequence of the sentences, i.e. to the syntax and you will hear the message of the hieroglyphic text (rebus principle). |
| 5. | To summarize the above said: |

| 1. | Contextual analysis: the text we are dealing with is intelligible, coherent, its style, construction, Hungarian syntactic structure and terminology are homogeneous. The likely authors of the text were teenage boys learning reading and writing. |
| 2. | Formal analysis: every word is Magyar, from the roots to the affixes. |
| 3. | The filling in of the jumped over vowels may seem arbitrary and it would be with individual words. But with longer texts the contexts gradually reduces the number of alternative options between the possible different readings of words, until reaching a unique reading. |
| 4. | The transliteration of the original hieroglyphic signs is made on the bases of acrophonic and rebus principles. This transliteration is more precise and in itself worth much more than the one Champollion arrived using the Rosetta stele, because here we do not have the distortions coming from the different-tonal systems of the alien languages, and because the acrophonic and rebus principles are working only in the original language of the writing, there is no need to prove the originality and uniqueness of the decoding. |
| 5. | The disk’s method of writing and its language, beyond the parity of some of the signs, agrees with the Cretan hiero- |
szörejtő alapelv csak a szöveg eredeti nyelvén működik, felesleges a megfejtés eredetiségének és egyediségének bármilyen más bizonyítása.

5. A korong írásmodja és nyelve, az egyes jelek azonosságán túl, egyezik a krétai hieroglif és LinA, valamint az eteo-Cypriot (LinC) írásmodjával és nyelvével is. Tehát, a diszk nem egy egyedi eset, a megfejtését legkevesebb három másik – térben és időben közeli - azonos írásmod és nyelv eredményes megfejtése is erősíti. Sőt, a LinB legnagyobb szakértőjének számító Th. Palaima professzor szarkasztikus megjegyzésének élét véve, ezek a megfejtések alapot nyújtanak “even to re-decipher Mycenaean Linear B” (még a műköni Linár B újbóli megfejtésére is), mivel mára a LinB “megfejtése” egy kisebb mennybéli város telefonkönyvére hasonlít: ami a megfejtőknek nehéz dió az vagy istenség vagy szentély lesz, aminek a jelentését nem kell megmagyarázni.

6. A szörejtő (rébusz) rendszer nem a korong sajatossága, az egyiptomi hieroglifák írnokai is használták. Gardiner (Egyptian Grammar) adta a rendszernek a rebus nevet és Kurt Sethe (Die Altaegyptischen Pyramidentexte) is foglalkozott vele, de a magyar nyelv gyökörendszerének ismerete nélkül nem tudtak vele - és így a hieroglifák hangzásításával sem - mit kezdeni. Érdemben először Borbola János foglalkozik az Nilus-völgyi írás alappilléreivel. Így foglalja össze, ahogyan ő nevezi, a szótagrejtvény vagy ősmagyar hangváltás lényegét: “A rébusz rendszer a hieroglifák hangtani alakjának az eredeti képértékétől eltérő hangzásítását jelenti. Így ugyanaz a hieroglifa (társashangzós vázának megtartása mellett) szótagképző hangjainak kicserélésével újabb értelmet kap.”

glyph and LinA, and the eteo-Cypriot (LinC) writing methods and languages. Thus, the disk is not a unique case; its decipherment is reinforced with at least three other – in time and space nearby – successful decipherments of identical writing methods and languages. In fact, to take the edge off the sarcastic remark made by Prof. Th. Palaima, the leading expert on LinB, that these decipherments may give bases “even to re-decipher Mycenaean Linear B”, because by now the dictionary of LinB resembles a telephone book of a heavenly town: for decipherers all the hard nuts are either deities or sanctuaries in no need for further investigation into their meaning.

6. The rebus system is not a specialty of the disk; the scribes of Egyptian Hieroglyphs also used it. Gardiner (Egyptian Grammar) did give the system its name, Kurt Sethe (Die Altaegyptischen Pyramidentexte) also dealt with it, but without knowing the word-root system of the Magyar language, they could not use it and consequently could not articulate, give verbal form to the hieroglyph writings. The first to examine the basic pillars of the Nile-dale writing, on its merit, is János Borbola. He sums up the essence of the rebus system as follows: “The rebus system denotes to the hieroglyphs - from their original pictographic values – different phonetic values. This way the same hieroglyph (keeping its consonantal root/base) by changing the syllable-forming vowels gets a new meaning.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A tudósok, akiknek nem sikerült megfejteni a phaistoszi korongot és a vele rokon írásokat, előszertettel foglalkoznak azzal, hogy a megoldás milyen legyen, illetve milyen ne legyen. <strong>Yves Duhoux</strong> (<em>How Not to Decipher the Phaistos Disc: A Review</em>, 2000) szerint például egy jó megoldás megmagyarázza a következőket:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Miért van mindkét oldalon a szöveg kezdete öt ponttal jelölve? Már maga a kérdés is kérdéses. Egyesek szerint, az A oldalon négy gyöngyszem van fűzéren: NéGY FűZéRe &gt; NaGY FőZáR &gt; <strong>nagy főzár</strong>. De az sem baj ha öt gyöngy van a fűzéren. A B oldalon valóban öt golyó van a fűzéren: öT FűZéRe &gt; iTT FőZáR &gt; <strong>itt főzár</strong>. Ez is főzár, de nem a nagy főzár. Miért nem egyszerűen csak zár? Azért mert ezek a főzárak mellett vannak más zárak is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>A &quot;\“&quot; jelek is zárak</em>. Ezek a zárak nyitották ki a diszk üzeneteinek egy második rétegét. A főzár szó nem véletlen és mellékes, nélküle a második réteg üzenetét rejtőjeleket esetleg nem zár káifiként kezelnénk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>A megoldásnak főleg fonetikus jelek ből kell állnia.</em> Így van, minden jel fonetikus, de nem szótág jel hanem a rébusz elv alapján szabadon hangzósítható képfel, melynek alap hangsértéke a képecskén látható tárgy (magyar) neve. Nincs fonetikusabb a hasonlóhangúan alapuló írásnál.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “<em>A megoldásnak meglehetősen jól kell illeszkednie a biztosan megfejtett párhumamos írásokhoz: a Lineáris B és Cypriot írás egyetlen jele sem magányos mássalhangzó. Minden táblázatnak, mely mássalhangzó-értéket társít a jelekhez, kitűnő esélye van arra, hogy téves legyen”</em> Ez egyszerűen nem igaz. Példák a LinB megfejtéséből: de-re-u-ko = δελεοκος (de =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Miért van mindkét oldalon a szöveg kezdete öt ponttal jelölve?</em> The question itself is questionable. By some, nn side A there are four beads on string: NéGY FűZéRe &gt; NaGY FőZáR &gt; <strong>nagy főzár</strong> : big main-lock. But it’s not a big deal if there are five beads. On the B side, there are indeed five beads on the string: öT FűZéRe &gt; iTT FőZáR &gt; <strong>itt főzár</strong> : here main-lock. This is also a main lock but not the big one. Why not simply just a lock? Because beside these main locks there are other locks as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>The “\“” signs are also locks</em>. They are opening up the second layer of the disk’s message. The main-lock term is not incidental and peripheral, without this wording we could miss the other locks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>The solution should comprise mainly from phonetic signs</em>. That is the case, every sign is phonetical, not syllabic, but with freely changeable vowels in accordance with the rebus principle – with the phonetic value of the object it represents (spelled out in Magyar). There is nothing more phonetic than the writing based upon analog sounding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>To conform fairly well to securely deciphered parallel scripts: in Linear B and Cypriot no sign stands for a lone consonant. Any grid that assigns a consonantal value to signs has therefore an excellent chance of being wrong.</em> This is, to put it plainly, not true. Examples from a LinB glossary: de-re-u-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
δ), gi-ri-ja-to = γριάτο (gi = γ), ka-na-ko = κνάκος (ka = κ). No persze, itt lehet olvassási szabálya hivatkozni, de az lényegte- lena. A kutya a párhuzamosságban van el- ásva. A krétai írások (hieroglif vagy kép- írás, phaiztoszi korong, LinA) évszáza- dok alatt fejlődtek ki a nyelv követel- ményeihez idomulva, és természetesen a minoszival valóban párhuzamos írások, az időben és térben közeli sumer és egyipto- mi mássalhangzós írások mintájára. A LinB ezekkel szemben átvett, adoptált írás: a minőszi LinA írásjeleket a műkö- nevő követelményeknek megfelelően, egy adott időpontban, művileg átdolgozták, hasz- nálatát szabályozták. A kettő viszonya inkább a főniciai és görög írás viszonyával párhuzamos: a főniciai mássalhangzós írás, a jelen nevei hangadó (acrophonic) képjelek; a görögbe átültetett és a nyel- hez idomított alfabéta tisztán fonetikus és az átvett betűnevek semmit sem jelentenek görögül. (Sőt, a görög észjárásnak az sem jelent semmit.)

A következtetésekkkel nem szabad táj messzire menni ha almát hasonlítsunk krumplihoz. A Cypriot-ra való hivatkozás értelmetlen, mert legalább három ciprusi írás van, közülük az eteo-Cypriot biztosan a LinA helyi változata, vagyis magyar- és Th. Palaima professzor, a kérdés legmar- kánsabb ismerője szerint nincs megfejtve. The Triple Invention of Writing in Cyprus..., 2005, című munkájában az ICS §196 kétnyelvű (biscript) szövegről ezt írja: “In the eteo-Cypriote portion, the only recog- nizable words are the name of Ariston and his father …” – ez egyáltalán nem úgy hangzik mintha megfejtett szövegről lenne szó, 15 eteo-Cypriot szóból az uralkodó neve az egyetlen felismert szó, és öt évvel ko = δλεύκος (de = δ), gi-ri-ja-to = γριάτο (gi = γ), ka-na-ko = κνάκος (ka = κ). You can refer here on reading rules, but this is nonessential. The devil is hiding in the parallels. The Cretan writing (Hierog- lyphic, Phaistos Disk, and LinA) has developed for centuries conforming to the requirement of the language, and natu- rally, influenced by the really parallel, both in time and in space approximate Sumerian and Egyptian consonantal writing systems. In contrast with these, the LinB is a borrowed, adopted writing system: the Minoan LinA signs were, in a given moment of time, surgically rede- signed to the Mycenaean needs, their usage was regulated. The relationship of the two is rather parallel with the relati- onship between Phoenician and Greek writings: the Phoenician is a consonantal writing, the signs are named by the acro- phonic principle; the transplanted and to the Greek language adopted alphabet is a clearly phonetic writing system and the adopted letter-names do not mean any- thing in Greek. (Further more, to Greek way of thinking it doesn’t matter that their letter-names don’t mean anything.) One shouldn’t go too far when comparing apples with potatoes. The referral to Cypriot is meaningless, because there are at least three Cypriot writings, amongst them eteo-Cypriot is for sure the local variant of LinA, and according to Prof. Th. Palaima, the man best-informed on the matter, it is not solved. In his writing The Triple Invention of Writing in Cyprus..., 2005, about the ICS §196 biscript he says: “In the eteo-Cypriote portion, the only recognizable words are the name of Ariston and his father …” – it doesn’t sound like a deciphered text, out of 15 eteo-Cypriot words only the name of the ruler is recognized, and we are five years after Duhoux writing. (You can find my
Duhoux írása után vagyunk. (A szöveg megfejtését lásd a Lineáris A írás megfejtve című írásomban.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“A hangadó alapelv a gyanús megfejtéshez jutásnak egy csodálatos útja. Gyakran előfordul, hogy kérdéses a jel által ábrázolt tárgynak az értelmezése.”</th>
<th>“The acrophonic principle is an admirable means of arriving at a suspect decipherment. It often turns out that the interpretation of the object said to be depicted by the sign is arguable.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ez nem érvelés: bármilyen írásjel téves felismerése téves tolmaácsoláshoz vezet, nemcsak a hangadó képjeleket. A Dél- és Közel-Kelet írásaival foglalkozó tudósokat érthető módon nagyon zavarja a hangadó elv, ez ugyanis csak az írás eredeti nyelvén érvényes, ha felborul az elv akkor sántít a megoldás. Mivel szerintük az ő megoldásuk jó, az elv a rossz – a nyelvészet felettébb furcsa tudomány!</td>
<td>This is not an argument: an incorrect identification of any letter, not just the acrophonic signs, leads men to a wrong interpretation. The scientist working with South- and Near-Eastern writings are clearly disturbed with the acrophonic principle, which only prevails on the original language of the writings, if the principle fails, the solution is limping. But because they are certain in their own solutions, the principle must be wrong – linguistics is a very strange science!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Példa: a ☼ jel nevének kezdőbetűjét helyettesítsük be a következő szavakba: ☼nbm, ☼nbrn, ☼nd, ☼ndl, ☼nshn. Ha megfelelő nyelven ejtjük a jel nevét akkor azon a nyelven értelmes szavakat kapunk. Amíg nem találjuk meg a megfelelő nyelvet, addig keseregetünk azon, hogy a hangadó elv nem működik, de csak addig. Ős igen, lesz aki a kéjelet bivalynak nézi, lesz aki eltéveszi a nyelvet, de ezek miért befolyásolnának véleményünket azokról akik jól oldják meg a feladatot?</td>
<td>Example: substitute the first letter of the ☼ sign’s name into the following words: ☼nbm, ☼nbrn, ☼nd, ☼ndl, ☼nshn. If you have got the language write than you get meaningful words in that language. While looking for the appropriate language, you can contemplate about the faultiness of the acrophonic principle, but only that long. And yes, someone will mistake the sign for a buffalo, others will mistake the language, but why would these people influence our judgment about those who solve the problem properly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hangadó képje választásával a célom ugyanaz mint az őkori írnoké: megkönnyíteni a helyes olvasat mielőbbi megtalálását. Mi ebben a gyanús?</td>
<td>Choosing the sign by applying the acrophonic principle, my intention was the same as of the ancient scribe’s: to ease the finding of a proper reading. What is suspicious about that?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Világos, hogy a körülbelül 40 jel a phaisztoszi korongot a főleg fonetikus szótagírások közé helyezi…

Először is: a mai magyar ábécé 44 betűből áll mégsem szótagírás!

- It is clear that the approximately 40 different signs locate the Phaistos disc among dominantly phonetic syllabic scripts…

First of all: The today’s Magyar alphabet consists of 44 letters and it isn’t a syllabic writing!
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Másodszor: semmi sem utal arra és semmi okunk feltételezni, hogy az írónok a “pha-
sztoszi” írás minden írásjelét használta a korongon.
Harmadszor: szótágírásra a jelek számából csak abban az esetben következhetethetnénk, ha egyetlen típusba sorolnánk őket, vagyis eleve feltételeznének mindegyikról, hogy szótagokat jelölnek! Egy kevert írásnál, melyben vannak hang, szótag és szó jelek is, ez a szám semmit sem jelent.

Semmi sem “világos” egy írás típusáról addig amíg nem tudjuk, hogy a jelek mit képviselnek!

Egy-két mondat Y. Duhoux eredeti címzettjének, Jean Faucounau-nak proto-
Ionic megoldásáról. Mint minden más proto-megoldás, egy nyelvből kiindulva (ion, magyar) megalkotsz egy kedved, szükségtelen szerinti protot (proto-Ionic, proto-finnugor), majd a protoból megfor-
dítva a menetirányt “levezeted” – nagy meglepetésre – a kiinduló nyelvet. Jól ismert példa a hattyú → kotang → hattyú körtánc. Egyetlen hibája van csak ennek a protozásnak: 100%-os.

Nem találom a kérdést a mezők szerepé-
ról, pedig azok sem minden ok nélkül ke-
rültek a korongra. Nem bizony, a mezők is zárak! lezárnak egy-egy jel-csoportot. Ezeket a jel-csoportokat záró jeleiből emelt ki a “\" vonalak 16-ot (és egy nem záró jelet) a külön üzenet közvetítésére. De mi van a többi mező és – mint láthat-
tuk – egyben szó-záró jelleg? Sorban összeolvassa őket, azok is értelmes mon-
dandót közölnék, egyben válaszolnak arra, az olyan nagyon nem is feszegetett kérdésre, hogy mi a szerepe ezeknek a mezőknek.

Second: nothing implies and no reason to assume that the scribe used all the signs of the “Phaistos” writing system on the disk.

Thirdly: We could conclude about syllabic script as a consequence of the number of signs only if we would classify all signs in the same class, namely as representing syllables! In a combined writing, where consonantal, syllabic and logographic signs are mixed, this number means nothing at all.

Nothing is “clear” about the type of writing unless you know what the signs are representing!

One or two sentences have to be said about the proto-Ionic solution of Jean Faucounau, Y. Duhoux’s original addresssee. Like every other proto-solution, starting from a language (Ionic, Magyar) you construct a proto (proto-Ionic, proto-FinnUgric) to your liking and/or needs, then from the proto, using reverse gear you derive – to a big surprise – the starting language. A known example is the hattyú → kotang → hattyú ring-dance. The only fault with this protoing that it is foolproof.

I cannot find the question about the role of the fields, yet they didn’t get on the disk for no reason. Not at all, the fields are locks as well!, they close up a sign-group. Out of the ending signs of these sign-groups did the back-slash “\“ lift out 16 (plus one non closing sign) for relaying the special message. But what about the rest of the ending signs of fields and – as it turned out – words’ ending signs? Enumerating them sequentially, they convey also a meaningful sentence, simultaneously answering the not very much inquired question about the role of these fields.
Ki búne, hol ki tüzet tetéli, vájatán nyílt üszök gyül? Rosszon gyül rossz.

Whose sin is, where the one who adds to the fire lights up the cinder on her opening? Bad ignites on bad.

Ilyet ki hallott? Csalnak tápról gyúlót tégellye’.

Who heard such thing? They lure things, igniting by feeding with fire, with pot (of fuel).

Hol gyúlóva’ csalnak, ott járuló locsolónak jó.

Where they lure with igniter, there a suitable sprinkler is beneficial.

A válasz tehát a fel sem tett kérdésre, hogy a mezők a vers-sorokba rejtett szöveg képleit határozzák meg: a phaistosz-szi korong szövege egy akrostichon, a verssorok utolsó képjelébe rejtett üzenetekkel!

Sajnálatom azokat akik szkeptikusan juttattak el idáig, keresve mindvégig az olvasat

The answer to the never asked question is that the fields are determining the signs of the hidden text: the Phaistos Disk is an acrostic poem, with the hidden messages in the end-signs of the fields!

I’m sorry for those skeptics who came up this far looking for the weak points in the
gyenge pontjait, mivel láthatták, hogy mindenféle belemagyarázás nélkül, egy-szerű átírással, a fonetikus képjet hangjai
eyt egy az egyben átírva, csupán néhol meg-változtatva a magánhangzót, jutottunk el
ezekig az olvasatokig. Égy szkeptikus is-
meri és elismeri a valószínűség számítás
következményeit és, amig csak egyenes
szövegről volt szó, vigasztalhatta lélki-
ismertét azzal, hogy ha minimális is, de
azért van esélye annak, hogy ez a magyar
olvasat véletlenszerűen összejöjjön. De az
akrosztichon felbukkanásával ennek a re-
ménynek vége, ilyen méretű akrosztichon
nem jöhet létre véletlenszerűen. Nincs
más hátta: vagy elfogadja az olvasatot
vagy úgy tesz mint aki sohasem hallott
róla.

Nem hagyott nyugton, hogy a B04 mező-
nél miért az utolsó előtti jelet emelte ki az
írnok. Nem jellemző a tévedés ezeken a
minőszi feliratokon, inkább a túlzott, szin-
te márrafinált átgondolás jellemzi őket.
(“Normalizálásuk” ezért soviniszta sér-
tegetés.) A kiemelő “/” vonalka itt abban
is eltér a többől, hogy a két utolsó jel
közé van húzva és csakugyan mind a két
jel része a harmadik akrosztikus szöve-
nek. Nincs elfrás!

És talán már nem lep meg senkit, hogy a
szózáró jelek, együtt és visszafelé olvasva,
szintén értelmes mondatokat alkotnak:

The question, why in the field B04 the
next to the last sign is emphasized, didn’t
let me keep quiet. Mistake isn’t a peculi-
arity on these Minoan scripts; rather the
artful consideration of every detail is the
rule. (“Normalization” of these texts is a
chauvinistic insult!) Here the out lifting
“\” back-slash differs from the others in
respect of being placed between the last
two signs and indeed both these signs are
belonging to the third acrostic text. No
mistake!
And nobody should be surprised that the
ending signs of all the fields read back-
wards, make up meaningful sentences:
Záró-jel akrostichon

Új csalónak újuló tűz.  
Ajjra újat ácsolnak.  
Tűz ajjáva tűz gyúl.  
Hol 'egelhető gulya porol ott csalnak,  
ott hull csikó kacolnak ű csupor tejéé'.

Rossz gulyán rossz tőgyelők.  
Szű gyógyul tág nyéle  
Gagyulót váj rossz.  
Életét tetőzi ki halóban alkot.

End-sign acrostic poem

For the new cheat there is renewing fire.  
On foot/dregs/refuse new is erected.  
With fire's remnants fire ignites.  
There is cheating where the grazing herd is dusting, there the colt perishes for the mug-full of milk from the mare.

In bad herd the milking cows are bad.  
The heart heals on large handle.  
Bad deepens in maddening man.  
The one who procreates when dying makes a peak to one's life.

Úgy látszik, hogy ezzel sikerült a phaisz-toszi koronggal kapcsolatban felhozható minden kérdésre egyenes és ésszerű választ adni. Sőt, nagyon remélem, hogy közben azt is sikerült bemutatni, hogy a korong felirata semmiben sem különbözik a hasonló minószi és más feliratoktól, ide-sorolva a kárpát-medencei képfeliratokat

It seems that with this we succeeded to provide the straight and logical answers to all the adducible questions regarding the Phaistos Disk. Moreover, I hope that we managed to show that the inscription doesn’t disagree with the similar Minoan and other hieroglyphic inscriptions, including the ones from the Carpathian
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akrostichon</th>
<th>Acrostic poem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lyány-járom, milyen Ő?  
Olén kelengyül élendő lentese.  
Ilyen lyány hálóján jön tűs.  
Ilyen lyány bűvőlő kéjnő,  
nyélől olyan vetélő.  
Lyány olén széhely,  
tők-mony avva’ bajt szül.  
Lyány Ő mátka-meny, mi’ bővülő  
lyány! má’ mama, SÜÌL,  
lejős szűrőjén merés! | Girl-yoke, what is it like?  
On her lap her reviving bottom becomes trousseau.  
On the net of such a girl comes hostage.  
Such a girl is a bewitching woman of pleasure,  
from handle she’s a shuttle.  
On the girls lap is a charcoal-furnace,  
with it the balls & dick begets trouble.  
The girl is intended fiancée, how widening the girl  
is! she’s already Mum/Mama, she’s  
MOTHERING,  
on her funneled sieve there is a catch! |
I admit, I was afraid of this, on side A out of 31 hieroglyphs 14 is that of the ‘lyány’, despite of it the reading is enjoyable, although only fully legitimate j=ly>l and n>ny formulae were used by the scribe. shuttle in a loom, brought up for its sexy shape and up-down fast movements.

girl: jány/lyány/lány/leány/leán, all in use

To avoid every mistake about the reading of the disk, the scribe spelled out the word SZÜL: mothering in full

The fact that there are at least hundred partial solutions of the disk doesn’t mean anything: 100 of even 90% solutions is less than one single 100% solution. Most of “solutions” are idolizing the hieroglyphs; they are comparing the signs on the disk by perforce to the signs on other texts. The essence of hieroglyphic writing is, as a matter of fact, not in the writing signs but in the writing method. The scribe seeks picture-elements with names sounding similarly as the recordable words. To represent the words áCSoLNaK, CôLoNK, CSaLoNaK, CSaLoNeK, CSeLoNeK, kaCoLoNaK and szegeCSeLoNeK the scribe did choose the easily recognizable boat with the similar sounding name, CSoLONaK in Magyar, immensely reducing with this the number of signs, for the most economical use of the always scanty writing-surface. He followed the same principle for choosing the other signs as well, not knowing how stupendous mental labour he had inflicted on the succeeding generations, which cannot use the rebus principle.

The scribe only used the logic employed by all the tradesman of his time and still in use today, namely that a carpenter for every working process uses the appropriate tool: either the saw, chisel, drill or the
nálja: fűrészt, vésőt, fűrót, kalapácsot. A vésőt nagyon ésszerűtlen lenne szegecséléshez használni, arra van a kalapács. Az írnok a phaisztoszi korong üzeneteinek grafikai megjelenítésére 45 jelet választott ki, ezeket találta a legmegfelelőbbeknek és a leggazdaságossabbaknak a feladathoz – még így is a korong már kisét túlmérészetnek számít.

Mi sem bizonyítja jobban azt, hogy az írnok mestere volt szakmájának mint az, hogy a jól összefüggő 45 képpel 242 lenyomatával sikerült leírni:

The total word count on the disk surpasses the number of impressions, although 15 out of the 45 signs are only consonantal signs.

The economical use of the writing surface was an important point for the makers of the disk. They obtained this target by choosing the most suitable hieroglyphs. As the hieroglyphs are not God or Academy given symbols but picture-signs only serving the graphical representation of the text, their free choice makes difficulty for those who every picture see only as a symbol, not as a talking image, which can be called by its own name.

Egyelőre ennyi, de talán ez is elegendő néhány csatolt kérdés megválaszolására. Miért készültek külön ennek a egy diszknek pecsét? Miért égették ki ezt a diszket külön figyelemmel, amikor a többi agyagra írt szöveg csak a tűzvészeknek köszönheti megcserepedését? A válasz kisét lehangoló: nem a szöveg magasztos voltaért, hanem mesteri összeszerkesztése

That’s all, for the time being, but it is enough to answer a couple of attached questions as well. Why did they make stamps especially for this disk? Why did they fire this disk purposefully, while all the other inscriptions are fired only in accidental blazes? The answer is a bit depressing: not for its elevated thoughts, but for the masterly compilation of the
miatt! Nagy ügyességet igényel egy ilyen többszörös akrosztichon megírása. A képességnek, rátermettségnek ezt a nagyszerű megnyilvánulását honorálja a korong technikai kivitelezése. text! It requires a great dexterity to write such a multiple acrostic poem. The splendid manifestation of ability and talent is honoured by the technical construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jel</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Hangérték : Phonetic value</th>
<th>LinA analogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G_L_</td>
<td>GYaLogol (a G_L_ gyökváz duplázott!) : on foot, walk (the G_L_ word-root is doubled)</td>
<td>JE=46, jár/jön: walk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LY_NY</td>
<td>LYáNY; L_G_NY LeGéNY: Ez a két kép jel csak a fejdíszben különbözik, amely mint a nő képjele önállóan is szerepel 026 sorszámmal a Krétai Képi-rások gyűjteményében. Itt a szövegkörnyezetből világosan következik, hogy nem általában nőről és férfiről van szó, hanem lányról és legényről. A #049 hieroglíf rudacska szövegének megfejtéséből egyértelműen következik, hogy a 026 jel a Párta vonalas rajza, tehát 02 a hajadon nő, vagyis a LYáNY jele: Girl as young (unmarried) woman, boy as young man, the context makes it clear, that here the word is about youth. The signs for Woman and Man are similar to the signs in the Cretean Hieroglyphic corpus, where the headdress &quot;sign 026 … appears as a ligature with 002 to form 003 … 003 VIR, which incorporates sign 026, constitutes a subset of MUL; the sign 026 may therefore connote female.&quot; As it turned out with the decipherment of the hieroglyphic document #049, the 026 sign is the linear drawing of the headdress (Párta) of unmarried girls still in use in some parts of greater Hungary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_B</td>
<td>RaB_. hátrakötött kezekkel!: prisoner, convict, with hands tied back (to RoB is RaBo in Hungarian!)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS_P_R_CSőPoRi (törpe):</td>
<td>Mischievos sprite, imp, goblin, hobgoblin, dwarf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_V_L_</td>
<td>BűVőLő: sorcerer/sorceress, magician</td>
<td>Hiero 004 on #264, similar look, same phonetic value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L, J</td>
<td>Liú/lijú/livő/léjú/léhő = tölcsér: Funnel, cone, conett, cr-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_Z_</td>
<td>TűZő, tűzött ruha, ruha-díszítés, mint a szallag és öv az ingen: stitch, quilt, stitched/quilted dress/dress-decoration, like the ribbon and belt</td>
<td>TWE=87, tűző : stitch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SZ_R</td>
<td>SZűR : long embroidered felt cloak of Hungarian shepherds.</td>
<td>SI=41, SZűr : cloak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_L</td>
<td>ToLL: feather</td>
<td>TE=4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V_J</em></td>
<td>IVőJ, ív-íj, íjj : bow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Külű, Köpű, Köpülő-korong : the moving disk of a churn</td>
<td>QE=78, köpülő korong / KA=77, Körkereszt : QE: churning disk / KA: cross in circle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>V Verőfa, verősulyok : club, cudgel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>NY_G NYűG (béklyó) : pillory (shackle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>B_LT_BaLTa : adze, hatchet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>T_K-M_NY ToKMány, szarvból készült kaszakő tok/tartó : stone cutter-chuck holder/jig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>R_NG_RiNGó, bölcő ives vége fogóval, az ágyacska közvetlenül a ringó talpon van: cradle, the arching end with handle, the bed sits on the rocking bedrock itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T Tört pálcza : broken rod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-S_, -SZ áSZok, főnév képző (as/-es, -asz/-esz) : gantry, shoot, sprout, noun formative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>CS_B_L_CSoBoLYó, kézi hordócska, korsó : pitcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>N „Nyűni kezdé az Ő vén fején való haját.” (Nádor-codex). Nyűni a gazt, a nem oda valót, az elhalt hajat és a nyű – erre való a nyűvelő, mai nevén fésű. : Nyű is an old word for fésű/kefe (= comb/brush).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>S, SZ SZék, SZűkül : Stool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>NY_L NYél : handle, shaft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>J_R_JáRó-szék/JáRó(ka), kar-ruca : carousel, playpen/baby-walker (see the last paragraph)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>CS_LN_K CSoLNaK, csónak : boat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>G, GY GYlók : dagger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ú (a mai magyarban többször Ő) Ürü (bőre), melyre valaha írtak, ezért a neve írá, majd egy h betoldásával írha lett. : Wether hide (in Magyar the root is the same for writing (parchment)). (ő is often replaced with ü in dialects.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>T_S TuS, (puska)tus, tuskó : stamp, (gun)stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>M Macska : cat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>J_ Juh : sheep, ewe (same pronunciation!)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>K Karoly, Karvaly, Keselyű : sparrow-hawk, vulture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Word(s)</td>
<td>Definition(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Gerle/Galamb</td>
<td>dove/turtle-dove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>H.L</td>
<td>HaL</td>
<td>fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B.N.</td>
<td>Bánya bejárata, tárna feletti érckiemelő görgős kerékkel</td>
<td>mine entrance with ore-lifting rollers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>(tárgyrag) Töl/Tölgyág</td>
<td>oak tree branch (suffix for accusative Tree-branch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>G.Y</td>
<td>GYöNGY</td>
<td>gyöngyvirág, GYöNGYike : lily of the valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>G.CS</td>
<td>GöCSfű</td>
<td>knotweed, knotgrass (grass with knots/nodules)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>R.S.</td>
<td>RóZSa, RoSetta</td>
<td>Rosette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dárda (három-élű)</td>
<td>3-edged pike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>P.R.L.</td>
<td>PaRoLó (legyező, parola = kézfogás! legyező-szerűen felmutatott tenyér: fegyvertelen), PáR-oLLó, (két egykarú emelőből összetéve, a nyelek érintkező része az él)</td>
<td>fan, pair of scissors, with the blades on the contact-line of the handles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M.Z</td>
<td>MeZ</td>
<td>mask (with opening for the eyes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S.G.</td>
<td>SZeGö (csipke)</td>
<td>trim with lace, hem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>CSíK-szedő</td>
<td>strainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>S.G.K</td>
<td>SZöGeK</td>
<td>idom SZöGeKkel, SZöGgel erősítve melynek csak a feje (pont) látszik : figure with angles (szögek), nailed (szög) down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>R.S.</td>
<td>ReS</td>
<td>slit, crack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Freskó részlet Knosszoszból, kézben-vállon hordott gyaloghíntő, járó-szék, melynek szerkezete emlékezett a 24-es képpel járókájára.

On this Knossos fresco detail the chair carried in hand and on shoulders is walking (járó) chair, which is reminiscent of hieroglyph 24 playpen/baby-walker.
When expounding the Phaistos DiSCo Songs, the locks were guiding me to the individual readings. The start of the text on side A is marked with a string of four (négy) or five (öt) beads. NéGY FűZéRe > NaGY FőZáR, or like on side B öT FűZéRe > iTT FőZáR >big main lock, or like here (is the) main lock to the reading of the DiSCo Song. The backslash marks the lift out signs and their reading direction (Lift out). By noticing that the backslashes, all but one, are the last signs in the fields, incurred the suspicion that the other closing signs of the fields also can hide a further message. Forsooth, they hide (Left...
out), and at the same time arises the question, why one of the closing lines of fields are not in its place. But it is very much in place in backwards reading of all the closing signs, when the two last signs are taken here into the reading as it is required by the backslash (End-sign acrostic poem). With this the row of the readings could end, but the hellion wouldn’t let me rest. A real acrostic poem uses the collation of initials for conveying the special message. With this we come to the last song of the Phaistos Disc (Acrostic poem) … or didn’t we not?

If the closing signs of the fields are readable in both directions, why than the initial signs of the fields are not? Bingo, the initials also can be read in backwards direction and scribes is getting personal:

kérdés, hogy az egyik záró vonal miért nincs a helyén. Nagyon is a helyén van, az összes mezőt záró jel visszafelé olvasatában, itt a két utolsó jel kerül az olvasatba, ahogy azt a vonalka helyzete megköveteli (Záró-jel akrosztichon). Ezzel be is fejeződött volna az olvasatok sora, de a kisördög nem hagyott nyugodni. Egy igazi akrosztichon a sorok kezdőbetűinek az összeolvasásával jeleníti meg külön üzenetét. Így jutottunk el a phaisztoszi diszk utolsó dalához (Akrosztichon) … vagy mégse?

Ha a mezőket záró jelek mindkét irányban olvasandók, akkor az iniciálék, a mezőket nyitó képjelek miért nem? Pompás ötlet, az iniciálék úgy szintén visszafelé is olvasandók és az írnok kezdi magát felfedni:
Akrosztichon visszafelé

íRáSoM oLYaN SoR-S JeLőLő ŐS-MőM,

MeLYeN BűVőL MáTKa-MeNYeM:

Ó eLNYeLi és BaJTeVő TőK-MoNY HuLLáS
LYáNY OŁeN.

TeLVe LéNYéTőL, NYéL iLYeNKó’ BőVeL,
LYáNY aLaNYTáS, éJJeN LYáNY HáLaLóN
LYáNY TüZe eLeNd,
LYáNY GYúL, LYáNY KéJNő, ÖLéN MaMa
JáRu LóN.

Acrostic poem in reverse

My writing is such a fate-representing ancient play/sham/imitation, by which my intended fiancée bewitches me: She absorbs and the trouble-setter balls & dick falling is in girl’s lap.

Filled with its being, the handle at such times plenteous, It is girl’s grafting, in nights on girls sleeping quarters the girl’s heat revives, The girl heats up, the girl is a harlot, on her lap she is mum additionally.

Akrosztichon visszafelé

Irásom olyan sors-jelölő ős-mím,

Melyen bűvől mátka-menem:

Ő elnyeli és bajtevő tők-mony hullás lyány olén.

Telve lényétől, nyél ilyenkő bővel,
Lyány alanyítás, éjjén lyány hálapón lyány tüze élend,
Lyány gyúl, lyány kéjnő, olén mama járulón.
Az idézetek a Czuczor-Fogarasi féle szótárból valók:
ős-mím = Ősi színjáték
mátka-meny “Jegyben járó nő, különösen hajadon leány”
alanyítás, az oltó-alany behasítása, ahol alany az “alapcsemete, melybe a nemesítés történik vagy történt”,
hálal/hálál “Bizonyos helyen gyakran vagy folytonosan alva tölti az éjet, hálogat, hálodgál.”

Getting thus far, now the question spontaneously arises: is there a backwards reading for the whole text? Yes, there is, and in this reading the scribe also talks about himself, this is the most personal text of the whole Minoan corpus. The scribe calls himself a ‘míes’, maker/smith or artist, and his artwork a ‘vakoló’ (plastering), a FaKe verse hiding some hidden messages, like the plaster hides the bricks:
A Phaistoszi Diszk Retróban

| Comma the ripening of the brush, the fur on the stomach is flowering. |
| The open, charming girl fills your life with new kind of fire calling you darling. |
| Her passage is an open funnel, her gap opens blooming for a cheat. |
| She’s on heat, calls you darling, her gait is incitingly gallant, what heats is a firing pearl. |
| She’s firm where the bung broadens, fires up, where the scraping along balls & dick frequents a jar. |
| What heats up for a bad cheat, she is weak to pair with, so the girl gets badly unstuck. |
| They batter with nails, the knotty with plane, veil by falling and kiss is thrusted upon by saliva on the seduced. |
| Where she’s a salt-pot, he keeps licking, the girl becomes balmy, here lap pairs smoothly. |

The Phaistos Disc in Retro

| Comes the ripening of the brush, the fur on the stomach is flowering. |
| The open, charming girl fills your life with new kind of fire calling you darling. |
| Her passage is an open funnel, her gap opens blooming for a cheat. |
| She’s on heat, calls you darling, her gait is incitingly gallant, what heats is a firing pearl. |
| She’s firm where the bung broadens, fires up, where the scraping along balls & dick frequents a jar. |
| What heats up for a bad cheat, she is weak to pair with, so the girl gets badly unstuck. |
| They batter with nails, the knotty with plane, veil by falling and kiss is thrusted upon by saliva on the seduced. |
| Where she’s a salt-pot, he keeps licking, the girl becomes balmy, here lap pairs smoothly. |
thus her body sprouting takes on in her lap from the cheat’s handle.

A laboring writing that plays sardonically, quarrels the master, the odious master who did fuck the girl, accepts their rake fieriness, he who is the good party, where he matches with equal: it’s the taken girl’s fault!

The pretending party has burnt his fingers, now he’s conceiving the conundrum (plastered-in words).

Supplementing the word counting from the Phaistos DiSCo-Song with the words from here, I can say with cool conscience that the scribe deserves the master title: with only 242 impressions managed to collate 416 words into intelligent sentences. To write down these words we needed 2573 characters, nearly ten times more...
| A szöveg mai ízlés szerint elégé trágár, de nem tanulság nélkúli: a mester azzal zárja a mondandóját, hogy végeredményben ő járt pórul, mivel nem ösztinte érzelmekkel közelített a lányhoz. Ezzel közvetve vállalja tettének következményeit. | than the impressions! The text by today's taste is rather obscene, but not without moral: the master closes his message with noting that at the end he is the looser, because hasn't approached the girl with sincere feelings. With this he indirectly accepts the consequences of his action. |

**Bízonyítás:** Mit kellene bizonyítani? Az akroszikus képlelek egy töbzsőrös akrosztichont alkotnak, és a rebusz elv következetes és szigorú betartásával juttottuk ezedhez az értelmes és összefüggő, sőt összefonódó olvasatokhoz. A rebusz elv magába foglalja a hasonlóan hangzó mássalhangzók felcserélhetőségét is, ezek teljesen elfogadhatók, valójában elenyészőek, minimálisak: c=cs-ty; j=ly-l; g=gy; n=ny; s=sz-sz-z. A jány-lyány-lyány-leány-leán szavak ma is élnek nyelvünkben. De a jelek számából … Nem, a jelek számából csak akkor következne, hogy azok szótagokat jelölnek, ha először bizonyítanánk róluk, hogy mindegysik csupán szótagot jelöl! Az írásmodsort semmiben sem különbözí a többi minőszi és kárpát-medencei felirattól, lásd a Kréta képírás megfejtve 1-5, az Arkalochori Balta felirata, a Minós, Mokhlosz és Isopata gyűrűk olvasatait és a Kép- és rovásírás cikkeit. A felhasznált jelek, az írnok saját szavai szerint egy általa kimagyalt vakolóhoz (szó-rejtvényhez) lettek – nagyon ügyesen – összeválogatva, tehát célhoz alkalmazva az eszköztár és nem fordítva.  

A felhasznált jelek, az írnok saját szavai szerint egy általa kimagyalt vakolóhoz (szó-rejtvényhez) lettek – nagyon ügyesen – összeválogatva, tehát célhoz alkalmazva az eszköztár és nem fordítva.  

A nyomtatásos módszer egyedi (és 3000 ével megelőző Gutenberg), ez azonban nem róható fel a korong készítőinek és nem befolyásolja a szöveg olvashatóságát.  

A korong nyelvezete inkább népi mint ősi, következőképpen az ös magyar nyelvi emlékek csupán nyelvünk latinbetűs kificamulásai. |

**Verification:** What should we prove? The acrostic hieroglyphic signs create a multiple acrostic poem, and we have obtained these intelligent and correlating, moreover intertwining readings by observing a consequent and strict compliance to the rebus principle. The rebus principle also includes the interchangeability of the similarly sounding consonants, these are practically slight and minimal: c=cs-ty; j=ly-l; g=gy; n=ny; s=sz-sz-z. In the living Hungarian the girl is interchangeably: jány-lyány-lyány-leány-leán. But from the number of signs … Nope, it would only follow from the number of signs that they are syllables, if we could prove first for each one that they represent only syllables! The way of writing does not differ from the rest of the Minoan writings and from those from the Carpathian Basin, like the Cretan Hieroglyphics solved 1-5, the Arkalochori Axe, the Minos, Mokhlos and Isopata rings and the essays of Kép- és rovásírás. The signs used, according to the words of the scribe itself, were selected – very skillfully – for the conundrum he contrived, thought out, which means the toolkit was chosen for the purpose, not the other way around. The typographic method is unique (and precedes Gutenberg by 3000 years), but this cannot be held against the makers of the disc and it doesn’t influence the readability of the text. The language of the disc is the vernacular or folk Magyar rather than ancient, which means that the so called Old Magyar is only a disfiguration caused by the Latin characters.