

א ב ג ד
ה ו ז ח ט
י כ ל מ נ ס
ע פ צ ק ר ש ת

א ב ג ד
ה ו ז ח ט
י כ ל מ נ ס
ע פ צ ק ר ש ת

A B C D
E F G H
I J K L M N
O P Q R S T
U V W X Y Z

α β γ δ
ε ζ η θ
ι κ λ μ ν ξ
ο π ρ σ τ
υ φ χ ψ ω

א ב ג ד

א
ב ג
ד ה ו
ז ח ט י כ ל מ
נ ס ע פ צ
ק ר ש ת
א ב ג ד

א
ב ג
ד ה ו
ז ח ט י כ ל מ
נ ס ע פ צ
ק ר ש ת

A
B C
D E F
G H I J K
L M N O P Q R
S T U V W
X Y Z

α
β γ
δ ε ζ
η θ ι κ λ
μ ν ξ ο π ρ σ
τ υ φ
χ ψ
ω

Three Fates or, some say, Io the sister
of Phoroneus, invented five **vowels** of
the first alphabet, and the consonants

B and **T**

ა ბ გ დ

ე ვ ზ თ

ი კ ლ მ ნ

ო პ ყ რ ს ტ

უ ფ ქ ღ ც ძ წ ჭ ბ ჯ ჰ

ა

ბ ბ

დ ე ვ

ზ თ ი კ ლ

მ ნ ო პ ყ

რ ს ტ უ ფ ქ ღ

ც ძ წ ჭ ბ ჯ ჰ

in the Basis of the alphabet
are the basic elements, of which this world is
made like words are made of letters.

The Three Mother Letters

א מ ש

Aleph, Mem, Shin

The Seven Double Letters

ב ג ד כ פ ר ת

Beth, Gimel, Daleth, Kaph, Peh, Resh, Tau

The Twelve Simple Letters

ה ו ז ח ט י ל ם ן ע צ ק

Heh, Vav, Zayin, Cheth, Teth, Yod, Lamed, Nun, Samekh, Ayin, Tzaddi, Qoph

(in the hebrew text they are simply three
mothers, שלש אמות)

It is from jewish Book Of Formation,
a comment to the first chapter of Torah,
the basis of Kabbalah. Only though it
righteously attributes M to water, III to fire,
the attribution of A to air is whether a secret

(sacred) or a mistake, or the question itself
is caused by my misunderstanding (such
possibility is also to be kept in mind)

As we research the first sentence of Torah,

בראשית ברא אלהים את השמים ואת הארץ

it becomes obvious, that א refers to eArth,
when as air is a combination of water and
fire. Steam (maybe, in the conception of the
ancients, fire and water also originate from
air, as lightning and rain) but this is not for
certain, uncertain as it gets, because the Book
of Formation itself it seems has different
opinions about which element corresponds to
which letter depending on the chapter and the
version. and thus this is an open question (also
because this subject is new for me as well,
actually, this booklet is not about that)

Modern linguistics teaches that semitic alphabets are consonant, but when we compare arabic and hebrew to latin, greek, georgian and so on, it's obvious that it's one and the same system, and thus Aleph, Mem and Shin are vowel, labial and lingual, made by voice, lips and tongue. (armenian used to be much more like greek, before Mashtots had mutilated it. You can read about it described by Koriun, by Khorenatsi, and at aeiou.nu/index-book.html, and thus Mashtots couldn't be the creator of georgian alphabet, because christians don't seem to be initiated into the depth of alphabetic structures, at least not in these two)

Old greek myth of invention of alphabet also puts in the basis of alphabet vowels (**A E I O U**) and two consonants **B** и **T**.

A	B	C	D		
E	F	G	H		
I	J	K	L	M	N
O	P	Q	R	S	T
U	V	W	X	Y	Z

	A					
	B	C				
	D	E	F			
	G	H	I	J	K	
L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
	S	T	U	V	W	
	X	Y	Z			

And also all sorts of local variations in reading (for example, J in spanish is h, and X in portuguese is sh[ʃ]) vowels are all over the place, A is also e and o and even ey, O and U are also A sometimes.

A	a
B	b
C	c [k, s]
D	d
E	e
F	f
G	g [g, dʒ]
H	h
I	i
J	j
K	k
L	l
M	m
N	n
O	o
P	p
Q	q
R	r
S	s
T	t
U	u [u, ju, a]
V	v
W	w
X	x [ks, z]
Y	y [j, i]
Z	z

[illegible]

additional dots and dashes under the letters give more exact reading to vowels and turn consonants into syllables, just as M in english is a syllable in the word my

and when כ מ פ צ are the last in their words, they turn into these: ך ם ן ף ץ

ا	a
ب	b
ج	dʒ
د	d
ه	h
و	w

ع	ف	ص	ق	ر	ش	ت	ث	خ	ذ	ض	ظ	غ
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

ز	z
ح	h
ط	t
ي	i
ك	k
ل	l
م	m
ن	n
س	s
ع	a
ف	f
ص	s
ق	k
ر	r
ش	sh[ʃ]
ت	t
ث	θ
خ	kh
ذ	ð
ض	d
ظ	z
غ	ħ

ا
ب ج د
ه و
ي ك ل م ن س
ع ف ص ق ر ش ت ث خ ذ ض ظ غ

ا
ب ج
د ه و
ذ ح ط ي ك ل م
ن س ع ف ص
ق ر ش ت
ث خ ذ ض ظ غ

In arabic ه is not vowel, but in kurdish it is exactly E.

(ħ is voiced h (or fricative g))

In arabic **o** is not vowel, but in kurdish it is exactly E.

ა ბ გ დ
ე ვ ზ თ
ი კ ლ მ ნ
ო პ ჟ რ ს ტ
უ ფ ქ ღ ყ შ ჩ ც ძ წ ჭ ხ ჯ ჰ

ა
ბ გ
დ ე ვ
ზ თ ი კ ლ
მ ნ ო პ ჟ
რ ს ტ უ ფ ქ ღ
ყ შ ჩ ც ძ წ ჭ ხ ჯ ჰ

Грузинский алфавит	Транскрипция	Названия букв	Грузинский алфавит	Транскрипция	Названия букв	Грузинский алфавит	Транскрипция	Названия букв
ა	а	ан	ბ	м	ман	გ	გ	გან
ბ	б	бан	დ	ნ	нар	ე	კ	კარ
გ	г	ган	ვ	ო	он	ზ	შ	шин
დ	დ	дон	თ	პ	п'ар	ი	ჩ	чин
ე	э	эн	კ	ჯ	жан	ო	ც	цан
ვ	в	вин	ლ	რ	раз	პ	ძ	ძილ
გ	з	зэн	ს	ს	сан	ზ	ც'	ც'ил
თ	т	тан	ტ	ტ'	ტ'არ	ყ	ჩ'	ჩ'არ
ი	и	ин	უ	უ	ун	შ	ხ	хан
კ	კ'	კ'ан	ფ	პ	пар	ჯ	дж	джан
ლ	л	лас	ქ	კ	кан	ჰ	h	h აე

α
β γ
δ ε ζ
η θ ι κ λ
μ ν ξ ο π ρ σ
τ υ φ
χ ψ
ω

Ancient pronunciation (AP) also raises some questions, but that is the officially accepted transliteration

[illegible]

Deviation from this structure in greek can be explained by the reform, described in this historical chronicle: «The vowels added by the priests of Apollo to his lyre were probably those mentioned by Demetrius, an Alexandrian philosopher of the first century BC, when he writes in his dissertation On Style: ‘In Egypt the priests sing hymns to the Gods by uttering the seven vowels in succession, the sound of which produces as strong a musical impression on their hearers as if the flute and lyre were used, but perhaps I had better not enlarge on this theme.’»,

and yet why M never stands in the column of labials is a more complex question, to which I have several possible answers, the most interesting of them is the hypothesis of patriarchal takeover, which could place Jupiter instead of Minerva, or could it be Kronos even before that. All this is merely a speculation, but pay attention, that Fairy is Feyra in russian, and in greek goddess is θεά,

and phonetically labial θ (yep, even in modern greek it sounds as f (though by articulation today it is labeo-lingual, combining thus male and female components, and maybe it refers to the concept of hermaphroditic nature of gods, who knows)) is substituted with lingual Z which stands for Ζεύς. Also notice the initials JK standing at that sacred place today (but not in italian and not in irish)

In latin alphabet
linguals are
structurally divided
into back-linguals
and front-linguals:

A	B	C	D		
E	F	G	H		
I	J	K	L	M	N
O	P	Q	R	S	T
U	V	W	X	Y	Z

Other alphabets don't have such structural definition, but the next paragraph of the Book Of Formation divides alphabet into five groups, differently placed in different versions of the book, they nevertheless agree on which letter to each group belongs, and the first peculiarity I noticed is ה amongst what I suggest to call vowels, and ו amongst velars (back-linguals) and whether it is some encryption showing, suggesting some keys transmitted orally, or is it the greek influence, or is it an evidence that ה is vowel, and ו is labial, the way they are pronounced in greek today (especially in the context of isopsephy considered to be chronologically older than gematria) that is another open question.

2:3 עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד חקקן בקול חצבן
 ברוח קבען בפה בחמשה מקומות אחה"ע בגרון
 גיכ"ק בחיך דטלנ"ת בלשון זסשר"ץ בשינים בומ"ף
 בשפתים:

Twenty-two Foundation Letters

He engraved them with voice

He carved them with breath

He set them in the mouth

In five places

Alef Chet Heh Eyn (אחחע) in the throat (Gutturals)

Gimel Yud Kaf Kuf (גיכק) in the palate (Palatals)

Dalet Tet Lamed Nun Tav (דטלנת) in the tongue (Linguals)

Zayin Samekh Shin Resh Tzadi (זסשרצ) in the teeth (Dentals)


Bet Vav Mem Peh (בומף) in the lips (Labials)

The version on this page places the groups according to eastern tradition (with some variation) while the version on the next page places the groups in western tradition (ABCD + the fifth group, probably consisting of letters added later, though, it is also a speculation, based, nevertheless, on the differences in japanese and indian canons)

עשרים ושתים אותיות יסוד חקוקות בקול חצובות ברוח קבועות בפה
בחמש מקומות א"הח"ע ב'ומ"ף ג"יכ"ק ד"טלנ"ת זס"שר"ץ:

2:3
Twenty-two Foundation Letters are engraved with voice, carved with breath, and fixed in the mouth in five places—*Aleph* (א), *Fle* (פ), *Chet* (ח), and *Ayin* (ע); *Bet* (ב), *Vav* (ו), *Mem* (מ), and *Pe* (פ); *Gimmel* (ג), *Yod* (י), *Kaph* (כ), and *Quph* (ק); *Dalet* (ד), *Tet* (ט), *Lamed* (ל), *Nun* (נ), and *Tav* (ת); and *Zayin* (ז), *Samekh* (ס), *Shin* (ש), *Resh* (ר), and *Tzadi* (צ).²⁹

Division of the alphabet into five parts is known in Ogham, where the fifth group is in its appearance explicitly different from the others,



and is also officially considered a later addition, thus my hypothesis of a similar state of affairs in hebrew is not unprecedented.

The idea of trinity of the alphabet is also reflected in the north-european runes. They are traditionally divided into three groups, so called ættir (ir is the plural suffix, ætts, æts) neither four, nor five, always three. That, in the context of unity of this tradition tells of the primordial trinity in other alphabets. But if those groups are vowel, labial and lingual, then why there's such a mess in the ættir we know today? Isn't it because there used to be only 9 letters? This could be supported by poetic edda, by nine muses, who can also be divided into three groups, three by three, digits, letters, notes, which is also mentioned in the first chapter of the Book Of Formation, but then this is also a tentative guess, demanding a confirmation within tradition, reflected in some ancient treatise. And the world tree Yggdrasil, at which, according to a legend, Odin hung during

Runa A B C efter Svernske ordningen.

F	Från.	F. P v consona.
1	Br.	H u. N v conl. N y. N d.
4	Thors	Th. p dh. p dh dh.
L	Odhes.	F o. I d. L f f d.
r	Rydhur.	R r. d r cr fin.
Y	Rön.	P f c. P Y g. Y q.
†	Haghall.	H Gh Ch.
†	Nadh.	N. f n fin. f n n. f d n.
I	Idher.	I voc. I j conf. I I c.
†	Aru.	A. I a.
r	Sun.	S pr. I s. I f med. ss.
1	Tijdh.	T. T u in fi. I d.
4	Syrghal.	B. f p in pr. alias g f
r	Lagher.	L. f ll.
Y	Man.	M. Y mm.

NIR141/-'P1B f d I
†IY†††††

acquisition of runic writing system, has three roots, which is watered with waters from a sacred spring by three norns, who are the matriarchal trinity, known to different nations under different names (fates, moirae, parcae, sudicy, rojanicy) and even tridevi are traditionally more ancient than trimurti.

And the Odin's rune-song lists 18 "songs" (doubled 9, because, like tarot, runes inverse their meanings when they're upside down, and that could be what the 231 gates are about) and that is exactly how many runes are in the amazing artefact, shown on the next page (and that artefact is rather authentic, I found it in Alphabet by Gardiner)



𐎠	𐎡	𐎢
a	b	𐎣
𐎤	𐎥	𐎦
e	f	g
𐎧	𐎨	𐎩
i	k	l
𐎪	𐎫	𐎬
m	n	
𐎭	𐎮	𐎯
o	r	y
𐎱	𐎲	𐎳
s	t	𐎴
𐎵	𐎶	

𐎠


𐎡 𐎢 𐎣 𐎤 𐎥

𐎦 𐎧 𐎨


𐎩 𐎪 𐎫 𐎬 𐎭 𐎮 𐎯

𐎰 𐎱

Namely not abcd, but abc, or abd,
something in between, abp. I.e. vowel, labial,
lingual



Transliteration of some letters raises question: e.g 𐎬
is sometimes transliterated as R, and thus doesn't R
correspond to letter 𐎬, which it sometimes reminds
a lot (compare it to P being R in russian)



I decided not to flip the rune ᚠ to look like it does on that runic stone, for I left it the way I found it in academic tables of transliteration and in the unicode.

It is curious that the names of the norns are similar to the alphabetic order ABC: Urd Verdandi Skuld, in this order symbolizing the past, present and future.

And in this context, the "incomprehensible" dogma of the trinity is revealed in trinity as the three visible phases of the moon, which are most likely the basis and graphic side of alphabetic writing, because the bow of the letter b is similar to)

and the bow of the letter d is similar to (and these letters are opposed in a variety of scripts: 6 g, 7 b, 8 d, and even 9

	3		f		b		g
	i		m		s		t
	e		n		š		t
	w		r		k		d
	b		h		h		d
	p		h		k		y

the vowel \bar{o} , and this is proved by the S or e in the first two forms of $\frac{\text{a}}{\text{a}}$ quoted above. It has seemed to me for several years past that the vowel signs which we find in many Egyptian words were intended not to be read necessarily as parts of the words, but only to indicate or limit their signification. But the subject is too large to discuss in an Introduction to a Dictionary, and demands a book to itself. Meanwhile, I understand that M. Naville is preparing a volume on the whole question, and as there is every reason to believe that he will present in a new light many important facts bearing upon Egyptian phonetics, its appearance is eagerly awaited.

Vowels as indications of the meanings of words or verbal forms.

The system of transliteration which I have used in this Dictionary is a modification of that which was employed by Birch and some of the older Egyptologists, and by Brugsch until the last years of his life. The following is the transliteration of the letters of the Egyptian Alphabet which Brugsch printed in the first volume of his *Wörterbuch* (1867) :—

The Egyptian Alphabet in 1867.

	a		b		h		k
	ā		p		h		k
	ā		f		χ		t
	i		m		s		t
	ī		n		š		t
	u		r		š		t
	ū, ua (w)		l		k		t

In 1880, the following modification of this Alphabet appeared in the fifth volume of his *Wörterbuch* (Folge und Umschreibung der alphabetischen Zeichen) :—

The Egyptian Alphabet in 1880.

a. Vowels and half-vowels :—

a. ā (a). ā (y). i. ī, y (i). u, ō. u, w (u).

I couldn't find the source of this order: one refers to the other, and he to the third, who doesn't refer, just proposes it

Ich unterscheide im altägyptischen Alphabete und umschreibe, übereinstimmend mit Herrn Vicomte E. de Rougé (s. dessen Note sur la transcription des hiéroglyphes in der Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde, 1866, S. 69 figd.) folgende drei Klassen von Lauten:

A. Die Vocale *a, i, u*.

B. Die Halbvocale *ā, ā, ū (ua, w)*.

C. Die Konsonanten *f, b, p, — m, n, r, l, — h, h, χ, — s, š, — k, k, — t, t, t*.

Zum graphischen Ausdruck dieser 23 Laute dienen in den beiden Schriften des heiligen Dialektes, der hieroglyphischen und der davon abgeleiteten hieratischen Schrift, die von mir sogenannten Fundamental-Zeichen. Ich bezeichne sie so, weil sie zu ihrer phonetischen Auflösung niemals den Beistand anderer phonetischer Zeichen erhalten, während sie im Gegentheil als Hilfslesezeichen, als wahre matres lectionis, der grossen Klasse syllabarischer Lautzeichen beigezeichnet werden können. Letztere sind allein auflösbar mit Kenntniss jener Grundzeichen, welche daher als phonetisch bestimmt eine nothwendige Voraussetzung sind. So z. B. nenne ich $\text{𓂏} = b$, $\text{𓂐} = p$, $\text{𓂑} = \chi$ Fundamentalzeichen, weil ihre Bedeutung und ihr Werth als bekannt vorausgesetzt werden muss; $\text{𓂏𓂑} = ba$, $\text{𓂐𓂑} = pa$

in zweiter Auflage in Deutschland unter dem Titel „Graphein“ erschienenen Buche zur Schau getragen wird, so ist das nicht nur unwürdig der deutschen Wissenschaft, sondern, milde gesagt, beipiesslos und unerhört. Gönnen wir dem Herrn Verfasser dieser Schrift den Hochgenuss seiner Entdeckung, dass nur Lumpen die Träger des geistigen Fortschrittes seien, aber beklagen wir es tief, dass in unserem Zeitalter, „wo, nach den eigenen Worten des Autors (S. 2), mehr Dressur, als wirkliche Cultur herrscht“, dem deutschen Volke derartige Aufklärungen über die ersten und ältesten Grundlagen der modernen Wissenschaft und Bildung aufgetischt werden.

VI

und $\text{𓂑} = \chi a$ dagegen Sylbenzeichen, weil ihre phonetische Auflösung mit Hilfe jener Fundamentalzeichen erfolgt, wie aus den Schriftvarianten $\text{𓂏𓂑} = ba$, $\text{𓂐𓂑} = pa$, $\text{𓂑𓂑} = \chi a$ erhellt. Es geht daraus der wichtige Satz hervor, dass die Kenntniss der Fundamental-Lautzeichen der altägyptischen Schrift hinreicht, um sämtliche phonetische Hieroglyphen-Gruppen zu entziffern.

Wir haben in unserem Wörterbuche folgende Reihe der Fundamental-Lautzeichen angesetzt, deren Aufeinanderfolge dem Leser beim Nachschlagen unumgänglich bekannt sein muss.

	<i>a</i>		<i>b</i>		<i>h</i>		<i>k</i>
	<i>ā</i>		<i>p</i>		<i>h</i>		<i>k</i>
	<i>ā</i>		<i>f</i>		<i>χ</i>		<i>t</i>
	<i>i</i>		<i>m</i>		und \rightarrow <i>s</i>	\Rightarrow oder 𓂏	<i>t</i>
	<i>ī</i>		<i>n</i>		<i>š</i>		<i>t</i>
	<i>u</i>		<i>r</i>		<i>š</i>		<i>t</i>
	<i>ū, ua (w)</i>		<i>l</i>		<i>k</i>		<i>t</i>

Dem Lernenden, welcher sich die Mühe giebt in dem Wörterbuche die verschiedenen Wortstämme näher zu untersuchen und mit einander zu vergleichen, wird eine für das

au résultat que nous cherchons de transcrire le 𓂑 par *e* ou par *i*, la bigarrure des transcriptions aurait seule de l'inconvénient.

La délimitation du nombre des articulations est une opération beaucoup plus délicate et sur laquelle il faut appeler la discussion. L'alphabet que nous proposerions comprendrait 21 lettres

<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>i</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
<i>ī</i>	<i>ī</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>χ</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>h</i>
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	

Les difficultés ne me semblent porter que sur un petit nombre de points que je vais indiquer successivement.



Premièrement, pour les voyelles, est-il nécessaire de distinguer les trois nuances, 𓂑 *a*, 𓂑 *a*, 𓂑 *a*? Les ressemblances, quant à la valeur des trois signes, peuvent se résumer ainsi: 1° variantes dans l'écriture des mots égyptiens, peu nombreuses toutefois aux temps pharaoniques. 2° faculté pour chacune des trois lettres, d'être, dans la syllabe, initiale (aspiration) ou finale (mater lectionis). 3° caractère vague, quant au sons-voyelles, prouvé par les transcriptions de toutes les époques. 1) Aucune différence n'a été notée par les coptes quant à la nuance de l'aspiration initiale.

































Voici maintenant les différences. Dans l'égyptien, on peut remarquer une certaine préférence pour 𓂑 comme initiale et pour 𓂑 comme finale: c'est probablement comme conséquence de cette vue que 𓂑 initial varie avec le groupe 𓂑 𓂑 𓂑 a été également choisi pour transcrire l'articulation *a*. 𓂑 initial répond, au contraire, habituellement au *v*. Dans le copte, on remarque aussi plus souvent l'*œ* en face de 𓂑 . J'admets volontiers que ces différences, quoique peu tranchées, puissent engager à noter 𓂑 *a*, 𓂑 *a* et 𓂑 *a*: division qui ne m'avait pas semblé nécessaire et que je n'ai pas employé jusqu'ici. Mais il me semble que dans les tables ou les dictionnaires il y aurait grand avantage à faire entrer les trois *a*, *a*, *a* dans un même article, pour éviter les renvois, fatigans pour le lecteur, que nécessiteraient les nombreuses variantes des dernières époques.

𓂑 est souvent final tout aussi bien qu'initial; je ne crois pas que 𓂑 soit autre chose que l'abréviation du premier: il se prête d'ailleurs parfaitement au rôle de semi-voyelle; il n'y aurait donc aucun besoin de distinguer *i* et *i* ou *j*. *u* jouera de même les deux rôles de semi-voyelle initiale et de voyelle vague, sans qu'il en résulte aucun inconvénient: il est inutile de lui substituer le *u* pour transcrire 𓂑 *ua*.

Parmi les consonnes, ce sont les dentales et les palatales qui fournissent matière à de plus sérieuses controverses. En ce qui concerne d'abord les quatre signes 𓂑 , 𓂑 , 𓂑 , 𓂑 , cherchons ce que leur emploi dans l'écriture présente de caractères communs, ou

1) Ce caractère vague des voyelles doit faire conserver le signe conventionnel partout où nous n'avons pas de renseignements certains sur la prononciation. Mais ce serait tomber dans l'excès que de ne pas se servir des voyelles fixes quand des transcriptions constantes nous les apportent. Exemples: *χons*, *Hor* &c.

In other cases, the opposition is the evenness of the labial b and the oddness of the lingual d: B D,  , which in turn gives reason to

										
alpa 'a	beta b	gamla g	ħa ħ	delta d	ho h	wo w	zeta z	ħota ħ	tet t	
										
yod y	kaf k	šin š	šinš š ₂	lamda l	mem m	dal d	nun n	zu z	samka s	ain '
										
pu p	šade š	qopa q	rasha r	taana t	gain g	to t	s ₂ u s ₂	i 'i	u 'u	word divider










assume the femininity of the labials and the muscularity of the lingual ones (fortunately, symbolism determines the evenness of the female characteristic, and the oddness of the masculine, which is most likely associated with the shape of the body parts) since labia refers to different things, and the word lingua is consonant with the word lingam.













This ill-mannered savagery takes us to the eastern understanding of dualism, where the feminine considered the passive, and the masculine the active beginnings, and this can be reflected in the dictionary of the language, which is most clearly manifested in the english to Be and to Do (in russian it is Быть and Дeять (the russian suffix ть is a cognate of (or calque to) the english preposition to, but when this to is a preposition, then in russian it corresponds to the preposition до)) and since my liberal science has gone this far, I dare to notice that the names eVe and aDam are consonant with the english words even and odd.

An inattentive reader may ask, is it abc or abd? From the point of view of the runes, c is a staveless d, this is also reflected in the fact that in russian cursive g stands for d, it is believed that c[k] sounded like g [g] in ancient times. In hebrew, greek, russian, g stands at the place of c.

And miseducated person may ask: what does russian have to do with it, because modern chronology says that the russian alphabet was created at the same time that the Bible was translated into slavic languages. But this, of course, is a lie: before the christians, rus' was under norman rule, and the normans knew the runes, which can also be reflected in the annals of the Chernorizets Hrabar "чрътами и рѣзами чѣтѣхъ и гатаахъ" and the russian letter Ж, which did not come from greek, but has similarity with the rune *, which is read as j[й]

Since the paper medium has a number of disadvantages: It is impossible to copy the

	Proto-Germanic	Old English	Old Norse	
Name	*Hag(a)laz	Hægl	Hagall	
	"hail"			
Shape	Elder Futhark	Futhorc	Younger Futhark	
				
Unicode	 U+16BA	 U+16BB	 U+16BC	 U+16BD
Transliteration	h			
Transcription	h			
IPA	[h]			
Position in rune-row	9		7	

Name	Proto-Germanic	Old English		Old Norse		
	*Jēra-	Gēr	Īor	Ár		
	"year, harvest"	"year, harvest"	"eel"	"harvest, plenty"		
Shape	Elder Futhark	Futhorc		Younger Futhark		
						
Unicode						
	U+16C3	U+16E1	U+16C4	U+16E1	U+16C5	U+16C6
Transliteration	j	j	io	A	a	a
Transcription	/j	/j	/o	a		
IPA	[j]	[j]	[jo]	[a]		
Position in rune-row	12	12	28 or 29	10		

symbol and ask the internet what kind of bird it is, I will add a comment that * is called Jeran and can be transliterated as j[ӡ] and a (? , maybe), but the exact same form of * is called Hagall which is transliterated as h into latin alphabet and as x into russian, and if you remove its stake (the vertical line) you get that very x, and this dialectal variation may explain the position of h approximately where in the russian alphabet ж is located. There is also * in the Bornholm artifact, where the runes are located alphabetically (and I have decided to leave out the hypothesis of futhark sequence being a mistransliterated abecedary, yet I mention it here, because there * also resides approximately in the same area). Notice, that J also can be read as j the short i, as ж the 3, and in spanish as h.

Another similar character is the berber 𐵚 which, on the one hand, is the most important letter of their ancient writing system but, on the other hand, is sort of a later addition to

the ancient set (this is also a matter waiting for opinion of an expert in the field)) but what is even more remarkable is that 𐵚 is transliterated as Z (and it stands at the end of the tifinagh alphabet)

But back to the idea of elements (by the way, according to one version, the word "element" itself comes from the sequence ΛMN) in the above-mentioned book of creation the lingual 𐵚 [m] is compared to fire, which is reflected not only in the graphic form, the lexical example ash (𐵚𐵚, fire) but also in the phrase "tongues of fire", and the sound m(f) is created by tongue, which in opposition to the lips is a masculine symbol (like fire in tai chi (☯)) and the labial 𐵚 [m] is compared to water, which is reflected not only in graphic form (if they are descending streams) and lexical example maim (𐵚𐵚, water) but also in tai chi water is a feminine element, a woman

in labor breaks water, and so on, so signs of these elements,

△ for fire is like the tongue letters Δ and Λ (also in A, but I have not yet solved the reason for the elusive resemblance of a and d, so far the assumption is that just as U and V are originally one letter, I and J are originally one letter, so D is a consonantal form of the letter A) and ∇ for water is like the lingual letter V (strictly speaking, it is not quite correct to say "lingual letter", it is not customary, but this is a simplification in order to avoid the cumbersome construction of "letter compared to the lingual sound V")


Also notice how if we imagine נ as streams of water, there are two of them, and if we imagine ש as tongues of flame, there are three (today ש is considered a tooth, and the name of the letter is shin (tooth), not ash (fire), but these objects have at least one property in common: they are eating. But sh[ʃ] is not even

a dental sound, it is alveolar, or even retroflex as it is called today, modern linguistics, that pseudoscience, "Every time I fire a linguist, the performance of the speech recognizer goes up". On the other hand, ש is also read as S, and in place of S it stands, and although S is also not considered dental, it is closer to teeth (it cannot be pronounced without teeth and if ש is dental, then S is the original reading, ʃ is the reading of the toothless) but what does it all matter, if the division, proposed in the Book of Creation is wrong, only that it still influences the perceptions of modern linguists (so I had to do some serious work to "forget" what I was taught and to see linguals as one group independent of where the tongue is placed.))



The famous symbol speaking about elements is eastern tai chi, in which I have found this form with smile of yeah and open mouth of ah and light over darkness, but don't forget about the

inner components, so it is complicated, but then letters, reminding these shapes, reveal that this is the way it is: абgde go just like this, so now I think I know they're the key. We couldn't have forgotten something so important, could we? and probably we yet will have to find what was the local key, if



..was it triskelion?

These pages are the work in progress, so it is raw and shared only because it is big if true.

Bruteforced antonyms so far:

- ☯ e (yeah) and a (ah)
- ☯ ploho / dobro
- ☯ баd/good
- ☯ бог/дъявол, би/гай (be/die (and it is b/d opposition I noticed some pages ago (so probably the modern yin/yang sign is later complication of more simple dualism (white/black) and because да can be written down as both da and ga, and because **Н** can be transliterated as both bu and pu, tells that it's likely to be the case))
- ☯ ☯ гад and satan
- ☯ ☯ Si и No

Back to the runes: what allows me to say that they are older than the latin alphabet even though the official history claims the opposite? First, my distrust of official history, which at all times has been a servant of ideology, has led me to look at the phenomenon itself regardless of what has been written about it before me, and then it becomes apparent that the runes are a more archaic system, let me try to explain, and this is second, The forerunner of the latin alphabet is the old-Italic script (for some reason in russian the term старо-италийское письмо refers to a completely different phenomenon) which not only has the same angular style as the runes of the other peoples but also has some symbols in common with the

VENETIC Este	EAST RAETIC Magrè	WEST RAETIC Bolzano-Sanzano	CAMUNIC Sondrio	LEPONTIC Lugano	
A A A	A A A A	A A A A	W A A	A A	a
			H		b
> (=j)		> (?)	> (=g)		c/g
			X (?)		d
A	A	A	A A A	A	e
A	A	A	H		v
X (=d)	X (=d)	X V (?)	Y A	X	z
B A A	B A	B	H A H		h
⊙ (=t)			X A A A A A	⊙	θ
I B	I	I	I /	I	i
X	X	X	// V A X	X	k
J J	J A	J	J J J	J	l
M M	M	M	M M	M M	m
N H	N	N	N H N	N H	n
			V V A A A A		o/u
O O			⊙	O A	o
P P	P P P	P	U A A A	P	p
M P	M A	M	A A	A A	s
A A	A A	A A A	A A	A	r
A A A	X A	A A	A V A	A A	s
X A	X A A	X	A A A A A	X	t
V A	A	V	V A A A	V	u
⊙ (=b)	P A A	P A A	⊙		φ
			A A A		ts/pp
			A A A A		p
Y (=g)	Y V	Y V		V	χ
B A A A A					f
	A A A A A				t'

runes of the peoples of northern europe. The türkic and hungarian runes have in common only angular style, but similar forms have different reading, similar to how the letters B H P X read differently in the greek and latin alphabets today (but most of the similar letters are still read alike, which we do not see between the türkic and norman runes) and yet what allows me to claim that runic writing was spreading from the north to the south, and not vice versa, as the official science holds today? Thirdly, a deeper, more thoroughly developed runic culture is among the peoples of northern europe, where there are the concepts specifically talking about the formation of letters (formation of runes, which is essentially the same thing) that other peoples do not have: stave (a polysemous notion, but one of its meanings is the vertical line) attaches meaning to finer elements than graphemes, с позволения сказать штрихемам, to strokes, however,

1 d
 4 a:
 X b
 X amb
 ↑ u, ts
 ↓ enk
 H u, tʃ
 † d
 X and
 3 e
 8 ~e
 3 e
 8 f
 A g
 † дь, j
 8 h
 † i
 † i
 1 j
 8 k
 1 k
 X unk
 A l
 8 l~j
 8 m
 > n
 D n, нъ
 3 o
 3 o:
 3 ö
 K ö
 8 ö:
 8 p
 8 emp
 H r
 / r
 A f
 l s
 Y t
 Y ent
 X tj, ть
 X tʃ, ч
 8 u
 8 u:
 8 ü
 8 ü:
 M v
 8 z
 Y 3
 8 tprus
 8 us

Old turkic runes →

Where does this order come from I do not know. It reminds the order of european alphabet, but knowing only that it is how it goes in the unicode, if it's genuine or influenced by western researchers I do not know. Being geographically closer to the east, it follows traditions seen in sanskrit, and separates the vowels from consonants, but unlike sanskrit, it keeps the consonants mostly in the european order.

← Old hungarian rovas

This order also reminds european order, and even more, but its origin is also not clear to me: Both scripts go from right to left, both fonts have a common feature: some consonants have different forms depending on whether a, o, u comes after it or e, i, y, and check the last two symbols.

orkhon	yenisei
1 a, æ	X, 1
1 i	1
8 e	8
3 o, u	3
8 ö, ü	8
8 b	8
8 b'	8
8 g	1'
8 g'	8
8 d	8
X d'	
8 z	8
8 j	8
8 j'	8
8 k'	8
8 k''	8
8 l	8
8 l'	
8 lt, ld	
8 m	
8 n	
8 n'	8
8 nt	8
8 nč	8
8 nj	8
8 ñ(η)	8, 1
8 p	
8 p	
8 č	
8 č	8
8 q	8
8 q	8
8 q	8
8 r	8
8 r'	
8 s	
8 s'	
8 š	
8 š	8, 8
8 t	8
8 t'	8
8 ot, ut	
8 baj	

C can be seen as a staveless variant of the letters Q and K, but the notion "stave" itself came from the north. Another letter-forming concept is the bind runes (binderunen) which is known in modern scripts as ligatures, but in northern european runes it is a letter-forming concept, just as today in danish aa is read as o, in runes ᚠ means a and ᚡ means o. Just as in ogam ᚩ means a, and ᚰ means o, and in tiffinagh ᠋᠋ is a and ᠋᠋ is o (but, it must be admitted that this is a weak argument, because the Æ and W ligatures are also letter-forming, but in runes it is on a completely different level) Fourthly, the myth of the invention of the runes by Odin himself is at the roots of no·r·se mythology, and the word "rune" is found in their national epics all the time, even though I could not find the manuscripts of these epics in runic writing. Either the runes were not really used for literature, but only for communication with the gods, or their libraries were sacred

groves, which in the bible were ordered to be destroyed. Whereas the myths regarding writing among the greeks are quite secondary, which may indicate that they were not national, but were borrowed (Hippocrates directly says that they were borrowed, but Plutarch recommends not listening to Hippocrates) But the greek myth is much more worked out, describing not only the first letters, but also subsequent reforms. While the jewish myth, on the one hand, recorded the most ancient stage, three mothers, three proto-letters, three elements,

CCLXXVII. RERV M INVENTORES PRIMI.

Parcae, Clotho Lachesis Atropos, inuenerunt litteras Graecas septem, A B H T I Y [?] ; alii dicunt Mercurium ex gruum uolatu, quae cum uolant litteras exprimunt; Palamedes autem Nauplii filius inuenit aequae litteras undecim [...] Simonides litteras aequae quattuor, Ω E Z Φ, Epicharmus Siculus litteras duas, Π et Υ. has autem [Graecas] Mercurius in Aegyptum primus detulisse dicitur, ex Aegypto Cadmus in Graeciam.

Парки Клото, Лахесис и Атропос изобрели семь греческих букв: Α, Β, Γ, Δ, Ε, Ζ, Η ... Другие говорят, что это сделал Меркурий, смотря на полет журавлей, которые в полете чертят разные буквы. Паламед, сын Навплия, изобрел еще одиннадцать букв: Симонид еще четыре – Ω, Ε, Ζ, Φ, а Эпихарм Сицилийский еще две, Π и Ψ. Меркурий первый принес эти буквы в Египет, Кадм из Египта в Грецию, а Эвандр, изгнанный из Аркадии, в Италию, где его мать Кармента переделала их в латинские, числом пятнадцать. Остальные буквы придумал Аполлон, играя на кифаре.

but then it describes the modern hebrew alphabet, which indicates the late origin of the book, but this does not say anything about the antiquity of the elements of which the book consists.

Using myths as historical evidence is a very unorthodox approach, but the structure found in the alphabets, unexpectedly even for me, gave many myths a meaning, which now allows them to be compared, but since the sample that I have is extremely scarce (only three national myths) I am only opening (who knows for myself alone or for the whole

world) a comparative analysis of the myths concerning the origin of alphabetic writing.

The discrepancy between this version of the myth and the version in the epigraph is explained by the inaccuracy of this version (another version is presented below, which is most likely closest to the original), and note how H is repeated, and apparently the editor corrected it in the wrong place. In any case, the version from the epigraph (as revised by Robert Graves) is considered the most accurate, because it is the most substantive, reflects the state of affairs in the alphabets most clearly.

It is noteworthy that Palamedes is considered the inventor of cubic dice, he is also considered the inventor of eleven letters in addition to the already existing seven

CCLXXVII Rerum inventores primi

Parcae Clotho Lachesis Atropos invenerunt literas graecas septem *AB†HTIY*, alii dicunt Mercurium ex gruum volatu, quae cum volant literas exprimunt. Palamedes autem Nauplii filius invenit aequae literas undecim, Simonides literas aequae quatuor *ΩΗΞΨ*, Epicharmus Siculus duas *Θ* et *X*. has autem graecas [Mercurius in Aegyptum primus detulisse dicitur, ex Aegypto Cadmus in Graeciam quas] Euandrus profugus ex Arcadia in Italiam⁵ transtulit, quas mater eius Carmenta in latinas commutavit num. XV. Apollo in cithara c[a]eteras adiecit. idem Mercurius et palaestram mortales primus docuit. Ceres [fruges serere] boves domare et alumno suo Triptolemo fruges serere demonstravit. qui cum sevisset et sus [id est porcus] quod severat effodisset, suem com-10prehendit et duxit ad aram Cereris et frugibus super caput eius positis eidem Cereri immolavit. inde primum inventum est super hostias molam salsam imponere. Velificia primum invenit Isis. nam dum quaerit Harpocratem filium suum rate velificavit. Minerva prima navem biproram Danao aedificavit, in qua Aegyptum¹⁵ fratrem profugit

mentioned above (since five of them were vowels, most likely used for musical notation, then the consonants b and t could be the forerunners of the modern concepts of flat and sharp: despite the fact that the recording of musical notes in letters is considered a relatively new tradition, a similar notation was used for musical notation in ancient greece) which gives a total of 18, i.e. 6 for each cube.

CCLXXVII falluntur qui interpolatori tribuunt cf. Dosith. p. 67. neque a CCLXXIV est avulsum, quae Bursiani fuit sententia IIB XCIII p. 783, sed antiquitas capitis huius exordium erat 22 *Parcae* [id est] aut *Parcae* [*Clotho Lachesis Atropos*] coni. Σ nimirum Parcarum una loquitur altera scribit secundum Servium et myth. Vat. p. 187, 36 23 H non Parcarum est sed Simonidis inventum, sextam igitur et septimam ignoramus || ITY coni Σ, ut alphabeti duae priores et posteriores literae a Parcis dicantur inventae || gruum volatu] cf. Auson. idyll. XII qui Φ literam vocat gruis effigiem, Martial. XIII 75 Nemesian. aucup. 15 vol. I p. 130 Wernsd. 'nec qui te volucres docuit Palamede figuras' 2 undecim] XVI (vel XVII) malit Mu temere. nam VII et XI decem et octo illas literas priscas conficiunt, quas recenset Aristot. fr. 454 ed. Ros. ap. Plin. h. n. VII 5. 57 3 ωεζφ F corr Σ e Bekk. AG. 781. 782 n || π et ψ F (imo H et Ψ) quibus librarius corrigebat errorem in literis Simonideis commissum, corr Σ ex Aristot. l. c: 'duas ab Epicharmo additas ΘX (XZ F³ om. r. ΨZ Detlefsen) quam a Palamede mavolt'. certum igitur inter literas a Palamede inventas fuisse ZΦ 4 ex Aegypto] ex Phoenice Plin. l. c Marius Victor. l. I scribendum igitur: *has autem Graecas* [quas] *Mercurius in Aegyptum primus detulisse dicitur ex Aegypto* [*Danaus vel ut alii dicunt ex Phoenice*] *Cadmus in Graeciam, Euandrus* coll. Pythodor. Bekk. AG. II 783, 7. 786, 4 6 XV F XVI corr Mu cf. Laur. Lyd. de mensib. 3 7 id quod est *ceteras adiecit* cum neque de literis intellegi possit ab Apolline adinventis neque literarum numero a M. Flavio scriba aucto, locum huiusmodi esse apparet. Excidit tale quid: [*Idem Mercurius primus lyram tribus* (quatuor) *fidibus instruxit*] 8 [*fruges serere*] secl. Sch 10 servisset F corr Lugd. Sch || [id est porcus] secl Sch cf. CXXVI 3 15 cf. CLXVIII || hoc caput excepisse videtur fab. CCLXXIV 'quis quid invenerit' ubi lacuna a Σ indicata hausta videtur Liberi patris vinique ab eo inventi memoria

But did he really invent them or did he learn them from the sorcerers who kept their knowledge in secret (the rune in translation means secret) is an open question, but since he lived half a century later than the mythical journey of the argonauts, who set off on a journey for the fleece (which is in the east named pyho [runo]) which was kept on a sacred tree, just like Yggdrasil guarded by a serpent, which suggests that it was not about the golden sand stuck in a ram's skin (would it be worth such a trip then?) But what was written on this skin (I remind you that parchment is exactly that sheepskin, and before they learned how to turn it into parchment, was it used in a cruder form) and my assumption is that there was precisely that secret of the runes, which, to the completion of the greek dark ages (during which the previous greek, syllabic, writing system was lost; and which culminated in the acquisition of the alphabetic writing


system) ceased to be a mystery. Fifthly, the testimony of Tacitus, which describes the tradition of divination with the help of certain signs, which are directly called runes in translation (which is confirmed by the fact that it is the runes that are traditionally and still used for divination) and this evidence

something which is visible only to the eyes of faith.

To divination and the lot they pay as much attention as any one: the method of drawing lots is uniform. A bough is cut from a nut-bearing tree and divided into slips: these are distinguished by certain runes and spread casually and at random over white cloth

Auspicia sortesque ut qui maxime observant: sortium consuetudo simplex. virgam frugiferae arbori decisam in surculos amputant eosque notis quibusdam discretos super candidam vestem temere ac fortuito spargunt.

is even in the first century AD, the oldest border to which modern historians attribute the origin of the runes (if not for Tacitus, this border would have been drawn at the level of the eighth century: for some reason, the writing systems that existed among various peoples before the arrival of europeans date back to the eighth century, including some narratives about the history of (so to say) scandinavian runes, but he describes this divination as the most common, i.e. we are talking about a certain culture, and the culture of magic is a significantly more ancient culture than writing, and therefore how deep does this culture go into the past? until the very moment when Odin invented the runes.



(my assumption is that this is a schematic representation of three cubes with one clean face on each)

How long ago was that? This is a separate issue requiring its own detailed study)

Auspicia sortesque ut qui maxime observant: sortium consuetudo simplex. virgam frugiferae arbori decisam in surculos amputant eosque notis quibusdam discretos super candidam vestem temere ac fortuito spargunt. may well speak of divination with runic dice, which explains the nature of æts (ættir) and why today, when divining, exactly three runes are laid out of the bag, and Tacitus also describes them cast in three. Despite the fact that it is possible to make cubes with eight sides (however, then it will not be cubes, but octahedrons) the ubiquity of the cubic dice speaks precisely of six runes in each æt, which may be the source of the 666 meme, as well as the sum of IVXLCD,

which, by the way, if V is not vijf, but vier (as one freak from alternative historians suggested for his own, chronological reasons) does not add up to 666, but to 365.

I V X L C D







Ī V̄ X̄ L̄ C̄ D̄

Ī̄ V̄̄ X̄̄ L̄̄ C̄̄ D̄̄

(the use of a horizontal bar to indicate a thousand ((two bars to indicate millions) suggests that M was not part of the numeral system, but either a late inclusion, appearing at the time of the loss of knowledge about the use of horizontal bars, or an abbreviation like russian тыс. or english k)







Sixthly, boustrophedon has no explanation in greek, but on runestones the text is often located on the body of a snake and (which makes it similar to ogham) starts from the bottom corner, in comparison with which the lines are "modern". Seventhly, the fact that they retained the division into three groups. Eighthly, there are only three letters in the first line.

Ninthly, parallels with archaic riddles in other writing systems: (Ψ[m] and Ψ[z, ks]) ~ (M[m] and M[z, s]) and (*[h] and *[j]) ~ (J[h] in spanish and J[j] in polish for example) ~ (ж [3] ~ J[3]) ~ (H[h] in Latin and H[i] in greek)

	Proto-Germanic	Old English	Old Norse	
Name	*Mannaz	Mann	Maðr	
	"man, human"			
Shape	Elder Futhark	Futhorc	Younger Futhark	
				
Unicode	 U+16D7		 U+16D8	 U+16D9
Transliteration	m			
Transcription	m			
IPA	[m]			
Position in rune-row	20		14	

М, м (название: **сан**, **др.-греч.** **μάν** или **σαν**) — вышедшая из употребления буква греческого алфавита. Происходит от финикийской буквы **цади**^[es]. От буквы «сан» произошла другая архаическая греческая буква — **Ϻ, ϻ** (**сампи**). Из-за того, что сан имела фонетическое значение, близкое к /s/, она была постепенно вытеснена буквой **сигма** к VI веку до н. э.^[источник не указан 2383 дня]

Tenthly, protective staves, identical to runic ones, have been known since ancient times (meaning ”Four-part centrally symmetrical symbols on central european ceramics of the 5th millennium BC”)

Name	Proto-Germanic	Old English	Old Norse		
	*Algiz?	Eolhx?	Yr		
	"elk"(?)		"yew"		
Shape	Elder Futhark	Futhorc	Younger Futhark		
					
Unicode					
	U+16C9		U+16E6	U+16E7	U+16E8
Transliteration	z	x	r		
Transcription	<i>z</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>r</i>		
IPA	[z]	[ks]	[ɹ], [y]		
Position in rune-row	15		16		

eleventhly, in the runal row presented on the stone presented here, the double nature of the labials is more clearly visible: **ƿƿ**, **ƿƿ**, **ƿƿ**, and **ƿƿ** (which can be also found in other alphabets: **BD FT MΛ ΠT**, but here we had to consult both greek and latin (**VX** contradicts it, but they’re digits, post-T, just as today digits are often placed after letters)) twelfthly, runes preserved connection with calendar (which ogham also did, ogham is

even more immemorial culture: the calendar in ogham is tied to botany, which in medieval times was being eradicated as a form of sorcery)

And a couple of counter-arguments:

The eastern order of ACDB is more consistent in that it goes from the inside out, just like speech.

Ogham or paleo-hispanic? Runes are between those two as a happy medium. And certainly a more convenient system replaces a less convenient one, and therefore even if the runes do not descend directly from paleo-hispanic, paleo-hispanic is structurally older than runes. And ogham, was it a further abstraction, or was it an independently existing code that influenced the creation of the runes. The question is open.

i	iodhadh (yew)
e	eadhadh (poplar/aspen)
u	úr (heather)
o	onn (gorse)
a	ailm (white fir/spruce)
r	ruis (elder)
(st/ts/sw)z	straif(blackthorn)
(gw)ng	ngéadal (reed)
g	gort (ivy)
m	muin (vine)
(kw)q	ceirt (apple)
(k)c	coll (hazel)
t	tinne (holly)
d	dair (oak)
(j)h	uath (hawthorn)
n	nion (ash)
s	sail (willow)
(w)f	fern (alder)
l	luis (rowan)
b	beith(birch)

(/ separates versions of different sources)

Paleo-hispanic writing systems, graphically similar to runes (some symbols are identical not only in graphics, but also in sound) but being a more primitive syllabic system. This is one of the newest branches of grammatology (the science of letters, a term usurped by crypto-marxists, but it should be returned to the bosom of linguistics) and although today they are considered to be borrowed from greek through greco-iberian, hardly anyone would replace a convenient alphabetic system with a more cumbersome syllabic. The reverse process seems more natural, that syllabic systems were supplanted by alphabetic ones.

But here greco-iberian says that H is the greek E, introduced before E. In this light, in Hyginus at the beginning we have ABOHTIY (but this is their spelling business, phonetically they are ABOETIU or ABEIOTU)

		G / K	B	D / T				
A	𐀀	𐀁	𐀂	𐀃	S	𐀄	M	𐀅
E	𐀆	𐀇	𐀈	𐀉	S'	𐀊	N	𐀋
I	𐀌	𐀍	𐀎	𐀏	R	𐀐	M'	𐀑
O	𐀒	𐀓	𐀔	𐀕	R'	𐀖		
U	𐀗	𐀘	𐀙	𐀚	L	𐀛		

A	𐀁	G	𐀂	S	𐀄	N	𐀋
E	𐀆	K	𐀈	S'	𐀊		
I	𐀌	T	𐀎	R	𐀐		
O	𐀒	D	𐀕	R'	𐀖		
U	𐀗	B	𐀙	L	𐀛		

But two S, and not one M? two Rs and no Ps? in the light of the above, one of the S is most likely a mistransliterated M, one of the R is P

Another example of an alphabet in which there is a line of three characters is the oldest (literally, the oldest one found so far) abecedary, ugaritic abecedary:



𐎀	𐎁	𐎂	𐎃	𐎄	𐎅	𐎆	𐎇	𐎈	𐎉
ʔa	b	g	ḫ (x)	d	h	w	z	ḥ (ḥ)	ṭ
𐎊	𐎋	𐎌	𐎍	𐎎	𐎏	𐎐	𐎑	𐎒	𐎓
y	k	š	l	m	ḏ (ð)	n	ṣ (ṣ)	s	ʿ
𐎔	𐎕	𐎖	𐎗	𐎘	𐎙	𐎚	𐎛	𐎜	𐎝
p	ṣ	q	r	ṭ (ṭ)	ḡ (ḡ)	t	ʔi	ʔu	s ₂



and this raises the question of whether the ethiopian script really comes from south arabian or is it an imperialist fabrication (then why not question the rest of the well-established “facts”? For example, is japanese writing really derived from chinese, and not vice versa? (but this is unlikely, since each character in chinese stands for one syllable. Very archaic, very organic. But katakana: wasn’t it the writing of the ainu before the chinese came? But eskimo syllabaries seem to be of prechristian origin, seriously))

I.e. paleo-hispanic script is more ancient than the ancient ugaritic alphabet? Structurally more ancient, this does not mean that the surviving records on it are more ancient than ugaritic ones. The chinese still use hieroglyphs, but being purely semantic (even though some of their elements have a purely

አ ቡ ጊ ዳ ሄ ው ዘ — а бу ги да хе вы зо
በ ጉ ዲ ሃ ቄ ዝ ዠ — бэ гу ди ха ве зы жо
ገ ዱ ሂ ቀ ዜ ዠ ሐ — гэ ду хи ва зе жы хо
ደ ሁ ቂ ዘ ዜ ሕ ቡ — дэ ху ви за же хы то
ሀ ዉ ዚ ዠ ሔ ጥ ጮ — хэ ву зи жа хе ты чо
ወ ዙ ዢ ሓ ጤ ጮ ዮ — вэ зу жи ха те чы йо
ዘ ዠ ሓ ጤ ጮ ይ ኮ — зэ жу хи та че йы ко
ዝ ሐ ጤ ጮ ይ ከ ኸ — жэ ху ти ча йе кы хо
ሐ ጤ ጮ ያ ከ ኸ ሎ — хэ ту чи йа ке хы ло
ጤ ጮ ያ ከ ኸ ል ጥ — тэ чу йи ка хе лы мо
ጮ ያ ከ ኸ ል ጥ — чэ йу ки ха ле мы но
ዮ ኮ ኸ ል ጥ — йэ ку хи ля ме ны нё
ከ ኸ ል ጥ — кэ ху ли ма не ны со
ኸ ሐ ጥ — хэ лю ми на не сы шо
ለ ጥ — лэ му ни ня се шы бо
ጥ ኮ ል ጥ — мэ ну ни са ше бы фо
ነ ኸ ል ጥ — нэ ню си ша ээ фы цо
ኸ ሐ ጥ — не су ши ба фе цы ко
ሰ ሐ ጥ — сэ шу би фа це кы ро
ሸ ሐ ጥ — шэ бу фи ца ке ры со
ዐ ሐ ጥ — э фу ци ка ре сы то
ፈ ዳ ቂ ራ ሄ ት ሾ — фэ цу ки ра се ты чо
ዳ ቂ ራ ሄ ት ሾ — цэ ку ри са те чы хо
ቀ ራ ሄ ት ሾ — кэ ру си та че хы по
ሬ ሄ ት ሾ — рэ су ти ча хе пы цо
ሠ ት ሾ — сэ ту чи ха пе цы по
ተ ሾ — тэ чу хи па це пы джо
ቸ ሐ ጥ — чэ ху пи ца пе джы бо
ኀ ሐ ጥ — хэ пу ци па дже бы бо
ሐ ሐ ጥ — пэ цу пи джа ээ бы го
ፀ ሐ ጥ — цэ пу джи ба бе гы до
ፐ ሐ ጥ — пэ джу би ба ге ды хо
ጆ ሐ ጥ — джэ бу би га де хы во

↑ The order you can see in russian wiki, where I took it. Whoever brought it there didn't bring the source. I took the liberty of painting it to show that the order is similar to ours.

э у и а е ы о
ъ ъ ъ ъ ъ ъ ъ
б б б б б б б
г г г г г г г
д д д д д д д
х х х х х х х
в в в в в в в
з з з з з з з
ж ж ж ж ж ж ж
х х х х х х х
т т т т т т т
ч ч ч ч ч ч ч
й й й й й й й
к к к к к к к
х х х х х х х
л л л л л л л
м м м м м м м
н н н н н н н
нь нь нь нь нь нь нь
с с с с с с с
ш ш ш ш ш ш ш
ъ ъ ъ ъ ъ ъ ъ
ф ф ф ф ф ф ф
ц ц ц ц ц ц ц
к к к к к к к
р р р р р р р
с с с с с с с
т т т т т т т
ч ч ч ч ч ч ч
х х х х х х х
п п п п п п п
ц ц ц ц ц ц ц
п п п п п п п
дж дж дж дж дж дж

phonetic function) they are not yet syllabaries, i.e. are the oldest form of writing texts in use today. And although many elements of chinese writing remind european ones, it is not yet possible to speak about a direct influence in one or another direction (there are references in the literature to the existence of phonetic signs of egyptian writing system before the formation of hieroglyphic writing, which echoes the theme of "32 symbols found in caves all over Europe") is not possible, for this we need the help of artificial intelligence, capable of keeping in mind all this incomprehensible lot of information and, abstracting from what people have written about it, to find common elements and model possible scenarios of the development of writings, which I am only guessing here based upon also the unprecedented accessibility of information.

If someone has heard a lot about phoenician and asks why this cherry-picking, why don't I rush into phoenician? This is phoenician, and, as you can see, it structurally repeats the Hebrew alphabet completely:



Pay attention to the ayn standing where is in the others stand o, and unlike modern hebrew, where it is similar to the russian Y, here it is similar to O, which may indicate that O and U are historically variants of the same letter (since in hebrew there are only four lines, and P and F are transliterated by one

letter, S and Sh are transliterated by one letter, even tsadi (צ, 𐤆, 𐤇) which in russian is in the line of the letter Y, in hebrew (and phoenician) is located between the letters that transliterate as P and Q

But the most interesting information does not have to be ancient. This observation right here is found recently in:

<https://roouh.livejournal.com/133411.html> and in the ancient literature, no mention of such a phenomenon has yet been found (which, of course, does not mean that it is not there)

А, Б, В, Г, Д, Е, Ё, Ж, З, И, Й, К, Л, М, Н, О, П, Р, С, Т, У, Ф, Х, Ц, Ч, Ш, Щ, Ъ, Ы, Ь, Э, Ю, Я

— Voiced
— Sonor
— Voiceless



combining this observation with the system that I've discovered and about which this booklet is,

Аа a
Бб b
Вв v
Гг g
Дд d
Ее e
Ёё jo
Жж z
Зз z
Ии i
Йй j
Кк k
Лл l
Мм m
Нн n
Оо o
Пп p
Рр r
Сс s
Тт t
Уу u
Фф f
Хх h
Цц ts
Чч tf
Шш f
Щщ f
unpalatalizer Ъъ
unpalatalized i Ыы
palatalizer Ьь
unpalatalized e Ээ
Юю ju
Яя ja

A B G D

Classical greek canon ABΓΔ

E V J Z

V as the fricative pair of B stands in hebrew instead of F. Then J is read as voiced h. All three are the fricative pairs of the previous plosive line

I M N L

Sonors. N can take this place because of η (η is a very strong sound, because it's bliss, onomatopoeia) I moved M to labials and got Immanuil (the name of Jesus Christ given to him at birth)

O P K T

The voiceless pairs of voiced lines. K is like Q and R at the same time

U F H S

ΥΦΧΨΨΨΨΨ dictates this line, and the fricative pairs of the plosives from the previous line.

Because the Germans pronounce V as F, and because I didn't have to move the letters much, I assume this table is a variant of the original form of the alphabet, especially since it proved to be suitable for transmitting information: on the next page there is an example of such spelling, I stumbled only on borrowed word brochure, trying to substitute ch with h, but now I see that ΥΦΧΙΨΙΙΙΨ compares ch with the letter S (as it is in Hebrew שׁין and שׂין are yet one letter) the child would say blosul and we would understand the child. And letters becomes lettels, maybe because they let tell.

And only in the process of editing have I realized that such periodization makes the alphabet related to syllabaries and, perhaps, testifies to its origin from them (my guess is it was from some kind of Celtic, druidic writing system)

Unprecedented availability of information makes available even the most sacred elements of human knowledge, such as bild language, language of gods, language consisting only of vowels, fills the bogomilic himn AEIOU with meaning and contraposes it to (who knows, maybe even more ancient, coming from that aeon, when B was the first letter, as it is in Tolah, Kolan, Ogham and in this modest biosule, huh) judais EIOUA or IEIOUA, from which it is one step to IEAOU, the alkhaik descending pentatonic.

- *Iouω* (Iouō, [ju̯o]): *Pistis Sophia* cited by Charles William King, which also gives *Iaw* (Iaō, [ja̯o]) but more frequently ^[114] (2nd century)
- *Iεου* (Ieou, [jeu]): *Pistis Sophia* ^[114] (2nd century)
- *ΙΕΗΩΟΥΑ* (I-E-Ē-Ō-O-Y-A, [ieɛɔya]), the seven vowels of the Greek alphabet arranged in this order. Charles William King attributes to a work that he calls *On Interpretations* ^[115] the statement that this was the Egyptian name of the supreme God. He comments: "This is in fact a very correct representation, if we give each vowel its true Greek sound, of the Hebrew pronunciation of the word Jehovah." ^[116] (2nd century)
- *Ιευώ* (Ievō): *Eusebius*, who says that *Sanchuniathon* received the records of the Jews from Hierombalus, priest of the god Ieuo. ^[117] (c. 315)
- *Ιεωά* (Ieōa): *Hellenistic* magical text ^[118] (2nd–3rd centuries), M. Kyriakakes ^[119] (2000)

ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠ

ᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠᠨᠠ

d@aeiou.nu



ა ბ გ დ

*Quincy
Okolwifad*

d@aeiou.nu



A B C D
E F G H
I J K L M N
O P Q R S T
U V W X Y Z

A
B C
D E F
G H I J K
L M N O P Q R
S T U V W
X Y Z

ა ბ გ დ

ე ვ ზ თ

ი პ ლ მ ნ

ო ყ რ ს ტ

უ ფ ქ ჯ ყ ვ ზ ზ ზ

The Three Fates
or, some say, Io the sister of Phoroneus,
invented five vowels of the first alphabet,
and the consonants B and T

ა
ბ გ
დ ე ვ
ზ თ ი პ ლ
მ ნ თ ყ რ
ს ტ უ ფ ქ ჯ
ყ ვ ზ ი ძ ჯ ზ ზ

ا
ب ج
د و
ز ح ط ی ک ل م
ن س ع ه ف
ق ر ش ت
ث خ ی ض ظ ع

א
ב ג
ד ה ו
ז ח ט י כ ל מ
נ ס ע פ צ
ק ר ש ת

A
B C
D E F
G H I J K
L M N O P Q R
S T U V W
X Y Z

၁
 ၂ ၃
 ၄ ၅ ၆
 ၇ ၈ ၉ ၁၀ ၁၁
 ၁၂ ၁၃ ၁၄ ၁၅ ၁၆ ၁၇
 ၁၈ ၁၉ ၂၀ ၂၁ ၂၂ ၂၃ ၂၄
 ၂၅ ၂၆ ၂၇ ၂၈ ၂၉ ၃၀ ၃၁ ၃၂