

A New Translation of the Moesian-Thracian Kjolmen inscription, and probably the first correct translation

Alexandru Gheorghiu
Researcher in linguistics
work done from Autumn 2020 to March 2022,
first published March 2022.

This is the first edition. Augmented editions with additional information and additional references for various points (when needed) will be forthcoming.

Abstract

A new translation of the Kjolmen inscription found in Northern Bulgaria, a new translation which is very probably the first correct translation. Once again, as in the case of my translation of the Thracian inscription on the gold ring found Ezerovo in 1912, the translation reveals an Indo-European language, one that was very distinct; a language which cannot simply be grouped with Balto-Slavic. The language in this inscription is much closer to Ancient Greek than to Balto-Slavic. It may have pertained to a branch of Indo-European that formed a sub-family with ancient Greek and perhaps also with Phrygian; for now I consider Thracian to be a distinct branch of Indo-European, with affinities to a number of the known branches of Indo-European: Ancient Greek, Albanian, Phrygian, Balto-Slavic, Armenian and others.

Keywords: Thracian, Moesian, Dacian, Ancient Greek, Proto-Hellenic, Phrygian, Proto-Albanian, Armenian, Balto-Slavic, Illyrian, Daco-Thracian, Thraco-Dacian, Getic, Pre-Greek, Proto-Indo-European

Part 1. Introduction and Translation

The inscription on the stone slab found near Kjolmen is catalogued as inscription number 6858. The script used on the stone is a type of Ancient Greek script, but it uses one letter not attested yet anywhere else, thus it is a distinct alphabet (there will be more discussion of the script later in this introduction). The inscription is inscribed on a stone slab found at the beginning of 1965, in a location one kilometer from the village of Kjolmen in the Preslav district of Bulgaria, which is located in northern Bulgaria, north of the Rhodope mountains, and south of the Danube river: a region corresponding to ancient Moesia.

A number of linguists in the field have long suspected that the Moesian-Thracian language was likely transitional between some South Thracian languages (such as the language recorded on the golden ring found near Ezerovo in 1912) and North Thracian/Dacian. And I think that is most likely the case, though it could be that Dacian was the same as the language in this inscription: I doubt that Dacian was exactly the same, and we can expect some differences between the Dacian dialects/languages and this example of Moesian.

Likewise we do not know how different the language of this inscription was from many South Thracian varieties, nor do we know whether some South Thracian varieties were more akin to Dacian and Moesian than others were: one should not expect that the Thracian languages fell simply into two divisions, North and South; Eastern Thrace south of the Danube probably had different dialects as compared to West Thrace South of the Danube: Western Thrace going into Illyria and south into Ancient Macedon and Greece---with a Thracian presence likely along the coast of North-Western

Anatolia as well, though there was probably not a very large population of Thracians in Anatolia, relatively speaking.

I do not believe that this inscription on the Kjolmen slab represents a Non-Thracian language, as Vladimir Orel theorized in the late 1990s, nor do I think that the language of this inscription represents (as Vladimir Orel theorized) a survival of a local Phrygian-speaking population left over from the time when most Phrygians migrated to Anatolia. My translation---rejecting Orel's 1997 translation completely---shows a language that looks to be quite Thracian.

I also agree with most past translators that the inscription is on a grave slab/tombstone, and represents a text having to do with the deceased. Orel came to believe that it was instead a dedicatory inscription (his entire translation is based really on a misreading of the portion "ekoa" in the inscription) which did not have to do with a grave nor with any deceased person(s). He was, I'm sure, wrong. Archaeological work confirms that the stone slab was found in a grave (catalogued as grave No.1) in the center of tumulus No.1. There are multiple graves and burial mounds in the immediate area. For further details, see Dremsizova-Nelchinova, 1972, 207-208. According to Dremsizova-Nelchinova 1972, the grave offerings found in situ indicate that the graves belonged to members of the Thracian aristocracy. The necropolis dates back to as early as the 6th century BC. The inscription is usually considered to date back to the 6th century BC as well. The archaeological indications are that the inscription on the stone slab is an epitaph for a fallen warrior (D-N, 1972). My translation, if correct, confirms that that is exactly what the inscription is: an epitaph for a fallen warrior-chief.

The stone slab bearing the inscription is gray-yellowish sandstone that is composed of thin easily separable layers: it gives way to a chisel easily, but also crumbles easily, so that clean chiseled letters can be difficult to achieve on such a material: it's easy for more pieces of the stone to break off during chiseling than one intends, which can skew the letters. Because of the fragile material, the letter "O" was rendered by a circular hole/depression (the letter "O" appears four times). And the letter N was indicated by two vertical lines parallel to each other (||) without the diagonal crossbar. Dimitrov (2003) theorized that the two letters appearing before the sequence ASNLETED are to be read as IL: I disagree with that theory, and I agree with the work of the many who read those letters as NU, not "IL". I also disagree with Dimitrov's theory (2003) that all instances of the characters ◀ and ▶ are to be read as "L". If one looks at the inscription, one will see that ◀ occurs twice, and ▶ occurs twice. One will also notice that ◀ occurs within the word that most translators render as BLABA, so in that instance ◀=L. And the second occurrence of ◀ is in the sequence that most translators render as LETED. I agree that ◀=L. But I disagree with Dimitrov that the sign that is facing the opposite direction ▶ also equals "L". Instead, I agree with most translators that ▶=U.

The main reason most translators believe that ▶=U is because the ▶ sign occurs only in one line, and in that line it occurs twice, and in that same line the ◀ sign also occurs (it occurs before the letters ETED): now here is the reason why most translators interpret ▶ as U and ◀ as L: because in that line where the word LETED occurs, the ◀ is oriented the same way as the ◀ that occurs within the word BLABA, but opposite from how it appears before the letter N: isn't that an orderly situation? Yes, I'm sure it is. The ▶ sign that appears before N stands for the Upsilon (U), while the ◀ sign seen in LETED and BLABA stands for L.

In support of this, notice that the inscriber/chiseler was careful about the orientation of all the other letters. The only exception is one time, where the Sigma after ETE is facing the opposite way from how it appears the other times. That could be a mistake, or it could be that that differently-

oriented Sigma sign also stands for a different sound (if so, a sound similar to S most likely; maybe [ʃ]¹ or Sy’).

One last thing to note about the letters is that two times there is the occurrence of a Sigma-like character whose sound-value is unknown: I think it is very likely the Š sound (often rendered “sh”; in IPA it is represented by the [ʃ] symbol). That Sigma-like character is the S at the end of ZESAS and the S within the word KATROŠO: so those words might actually have been ZESAŠ and KATROŠO. So I have indicated that in my rendering of the text. To make the inscription easier to read, I have added periods after each short sentence and a hyphen between Ebaro and Zesaš.

Notice that unlike many previous translation attempts (and they all got it wrong), I did not assume that the N occurring after Zesaš must be considered as being the last letter of a sequence that some thought was SASN or ASN (there actually is an ASN word in the text, but I believe it occurs only once, and it occurs before LETED: in the sequence that reads NU ASN LETED). I believe that the N after Zesas is actually the first letter of a word that is continued after the line of script has changed direction, and I think they did that because it was a tradition among the scribes in that part of the world: *it was a way of showing that one line continues from the other*. I notice that the second time that they do that in the inscription, once again my interpretation makes sense of it: the second time the scribe did that, it was with the A that occurs after ETES: I have found that that “A” works best as the first letter of the word that continues after the line once again changes direction: A/IGEKOA (the forward slash / represents the line break), just as I found that the N after Zesas works best as the first letter of the word that continues after that first line break: N/ĒN. Coincidence? I don’t think so. I think it was intentional. Here then is my translation:

Ebaro-Zesaš nēn etes aigekoa. N’blaba ēgn. Nu asn leted. Nu ednen ida katrošo.

=”Ebaro-Zesas nine years led. Do not disturb him. Do not damage (this) writing. Do not take away the stone.”

Notice the structural symmetry/pattern of each phrase after the first sentence. Each phrase after the first sentence is structured the same. This is the structure: (No/Not/Do Not) +A Verb+the object. In the first such phrase, N’=”No/Not/Do not”. Blaba=the verb (in this case a verb meaning “harm/damage”). Ēgn=the object (in this case, the object is “him”). In the next phrase, again we see Nu=”No/Not/Do Not”, Asn=the verb (in this case, a verb meaning “strike, gouge, damage”), Leted=the object (leted=”writing”). In the third phrase of this kind, again we see Nu=”No/Not/Do Not”, Ednen=a verb (in this case a verb meaning “take away”) and Katrošo=the object (katrošo=”stone”): but this time, a word meaning “this” (Ida=this) was added before the object, so it would be clear which stone is being referred to, quite sensibly.

Part 2. Explanation of the new translation, and a discussion of what this language tells us

1. *Ebaro-Zesaš* is a Moesian male anthroponym which most likely meant “Ebaro-Sprout”, meaning “Sprouting/sprung from Ebaro”, which was a way of saying “child of Ebaro”. I translate the name as “Ebaro-Sprout” because I am using the noun form of English “sprout” in order to correspond to *Zesaš*, which I believe is in noun form, not in verb form (see explanation below). “Ebaro” meant “strong”: “Ebaro” was the name of his father and/or his family clan/gens. “Ebaro-Zesaš” could have

¹[ʃ] =the voiceless palato-alveolar fricative, often rendered as “sh” or Š.

instead/also meant “Strength-Sprout”, e.g. “Sprung from strength”, but I think “child of Ebaro” was the meaning intended, with the older literal meaning “Ebaro-Sprout”.

For the element “Ebaro”, I am not the first to derive it from PIE **h₂(e)b^hro-* “strong, mighty”: this is the interpretation/determination of most linguistic publications dealing with this inscription; Orel is one of the few who interpreted the inscription in a way that did not interpret “Ebaro” in that manner. But Orel was wrong. The element is found in other Thracian attestations, including the verified Thracian anthroponyms *Ebruzelmis* and *Ebruzenis*. The element “Zesaš” is, according to the sources I referenced, attested elsewhere (in Moesia, according to my notes) on its own as *Zesas*, and according to my notes, Georgiev (et al.?) cite also the anthroponyms *Zeizis* and *Zeisis*, attested in Thrace.

I derive both attestations of *Zesas* (including the element in the Kjolmen inscription) as well as the forms *Zeizis* and *Zeisis* from PIE **yéwos*, from which derives Ancient Greek *ζειῖᾱ* (*zeiā*)=“einkorn wheat; spelt”; and, according to at least two authoritative works on Armenian^{2 3}, that PIE root-word is also the source of Old Armenian *յօվ* (*ǰnυ*)=“sprout; twig; offspring”, despite the definition of PIE **yéwos* usually being given as meaning “cereal; grain; barley; spelt”, and despite the problem that the **y*→*ǰ*(*ǰ*-) sound-change for Armenian is not universally accepted. If that sound-change turns out in the future to no longer be accurate for Armenian sound-changes from PIE, then I would suspect that the word represents a loanword from another IE language once spoken in Anatolia or elsewhere, and I would still suspect that the word most likely derives from PIE **yéwos*, or even via another lineage descending from PIE **yew-* **yewh₁-*, the source of PIE **yéwos*.

I don’t believe that the meanings “sprout; twig; offspring” in Old Armenian are later post-PIE developments: I think that those are in fact the older meanings from which the meanings “cereal; grain; barley; spelt” later developed, which means that the older meanings of PIE **yew-* **yewh₁-*, were not “to ripen, mature”, but instead the older meanings were “to sprout, rise, grow”, with “grow” later shifting to “to ripen, mature”. I do not think that the Old Armenian and Armenian examples derive instead from a different root-word; I think they derive from this PIE root that I am discussing here, since the different meanings can be explained so well by applying my interpretation, and since we find sonic forms that are so close to Old Armenian *յօվ*, forms that are known to derive without any doubt from the **yéwos* root-word: see Lithuanian *jāvas*=“grain, cereal”; Sanskrit *yáva*=“barley; grain; cereal”; Persian *jow*=“barley; grain”, for example. So, since the Old Armenian word has such meanings (“sprout; twig; offspring”) and is considered to very likely derives from PIE **yéwos*, the same root-word from which Ancient Greek *ζειῖᾱ* (*zeiā*) derives, I theorize that the *Zesaš* in the Kjolmen inscription derives from the earlier *Zeis-* form (seen in the attested *Zeisis*), in turn deriving from PIE **yéwos* via intermediary stages.

2 Acharian, Hrachia (1973), in *Hayerēn armatakan baṙaran* [*Armenian Etymological Dictionary*] (in Armenian), volume II, 2nd edition, a reprint of the original 1926–1935 seven-volume edition, Yerevan: University Press, page 131 ab.

3 Macak, Martin (2017–2018), “Chapter X: Armenian”, in Klein, Jared S.; Joseph, Brian D.; Fritz, Matthias, editor, *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics: An International Handbook* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft [Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science]; 41.2), Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, § The phonology of Classical Armenian, page 1055

The Moesian sonic-form *Zeis* is very close to Ancient Greek *Zeĩa*, but I theorize that the Thracian meanings were the same as the meanings known for Old Armenian յՅՎ: “sprout, twig, offspring” and for sure in Moesian also “offshoot”, as in the offshoot growing from a plant/tree. “Offshoot” led to the meaning of “offspring”. Ancient Greek *Zeĩa* is derived from an earlier Proto-Hellenic form **dzeyyã*, in turn from earlier **yéw-ih₂ ~ *yu-yéh₂-s*, in turn from PIE **yéwos*, which is alternatively reconstructed as **yéwh₁os*. The divergent meanings seen between Ancient Greek and Moesian/Thracian could mean that the Moesian/Thracian *Zesas* derives more directly from the original root-word by a lineage different from the lineage that led to Ancient Greek *Zeĩa*, despite such sonic closeness. The explanation could be that the Daco-Moesian-Thracian area is the area of origin for that particular PIE root-word, and the Old Armenian word would likely derive from the same area as well, according to this theory.

Now I will detail the extensive evidence supporting my interpretation and etymology of the *Zesas* element seen in the Kjolmen inscription.

Before I deciphered the meaning and etymology of *Zesaš*, I had deciphered the meaning and etymology of Thracian *tralis*, which is found as the last component in many attested Thracian anthroponyms (cf. Auloutral(e)os {genitive}, Beithutraleos {genitive}, Brasitralis, Dalitralios {genitive}, Dutoutralis, Eptitralis, Mukatralis/Moukatralis, Suratralis, et al.). Rejecting a blogger’s⁴ interpretation that I saw online (he had written on his website that *tralis* meant “in thrall to” and that it was cognate to English “thrall” and that the term found in those names derives from Germanic but was adopted by Celtic peoples, and that all those *-tralis* names that I mentioned above are Celtic names; but I pretty much knew that that interpretation was completely wrong, nor do I know of a Thracologist that supports any of that) and knowing that Duridanov in his “the Language of the Thracians” wrote in the 1970s that *-tralis* was used to indicate “descended from” (but Duridanov did not give an etymology or further elucidation or cognates for that word, he only wrote what he thinks the *tralis* element indicated), I decided to check Ancient Greek dictionaries for clues. I found that a gloss from Hesychius says that τρᾱλλόν (=trallon) meant πικρόν (=pikron, meaning “pointed, sharp, keen”).

Advanced as my knowledge was by that time, I knew that that word right there, τρᾱλλόν, was very likely a Thracian word (it seems that from surviving Ancient Greek manuscripts it occurs only in Hesychius, so it was rarely used by Ancient Greek writers) and that it was very likely the key to deciphering the meaning and etymology of Thracian *tralis*. I also then realized that essentially Duridanov was correct⁵, and my elucidation shows how and why, the origin, affiliation, mechanics and

4 I’ll probably name him/them and his/their website in the next edition of this paper. He doesn’t seem to be a linguist nor an archaeologist. The website is a blog where he and perhaps others are arguing that Dacians and Thracians were actually Celts who spoke Celtic languages---so in other words he’s saying that Dacians and Thracians didn’t exist except as branches of the Celtic people: a view which almost needless to say is completely fictional, illusory and extremely erroneous. It almost surprises me that someone would argue that in the 21st century: but I see such things often, people looking at a topic emotionally rather than scientifically (in this case, he happens to be Irish and he really wants to be able to add the Dacians and Thracians to the list of Celtic peoples: he might as well try to add the Phrygians and the Albanians). The same can be said of those who are arguing that Thracian was a Baltic or Slavic language. I’m arguing that Thracian was a Thracian language, very distinct from Celtic or Baltic or Slavic.

5 Essentially correct, but *-tralis* did not actually mean “descended from”, it meant “sprouting from”: so *-tralis* was used to indicate what can also be indicated by the idea of “descent from”/“descended from”, but the Thracians used a different analogy: not “descent” nor “descending”, but instead “sprouting/an offshoot”. I did not read Duridanov’s publication in the language that he wrote it in (I read an English translation), so in time I will find the actual words that he used there in his work.

precise meaning of the Thracian word. I knew that words meaning “pointed” are often (even usually) part of a set including the meaning “to issue out, sprout, rise up”, and I already knew of Ancient Greek examples showing such a semantic cluster (see my paper on the etymology of Koriandron). So I wrote down the information from Hesychius in my notebook, and I wrote down my hypothesis.

Then I continued to search in an Ancient Greek dictionary for more information. I found mention of an ancient city in Caria (in Western Anatolia, in the valley of the Maeander river; the modern city of Aydin is located on the site of the ancient city) that was known as Τράλλεις / Τράλλις (=Tralleis/Trallis), which according to the *Geographica* of Strabo (64 BC---24 AD) was founded by the Argives and Trallians, the Trallians (ancient Greek: Τράλλεις, Τραλλεῖς, Τράλλοι, Τράλλιοι) being a Thracian tribe within the land of Illyria. The Roman writer Livius (59 BC---17 AD; known in English as “Livy”) called them Illyrians---whether they were Thracians mixed with Illyrians, or whether Livy called them Illyrians from a confusion with the location of their earlier territory, is not known, but other ancient authors refer to them as Thracians (nor is it known how different the Illyrian languages were from the Thracian languages).

The Trallians were often in the employ of Hellenistic kings, employed as mercenaries, executioners and torturers in Anatolia. Strabo’s account of the city of Tralleis/Trallis in Caria being founded in part by Trallians has been deemed fictitious by some modern historical works, and such historians view the similarity between the name of the city and the name of the Trallians as a coincidence. However, I know of no linguist who has demonstrated anything regarding the meaning and/or etymology of the city’s name. What I have found suggests that Strabo was reporting actual history: in later times the same city was also known as *Ανθέα* (Anthea) and *Ευανθία* (Euanthia). I already knew from the work I did on the etymology of Koriandron (see that work of mine) that *Ανθ-* (=Anth-) in Ancient Greek (deriving almost certainly from Pre-Greek) meant “to sprout up, rise up; pointed”: in my next version of this work I will detail more of those findings here, for now I refer the reader to that work of mine, also available on Zenodo.

For now it suffices to say that is for certain that *Anth-* at some times in ancient Greece had the meanings “to sprout up, rise up” as well as “pointed” and “projecting out, issuing out”: see for example Ancient Greek ἀνθρήνη (anthrene)=”hornet, wasp” for the “pointed” meaning (the wasp’s stinger) and Ancient Greek ἀνθερεών (anthereon)=”chin”. And recall that Hesychius wrote that τραλλόν (=trallon) meant πικρόν (=pikron, meaning “pointed, sharp, keen”). So now, can it be that the name of the city of Caria had a different etymology and a different meaning, but some Greeks who knew of the word τραλλόν (the same one as defined by Hesychius) and who likely also knew the meaning of the name of the Trallians (whose tribal/ethnic name most likely is derived from Hesychius’ τραλλόν) later gave the city the new/additional names Anthea and Euanthia? It’s either that option, or, more likely, Strabo was reporting actual history, which is not unlikely since the Trallians were employed in Anatolia often. W. M. Ramsay (1851---1939), the foremost authority of his day on the history of Asia Minor, believed that the Trallians had settled in numerous parts of Western Anatolia, including Caria. There was a village/town called *Τραλλία* in ancient Illyria.

Though the λ is not geminated in *-tralis*, I am certain that it is a variant of the same word: in the name of the tribe, it probably referred to pointed spears and/or arrows and/or other pointed weapons. In *-tralis*, found in numerous Thracian anthroponyms, the meaning I’m certain was “offspring” derived from “offshoot of a plant/tree”, from “issuing out, sprouting, pointed” (recall the

meanings of Old Armenian յՅՈՎ: “sprout; twig; offspring”). In Ancient Greek, I’ve also found the word *τράφηξ* (=tráphēx) meaning “wood-beam; spear; handle of an oar”; the word has two known variants: *τράπηξ* (=trápēx) and *τρόφηξ* (=tróphēx). According to Beekes ⁶, the suffix (seen in several Ancient Greek words which are considered to be of likely Pre-Greek origin) and the nature of the variations show that the word is Pre-Greek, rather than deriving from PIE **treb-* (a root which is thought to have meant “settlement; dwelling” as well “to build; to dwell”), which is considered to be the source of Latin *trebs* (=“timber; wood beam; rafter; tree-trunk; penis”). Whether from Pre-Greek or Illyrian or Thracian or another source, I agree that the word is likely not from PIE **treb-*. The word *τράφηξ* and its variants are quite likely cognates of Thracian *-tralis* as well as of the *trallon* word glossed by Hesychius and the tribal/ethnic name of the Trallians.

I have in my notes the note of an attestation of a Thracian anthroponyms *Moukakakeous* ⁷ and *Moukakakaes* ⁸, which are parallel to other such Thracian anthroponyms which I have noted in my papers: *Moukakenthos*, *Moukatralis*, *Moukaporis*, *Moukapuis*, *Moukapus*, *Moukazenis*, *Moukazeras*. I have found that *kakaes/kakeous* meant “sprout/offshoot/offspring” in some Thracian dialects/Thracian languages (as did *-tralis*), and if one could know for certain where each name originates from, one could begin to sketch out likely dialect/language areas; but in actuality, especially in Roman empire times, one can find Thracian names even in what is now Hungary, the Near East and Italy, so it would not be easy to delineate the language areas from anthroponym attestation locations, because even if a name is attested in a certain location in Thrace, the name could originate from the opposite end of Thrace. *Moukakakeous* is attested in northern Thrace, but it may originate from Southeastern Thrace, for example.

The main evidence that tells me that *-kakaes* meant “sprout; offshoot/offspring” are the names that the Lycians and Pisidians gave to their version of the Horse-riding god, a god also very popular among the Thracians and the Getae: the known Lycian/Pisidian names for the Horse-riding god were: *Κακασβος* (=Kakasbos; attested only⁹ in the dative declination *Κακασβω*) and *Trikasbos*; scholarship suggests that the second part of the name, *asbos*, is related to words for “horse” in the Anatolian languages and, ultimately, derives from PIE **h₁ékwos*, -“horse”¹⁰: yes, that’s correct, I’m sure: see Thracian *esbe* and *asbe*=“horse”, as well as Thracian (other Thracian dialects/other Thracian languages) *asprios*=“horse” and Thracian *espiros*=“horse”, the latter two (*asprios* and *espiros*) attested in three different variant names for the Thracian horse-riding god: *Outasprios*, *Ouetespiros* and *Betespiros*. This same horse-riding god was known in Ancient Greek as *Ephippios*. The Ancient Greek *Ephippios* means “Up(on)horse” (just as the “epicenter” of an earthquake means the location on the surface of the earth

6 Beekes, Robert S. P., (2010), *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series; 10), with the assistance of Lucien van Beek, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

7 Attested in an inscription catalogued as IGBulg.538 found in what is now Glava Panega, Bulgaria; the inscription is considered to probably date back to the 2nd century BC. This form *Moukakakeous* is certainly a genitive, since the full name reads “*Ebruzelmis Moukakakeous*”. Glava Panega is the site of a Thracian shrine to Asclepius, located near a natural spring river which was highly regarded for its therapeutic/healing/medicinal powers due in part to its mineral content. The site is in Northern Bulgaria in the region of Lovech.

8 I will try to find the source of this attestation, e.g. the exact inscription, where the inscription was found, the date of the inscription according to archaeologists, and so on. It could be that the form with *-kakaes* was reconstructed from the genitive form *-kakeous* (see the note above this note), but it may also be that both forms are attested.

9 In my notes I also have noted the variants *Kakasbas*, *Kakaob* and *Kakathibos*: if those sources were correct, then those are also attested.

10 For this etymology of *asbos*, see Locatelli, Lauriane. 2015. “Le Cheval Dans l’onomastique Du Sud-Ouest De l’Anatolie”. In: *Bulletin De l’Académie Belge Pour l’Étude Des Langues Anciennes Et Orientales* 4 (mai), 101-105. As well as: Lebruin, René; Tavernier, Jan. “Syro-Anatolica Scripta Minora VIII”. In: *Le Muséon* 123 (2010): 4-5. Peeters Publishers.

that is directly above the underground location where an earthquake originated from), “*Ep-*” being of course the Ancient Greek word ἐπί=epi=“on, upon, on top of”, already known to derive from PIE **h₁epi*, “on, at near”. “Hippios” is of course from *hippos*, the Ancient Greek word for “horse”, from PIE **h₁ékwos*, “horse”. I’m sure after doing research on this, that Thracian *Out-*, *Ouet-*, and *Bet-* also meant “on, upon, on top of”, and I’m quite sure that Thracian *Out-/Ouet-/Bet-* in those names for the horse-riding god derive from PIE **úd*, “up; upwards; away; out; outward”, another PIE root that had some identical/near-identical meanings as compared to PIE **h₁epi*, “on; upon; at; near”, but as one can see the two PIE words had different additional meanings, reflecting their different origin. Looking at words that established linguistic works derive from PIE **úd*, there is no doubt that those Thracian words derive from there. See Proto-Indo-Iranian **ut^sčáh*, “above, upwards”; Latin *usque*, “up to”; Proto-Indo-Iranian **ut^stamás*, “highest, most elevated”; Proto-Indo-Iranian **ud*, “up, upwards, away, out of”; Old Irish *oss-*, “up, off”; Proto-Slavic **vy-* “out”; et al. For the Thracian variant *Bet-*, see an identical phonological phenomenon in the case of Proto-Slavic **vy-*, where the V sound developed at the beginning of the word/prefix, just like we see in that dialect of Thracian that the V/B sound developed there.

After researching the evidence, I am sure that the *Kak-* in *Kakasbos* also meant “upon, up, on top of”, from a Pre-IE root-word that meant “to sprout up, rise up; pointed”: besides all the evidence discussed above, I have found additional evidence, such as the Sumerian word *gag* meaning “arrowhead, peg, nail” so the older meaning was “pointed/protruding”, semantics/meanings which in human languages are usually, from a set of meanings that included “to sprout up, rise up”, as I will prove with more examples in the next edition. To continue now with the Sumerian cognates for Thracian, Lycian and Pisidian *Kak-*: Sumerian *gi-gag* meant “pointed reed” (“gi”=“reed”), while *kak*, according to the ePSD ¹¹, meant “weapon”, and was written with the same cuneiform used for *gag*: the meaning “weapon” obviously developed from “something pointed”.

The Ancient Greek word/name Γίγῶς (=Gígās, source of the genitive Γίγαντος and of the term Γίγαντες, “Gigantes”, the giants of Greek mythology; and so the source of the words “gigantic” and “giant”) is of mysterious origin. I believe that it derives from Pre-Greek **Gig* meaning “to sprout up, rise up, pointed”, which led to “towering up high/rising up high” which led to “of giant size”. And that Pre-Greek **Gig* is cognate to Sumerian *Gag* and *Kak*, described above. Lithuanian *gōgas* may be a cognate, according to some, but I haven’t researched that Lithuanian word yet. There is more material which I will detail in my next edition. For now I will say that the *Trik-* in *Trikasbos* also meant “up/upon/on top of”.

This etymology of Thracian *-kakaes/-kakeous* that I present here (deriving from Pre-IE **kak*=“to sprout up, rise up; pointed”) supports my etymology of Thracian *-tralis*; and these etymologies support my etymology of the *-zesaš* found in the Kjolmen inscription. And there is much more material to consider as well, some of which I will detail next time, some of which I will detail now: to see just how likely these etymologies are, consider the example of *-kenthos*, another terminum found for many attested Thracian anthroponyms: *-kenthos* is unanimously considered to derive from PIE **ken-*, “to arise, begin” and which I think also meant “sprout”, thus also meant “new, fresh, young”, as is attested in many descendant Indo-European words. From PIE **ken-*, the Proto-Celtic **keneti* is considered to derive, and **keneti* indicated “sprouting from, arising from”, seen in the Gaulish anthroponym suffix *-cnos*. I say that PIE **ken-* “to arise, sprout” and PIE **kent-*, “to prick, point” are two expressions of the same ancient root-word. From PIE **kent-*, “to prick, point”, Ancient

11 ePSD=electronic Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary, provided by the Pennsylvania Museum of Anthropology and Archaeology, and available online for free, full access.

Greek κέντρον (=kéntron) is already known to derive: κέντρον meant “something with a sharp point: point, spike, spur, sting, quill, thorn, a goad; a metal nail; a penis; etc.”

So the etymology of Thracian *-kenthos* supports my etymologies of *-tralis*, *-kakaes*, *-kakeous* and *-zesas*. See also another Thracian anthroponym terminum: *-zenes* (and the northern Getic variants *-zanis* and *-sanis*) known to be from PIE **ǵénh₁-* “to produce, to beget, to give birth”: far back before Proto-Indo-European the older form of PIE **ǵénh₁-* probably had the same meanings as PIE **ken-*, discussed above. PIE **ǵíǵnh₁-*, is considered to be a reduplicated present stem form of PIE **ǵénh₁-* “to produce, to beget, to give birth”: notice the similarity of PIE **ǵíǵnh₁-* to Ancient Greek Γίγᾱς (=Gígās), which I say likely came from a Pre-Greek/Non-IE root meaning “to arise; sprout up; towering high”. An example of a Non-IE word molding the sound of a Proto-Indo-European reduplicated present stem? Perhaps. Or, that reduplicated form and the root-word itself came from Non-IE? Or the Non-IE source of Γίγᾱς was actually an Indo-European language, or descended from a common ancestral language going back before PIE?

Even the *-zelmis* portion of the Thracian anthroponyms *Ebruzelmis* and *Dizazelmis* may have meant “sprout; offshoot”, from an older set of meanings that included “pointed”: see my work on the etymology of Getic *Salmoxis/Zalmoxis* for more about *-zelmis* and *Salm-* and *Zalm-*. I have found that Getic *Salm-/Zalm-* were cognate to Hittite *Kalm-* meaning “pointed, sharp, projecting”, deriving from PIE (Hittite was an Anatolian Indo-European language).

In Romanian the words *copil* (= “child”), *copleși* (the oldest meaning was “a plant putting out too many branches and offshoots”¹²) and *copac* (one of the words for “tree” in Romanian; nowadays mostly used for trees that don’t bear fruit or nuts, but often enough used to refer to nut trees and less often fruit trees, and Romanian dictionaries usually list it as a “synonym” for *pom*, which is used only for fruit and nut trees: so *copac* is actually a general term for “tree”, while the Latin-inherited *pom* is more specialized) are of mysterious origin and etymology; I don’t think that I am the first to derive the three of them from the same root (though I do not recall anyone before me adducing *copac*), but I probably am the first one to say that they all derive from a root-word **kop-* that meant “sprout; branch; offshoot; offspring”, and also “something pointed”: and I probably am the first to say that *copac* (=tree) derives from the “branching/offshoot” meaning. So it does not derive from any word that meant “to chop, cut”: in that scenario, *copac* would have meant “that which is often chopped/cut”, but I’m sure that’s not it, despite some linguists pointing to a Slavic *kop’* meaning “to dig, scratch”: but I think the Slavic words are simply distant cognates going back to the old meaning of “pointed, sharp”, and the Romanian *copac* derives from a “branching” meaning in a Paleo-Balkan/Carpathian language.

So in Romanian we see the continuity of an analogy going back to the pre-Roman IE and Pre-IE peoples of the Balkan-Carpathian region: this analogy was also widespread throughout ancient human cultures, and it is not yet known whether those Romanian words come particularly from Dacian, Thracian, Moesian, Illyrian et cetera.

Considering all this evidence and material from the Daco-Thracian part of the world, it is very likely that I am correct in my interpretation of the *-zesaš* element seen in the Kjolmen inscription. If I’m correct, that means that the full name in the inscription is *Ebaro-Zesaš*. Now let’s look at the next part of the inscription.

2. The next three letters are *Nēn*; after considering that the preceding letters spell *Ebarozesaš*, and considering that the next four letters spell *Etes*, which, in the opinion of many past scholars and in my opinion as well, most likely meant “year”, cognate to Ancient Greek ἔτος meaning “year”---after considering that, I think that *Nēn*=“nine”, the number nine, deriving from PIE

12 See Victor Celac’s excellent recent work on the oldest attested meanings of *copleși*.

**h₁néwn₁*, -"nine" and cognate to Proto-Albanian **neunti-* "nine"; Proto-Anatolian *ḡnūn* "nine"; Proto-Hellenic **ennéwā* - "nine"; Old Armenian *inn* - "nine"; Latin *novem*, "nine"; English "nine", et al.

3. "Etes" meant "year" or "years". Cognate to Ancient Greek *ἔτος* (= *étos*), meaning "year", and both deriving from PIE **wétos*, "year". Not a loanword from Ancient Greek. Such a basic vocabulary word is not likely to be a loanword. Phonologically, compare Thracian *Out/Ouet-* from PIE **úd*.

4. *Aigekoa*---So the inscription indicates only "nine" years. Then unless it was the epitaph of a child, which I really don't think it was, the inscription is not recording how many years the person lived. Then maybe it's recording what made the person notable and worthy of such an inscription? I think so. I interpret "aigekoa" as meaning "led", the past-tense of the verb "to lead". Ebaro-Zesaš led this tribe of warriors (warrior-shepherds, perhaps?) for nine years, and they were pleased with his leadership. Interestingly, we find the PIE root **h₂eǵ-* "to drive", from which are considered to derive words meaning "to lead" as well as words meaning "goat": there is more than one example of a "goat" meaning considered to derive from PIE **h₂eǵ-*; one example is Proto-Indo-Iranian **Hajás*, "goat", which J.P. Mallory and D.Q. Adams derive from PIE **h₂eǵ-* + *-os* (a deverbal suffix) in a 2006 work highly regarded in the field¹³. An example of a "to lead/leader" word considered to derive from PIE **h₂eǵ-* is Ancient Greek *ἄγος* (*agós*), meaning "leader".

Why is a goat linked with "to lead/leader" in so many IE languages? The answer may be that PIE **h₂eǵ-* meant "shepherd's crook" before it meant "to drive", with the root having an older meaning of either "curved" or "sharp point" or including both meanings (a shepherd's crook is curved and ends in a sharp point, and is used to drive animals forward, to lead them on). And the PIE root-word **h₂eyǵ-* meaning "goat" likely had a root meaning of either "curved" or "pointed" in reference to goat horns. The "curved" option is likely indicated by PIE **h₂eyǵ-* meaning "oak tree", a PIE root which is sonically identical to the PIE root which meant "goat": perhaps both come from the root meaning "curved": the very curved branches of oak trees, and curved goat horns. So the semantic progression for the "goat/leader" situation could have been: "curved" leading to "shepherd's crook", which led to "to drive, urge on, lead on".

Now, notice the closeness between Moesian *aigekoa* in the Kjolmen inscription and Ancient Greek *αἰζ* (= *aíz*; genitive *αἰγός*=*aigós*). There was also a Dacian citadel/fortress/settlement known as *Aigidava*: it was called so because it was located at a high elevation in the mountains (*Aigidava* was located somewhere along the upper course of the river called *Argeş* in Romanian, upstream of lake Vidraru: that upper course of the river *Argeş* is called *Capra*, meaning "Goat" in Romanian, because that part of the river climbs high into the mountains like a goat); so in other words, it was "Goat Town" or "Goat Fortress" because it was at a high elevation in the mountains where the wild mountain goats prefer to be. The Dacian toponym *Aigidava* suggests that *Aigi* meaning "goat" was a Dacian word that was identical to Ancient Greek: in Ancient Greek, the word *Aigi* was used as a prefix to mean "goat". The Proto-Albanian form of the word for "goat" was **aidzija*.

13 Mallory, J. P.; Adams, D. Q.; (2006) (2006) *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World* (Oxford Linguistics), New York: Oxford University Press

The plural forms of *αἴζ* were: αἴγες (nominative and vocative); αἴγων (genitive); αἴξις (dative); and αἴγας (accusative); the plural form was used in at least one Ancient Greek work to mean “waves” of the sea: I do not think it was a likening of sea-waves to frolicking/jumping goats, as some think; I think that usage comes from the old root meaning of “curved” still surviving among some people: the curve of waves. Or the old root meaning was forgotten, but the tradition of using that word for “waves” survived. I think I’m right because *αἴζ* also referred to a type of water-fowl, apparently a goose or goose-like fowl, and that very likely comes from the curved neck of the water-bird. The data that really solves the mystery is the fact that in many Indo-European languages, the goat words deriving from PIE **h₂eyǵ-* especially (and in some languages, exclusively) refer to the she-goat: the emphasis on the she-goat is found in Ancient Greek as well.

Why? I’m sure that it was because of the curved sack where the udders of a mature female goat are located: if the root-meaning was curved (referring primarily to the goat-horns; in some IE languages, particularly in Balto-Slavic, the words deriving from **h₂eyǵ-* refer especially to the he-goat/buck/billy-goat, the opposite of the usual phenomenon), and that root-meaning was still known for quite awhile in ancient times in the IE languages, then it was easily also used to refer to the curved udder-sack of female goats: proof of this is furnished by the fact that in Proto-Slavic, **azь* meant “billy-goat” and also meant *Leuciscus idus*, a species of fish that has a curving bulge right where the curving bulge of the udder-sack is located on mature female goats.

In Armenian, the word for “goat” is *Ayc* (deriving from PIE **h₂eyǵ-*) and the plural is *Aycic*. While *Ayce* (a plural noun) refers to clothing made of goat’s hair. However, it is the Armenian verb *ւծել* (= *acem*, meaning “to bring, carry, fetch”, deriving from PIE **h₂eg-* “to drive, lead, bring”: the semantic development in Armenian went quite smoothly from “to drive ungulate animals forward” to “to bring ungulate animals to a place/certain place” to “to bring, carry, fetch” in general) that provides the explanation for the *-ek* suffix seen in the Moesian¹⁴ verb *Aigekoa*: in many conjugations of *acem* in Armenian we find such a suffix: see *acic* (subjunctive aorist 1st person); *acic em* (subjunctive present 1st person); *acic es* (subjunctive present singular 2nd person); *acic ē* (subjunctive present 3rd person, aorist stem); *acēak*, *aceak* (indicative imperfect 1st person); *acak* (indicative aorist 1st person); *acic emk* (subjunctive present 1st person); *acc uk* (subjunctive aorist 1st person); *acēk* (indicative present 2nd person plural); *acēik*, *aceik* (indicative imperfect 2nd person plural); *acēk*, *acik* (indicative aorist 2nd person plural); *acic ēk* (subjunctive present 2nd person plural); *acjik* (subjunctive aorist 2nd person plural); *acēk* (imperatives imperative 2nd person plural); *acjik* (imperatives cohortative 2nd person plural); *mí acēk* (imperatives prohibitive 2nd person plural); *acic en* (subjunctive present 3rd person).

The Moesian present tense conjugation may have been *Aigeko* = “to drive, to lead”. *Aigekoa* = “led” is a past tense conjugation. So the *-ek* suffix does not pose a problem. Nor does the fact that *Aig-* looks like it derives from PIE *h₂eyǵ-* rather than from PIE **h₂eg-*: I described above how it is known that they were confused in ancient times, due most likely to the fact that both derive from the same root-word which meant “curved”: on one hand, “curved” led to “shepherd’s crook; a curved goading tool”; and on the other hand “curved” led to “goat”, because of the curved goats’ horns: that is why I think some words meaning “goat” are considered by linguists to derive from PIE **h₂eg-* instead of from PIE *h₂eyǵ-*.

14 I do not mean that there was only one language/dialect of Thraco-Daco-Getic spoken in Moesia.

5 and 6. The next letters that we will study are the letters beginning a separate line (there are three separate lines of inscription on the slab), the letters: Nblaba. Here, as in the opinion of most translators, “N” meant “No/Not/Do not”, while “blaba” meant “harm/damage/mischief”. The “N” derives from PIE **ne-* meaning “not”. The Moesian “blaba” word meaning “harm, damage, hurt, mischief” is cognate to Ancient Greek (I’m quite sure it is not a loan from Ancient Greek; a term like this is not likely to be a loan) βλάβη meaning “harm, hurt, damage, mischief”. The Moesian and Ancient Greek words are quite likely from Pre-Greek/Pre-IE: Beekes suspects that the Ancient Greek word is from Pre-Greek, and so do I after reviewing the data/material.

7. The next and final letters in this line spell “ēgn”, which I’m very sure meant “him”, deriving, just like Ancient Greek ἐκεῖνος (=“that, those; he”) and ἐκεῖνος (=“that; he”), from e- (from PIE **h₁é/*é*; has an augment function, often leading to the meanings “and, then”) + PIE **ké-/*ko-/*ke*¹⁵ (a Post-positional demonstrative particle; as well as a deictic particle) + PIE **h₁énos* (=“that; that over there”). Compare Old Norse *hann* (=“he”), which is considered to likely be cognate to Ancient Greek κεῖνος, which is another alternative form of ἐκεῖνος, mentioned above. Compare also the following forms, which are considered to derive only from PIE **ki- ~ *ke- ~ *ko-/*ke*: Scotch Gaelic *gun* (=“that”) and Breton *ken* (=“so”). But the Moesian word is closest to the Ancient Greek examples, which fits the other close Ancient Greek cognates found in this inscription.

8. Now we have gotten to the final line, the 3rd line. The first two letters are N and Upsilon; I will render the Upsilon as “u”, because the common rendering of it as “y” often causes a misperception regarding how it was pronounced, the common misperception among the non-educated being that “y” in Ancient Greek rhymes with the English word “why”, which is very wrong. The vowel sound that the letter stood for in early Attic Greek was like the English long “ō”, found in “smooth”. In Classical Greek, it was pronounced as a close front rounded vowel (check online for a sound sample of that), which sounded a lot like “ee”, mixed the “eu” sound in French. So the first two letters in line three are NU, which is the full form of the “N” that we saw before “blaba”: so either the writer decided that, because the next word would be “blaba”, it was not necessary to carve a vowel after the N, because the meaning of the N would be understood without a vowel there; or, the Upsilon vowel sound actually was not there when that phrase was spoken, but is there when the next word begins with a vowel (the next word after NU is ASN, which begins with a vowel). Either way, *Nu*=“No, not, do not”, deriving from PIE **ne-* meaning “not”. The next letters are “ASN”, and so “NU” applies to “ASN”. See the next paragraph detailing “ASN”.

9. “*Asn*” meant “strike, scratch, gouge, damage”, deriving from an as yet-unknown-by-the-reference-books root-word **as-*, meaning “pointed; sharp point; protruding; sprouting; rising”. This root-word could have been of Pre-Greek/Pre-IE origin, as I will show in the next edition, but it is probably akin to/cognate with the PIE root **Heh₃s* (alternatively reconstructed as *h₃es-*) meaning “ash tree”: the ash tree was one of the small number of trees preferred in ancient Europe for making the shaft of spears (another tree that needs to be mentioned now as one of the preferred spear-shaft-wood trees is the cherry tree), and this aspect of the tree is believe was so important that the tree was literally called “spear” meaning “spear-tree”, as I have documented examples of that regarding the cherry tree in ancient Greek. From PIE **Heh₃s* (alternatively reconstructed as *h₃es*) derives Proto-Slavic **āsenb*, meaning “ash tree”. So as is documente already in numerous reference works, an ancient root-word meaning “pointed; sharp point” often has cognate verbs meaning “to strike, gouge, stab, pierce,

15 Linguists of Proto-Indo-European do not agree/are not sure about the reconstruction; usually it is viewed as being already variable at the time of Proto-Indo-European, so the reconstruction may be given as: **ki- ~ *ke- ~ *ko-*, and perhaps also---or instead---the form **ké*.

scratch, harm, kill, injure”. I theorize that Moesian *Asn* was a verb meaning “to strike, gouge, stab, pierce, scratch, harm, injure” and maybe even “kill”. The meaning intended in this inscription is all of those except “kill”. So *Nu Asn*=“Don’t strike/gouge/damage”: the fact that they didn’t repeat the word “*blaba*” in this line indicates that the meaning was more towards “strike, gouge, scratch”, which makes sense. Before I continue to the next word, I want to note here that I suspect that the Ancient Greek word/name *Ἀσίᾱ* (=Asia) derives from the same ancient root, which had a cognate or parallel or loanword in the Akkadian root-word *a-ṣu*, meaning “to go out, issue out; to rise”. There will be more about this in the next edition. An Akkadian cognate would not surprise me, since Akkadian and other Semitic languages contain a number of root-words of Non-Semitic origin/not exclusively Semitic origin. See also Akkadian *kakkabu*=“star” and *kakku*=“stick, weapon”, which are cognate to Sumerian *kak/gag* (described above) and cognate to those Lycian, Pisidian and Thracian forms that I discussed above. The “star” meaning developed from “pointed rays of light”: consider how humans draw stars, how we depict them graphically in sculpture as well: the five-pointed star, the six-pointed star, the seven-pointed star, et cetera. I have researched the etymology of Akkadian *kakkabu* and my etymology fits: the set of meanings ranged from “pointed” to “sprouting/rising” to “spherical” probably as well (see Akkadian *kakkultu*=“eyeball” and Sumerian *gakkul*=“eyeball”¹⁶), because the spherical sun and moon radiate pointed beams of light. I have explained the semantics better and in more detail in a previous work of mine on the etymology of Sumerian *mu* and *mul*, also available on Zenodo.

!0. “Leted” meant “writing”, deriving from PIE **lat/*let/*lot*, “to flow”¹⁷, which is also the source of at least three river names in Lithuania: *Latava*, *Latuva* and *Latupis*; and there are other river and lake names in Europe which likely derive from that root-word: *Letes*, *Late*, *Latupi*, *Lator patak*, *Latorica*, *Lataná*. See also Old High German *letto* (=“clay”), Ancient Greek *λάτᾱξ* (=látax, meaning “drops of wine” and also meaning a water-dwelling quadruped mammal of some kind, likely the beaver), Old Norse *lepja* (=“clay, dregs, sludge”), Old Irish *laith* (<**lati-*) meaning “liquid, ale, liquor”) and *lathach* (<*latàkā*) meaning “silt; mud”. The semantic progression I theorize was like so: from a root-word **lat/*let/*lot* meaning “to flow; liquid; wet; grease; fat” developed a word uses to refer to inks/dyes used for writing on tanned leather hides (paper was rare in Ancient Thrace, I’m sure) as the Ancient Greeks and others often did; and from there the word came also to mean “writing”/“any verbal composition that is written down, including inscriptions”. The Moesians may not have had a word for “inscription”, since quite likely the practice of inscribing in stone was rare, as indicated from the trouble the inscriber had in inscribing the letters on the stone slab. I have seen mention of a conjectured PIE root **leyt,-* “to scratch” in only one work from 1995¹⁸ and so far I believe that such a root-word probably did not exist, and so I don’t think it’s likely that Moesian *leted* meant “inscription” deriving from an earlier “to scratch”: that semantic progression is very very common and immediate, but I doubt that such a root-word existed. So I prefer the derivation from that root meaning “to flow; wet; liquid; grease; fat”, and I think it’s very likely that the name of the Ancient Greek goddess Λητώ (=Lētó) derives from there as well, because Leto was quite likely a very ancient goddess (in Greek mythology, she was the mother of Artemis and Apollo) and so likely goes back to those fat goddesses of Neolithic times, and so Leto likely meant “fat, fertile” referring also to the fatness of vegetation, of various animals and the soil. The Doric forms were *Lătó* and *Lětóā*, while the Aeolic form was *Lătōn*. See also the Lycian *lada* meaning “wife”, likely from an older word referring to curvy forms of mature women, in turn from the older “fat” meaning. For the suffix *-ed* seen in *leted*, compare a suffix in *-ed* in the Breton

16 In addition, I have seen that in some ancient languages, looking at something is likened to shooting out beams/rays of light from one’s eyes.

17 I also find mention of a supposed PIE root *h₂leyH*, “to smear”. If such a root-word existed, it was probably akin to this **lat/*let/*lot*, “to flow; liquid; wet” that other sources describe.

18 See Sihler, Andrew L. (1995) *New comparative grammar of Greek and Latin*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press. Page 224.

language which makes plural nouns from singular nouns: perhaps Moesian “let” meant “letter” and “leted” meant “letters”. Or maybe “let”=“writing” in Moesian, and -ed was simply a noun suffix that would have sometimes been encountered in Moesian, but was not used for making plurals. In my notes I have noted an -ed suffix in Cornish which made nouns from verbs (will verify this in the next edition). The writer of the inscription may also have left out a vowel after *Leted* because it was deemed not necessary for understanding the meaning, so perhaps the word was actually **Leteda*=“writing”. So I interpret the phrase “*Nu asn leted*” as meaning “Do not strike/gouge/damage the writing”.

11. The two letters after *Leted* are: *Nu*, which is the same word meaning “No/Not/Do Not”, seen before *Asn* in this same third line. See explanation and etymology above.

12. “*Ednen*” meant “take away/make off with”. The *Ed-* portion is a prefix, deriving from PIE **éti-*, “beyond, over”: in some Indo-European languages, that unvoiced “t” sound in PIE **éti* became the voiced “d” sound, and I’m quite sure that happened in Moesian in this case, though it could have happened late in the day, in the centuries just before the Kjolmen inscription, or even in that same century. And it could be that in some phonological environments, the sound remained unvoiced: but the phonological environment of the word “etnen” caused it to be pronounced “ednen” soon after awhile. The *Nen* portion is from PIE **nem-*, “to take; to give; to distribute”, cognates include Proto-Germanic **nemana*, “to take”; Latvian *ņemt*, “to take”; Ancient Greek *νέμω* (= *némō*), meaning “to deal out, distribute, dispense”: likely enough the Pre-Proto-Indo-European meaning of **nem* was “hand”, later leading to “to take; give; deal out; distribute; dispense”, with further semantic developments post-PIE. So **éti-nem*=“take beyond”, while in Moesian *ednen* meant either “take away” as well as “take beyond” or meant only “take away”. For the simple meaning shift, see Tocharian B *ate*=“away”, and Lithuanian and Latvian *at*=“away; back” and Proto-Slavic **otъ* =“away from; from”.

13. I think that *ida* meant “this”. Compare Latin *ita*=“so; thus”, and see how “thus” is so akin to “this”. Latin *ita* is considered to probably derive from a compound of PIE **ís* (alternatively reconstructed as **h₁e*) meaning “the” + PIE **só* meaning “this, that”.

!4. *Katrošo*, an inflected form of *Katros*, which meant “stone, rock”, deriving from a root-word that I first identified in the year of 2020 ¹⁹: PIE **kwet-* meaning “something shiny; radiant; something pointed”. The meaning of “something shiny” led to the meaning of “stone, rock”, at first referring to shinier stones: precious stones; then later including most stones and rocks: many non-precious stones and rocks gleam and glint in the sunlight as well. Also possible is a semantic of “something pointed>sharp>to cut>piece cut off<rocks and stones”, because rocks and stones seem like they are broken off/cut off pieces of the earth. Maybe the second scenario reinforced the first scenario. From this root I think PIE **kweyt-* “to shine” derives. Considering PIE morpheme structure PIE **kwetwor-* (=“four”) has too many consonants to be a true primitive morpheme, so I think that the earlier form of the PIE word for “four” was, as has been theorized already, either **kwet-* or **kwetu-*, and I think it’s very likely that the meaning “four” derived from an earlier meaning of “tooth”: because the human molars are quite cube-shaped, and even the human incisors are often four-sided rectangles of bone, though they aren’t cube-shaped. “Tooth” would have developed from the earlier meaning “bright/white”, and the semantic development was also influenced a lot by the semantic of “pointed, projecting; a peg”, meanings which are also very present in the ancient root-word that I am describing. I think that Ancient Greek *πέτρᾱ* (meaning “rock; frequently used of cliffs, ledges, etc. by the sea”

19 See my paper on the etymology of Cinnabar and Koriandron, as well as my paper on the etymology of Salmoxis, Kypros, and more. Both works are available on Zenodo.

and also “mass of rock or boulder” and “stone as in the material, e.g. something made of stone”) derives from this **kwet* root that I am describing. This is quite likely indicated by the Phrygian word *tetrakine*, said to mean “a type of lettuce”: likely the reference was to “rock lettuce”, e.g. a type of lettuce growing on rocky soil (alternatively, perhaps the reference was to a spiny lettuce, such as the wild ancestor of lettuce: “spiny” is included in the semantics that I am describing for **kwet*-). In Thracian, the anthroponym *Ketriporis* is attested, meaning “child of *Ketros/Ketrus*”: very likely, *Ketros/Ketrus* was the Thracian version of the Ancient Greek nickname *Petros*, which meant “rocky”, e.g. “tough, strong”, the source of the names *Peter*, *Petru*, *Pietro*, et cetera. It has been observed that words with “-e-” in Thracian correspond to some words with “-a-” in Dacian/Getic: see the Getic anthroponym *Aulozanis/Aulosanis*, where as South Thracian would have it *Aulozenis*: and this is just one example. So South Thracian **ketra/*ketros* (=“stone, rock”) would have been Daco-Getic-Moesian **katra/*katros* (=“stone, rock”), at least in some dialects/languages. So the Dacian fortress Petrodava may actually have been a Greek’s half-translation of an original Dacian **Katridava* or **Katrodava*---unless there was some Dacian dialect where the word for “rock, stone” was identical to Ancient Greek. All these indications make me posit that the *Katroso* seen in the Kjolmen inscription means “stone, rock” referring of course to the stone slab bearing the epitaph of the Moesian tribal warrior chief *Ebarozesaš*. So then, “*Nu ednen ida katrošo*” means “Do not take away/make off with/remove this stone”, which sure makes a lot of sense.

3. Conclusion

My conclusion is that my translation is correct, and this is thus the first correct translation of the Moesian inscription found near Kjolmen. This Moesian language shows more affinity to Ancient Greek than did even the language that was uncovered by my translation of the gold ring found near Ezerovo. But the two languages seem similar enough to me that I think that they are both Thraco-Dacian languages. Notice that in the Ezerovo ring inscription, I identified a verb “*esko*” meaning “to petition”: while in this inscription I identify a verb “*aigekoa*”, which I think is the past tense of a present tense “*aigeko*” verb.

My interpretation of the name *Ebaro-Zesaš* shows that we are most likely dealing with a Thraco-Dacian language. And looking through my other interpretations and other etymologies of words from this inscription, they are very much part of the Thraco-Dacian milieu, which connected a lot with the Ancient Greek and Pre-Greek milieu, as well as sometimes connecting with Lycian and Pisidian and Phrygian: though the language in this inscription is pretty far from Phrygian, it surely had a number of elements in common with Phrygian and a number of Pre-IE words in common with Phrygian and Lycian and Pisidian and Ancient Greek, et al. I have read all the well-known Kjolmen translation attempts that were published in the past, including the recent past, and I expect that all of those are wrong. This translation that I present here is very likely correct.

I will soon publish an augmented edition of this work. My new etymological findings suggest a number of new etymologies for a number of other hitherto unexplained words: and I will try to find more evidence to establish that the etymologies are correct.

My **kwet*- theory suggests that Proto-Hellenic **g^watiléus* (the reconstructed older form of Ancient Greek *βᾶσιλεύς*) may derive either from **kwet* or from a Pre-Greek root from which **kwet* could be derived. Since **kwet* included the meaning “pointed; sharp point”, it’s known linguistically that the meanings “to strike, to hit, to stab, cut, slay” would easily have developed from **kwet*. And the gw/kw sounds are known to easily shift from one to another in numerous languages, and the vowel change from -et to -at and from -at to -et is also very common. So maybe **g^watiléus* meant “Striker” and “slayer”: among the Mycenaeans, a Gwasileus was the master of the guild of smiths: in that case, if this

etymology is correct, “Striker” would have been a reference to the way a blacksmith/metalworker beats/strikes the glowing pliable hot metal into shape.

I have three other linguistic research papers available on Zenodo, and more new works will be appearing soon.

Alexandru Gheorghiu

March 5th, 2022

alexandru.gheorghiu.323@gmail.com