

# A New Translation of the Moesian-Thracian Kjolmen inscription, and very likely the first correct translation

Alexandru Gheorghiu

first draft/edition published March 2022.

second draft/edition published June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2022.

third draft/third edition published March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

fourth draft/edition published July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

## 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 appears to be 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, Phrygian, Balto-Slavic, Albanian, 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 outside of Thrace<sup>1</sup>, 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, probably, 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.

---

1 The letter referred to is the six-stroke Sigma, which aside from its occurrence in the Kjolmen inscription, has so far only been found in an inscription in the “valley of the Thracian Kings”, near Kazanlak, Bulgaria, and dated to the late 6<sup>th</sup> century BC: see Dimitrov (1995), 23-25, and Dimitrov (2003).

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 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 6<sup>th</sup> century BC. The inscription is usually considered to date back to the 6<sup>th</sup> 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]<sup>2</sup> 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"; while 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 Katroso: 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 this 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

---

2 The symbol [ʃ] is the voiceless palato-alveolar fricative, often rendered as "sh" or Š.

1. *Ebaro-Zesas* I expect (as did Vladimir Georgiev, though I recall he believed the name was *Ebaro-Zesa*, with the second “s” pertaining to the next lexical item in his interpretation) is a Moesian male anthroponym which I posit most likely meant “Sprung from Strength” or “Flowing from Strength” or “Strong-source”/“Mighty source”; the latter two meanings implied “from a mighty/fertile source/origin/pedigree”. The meanings “Flowing from Strength/Sprung from Strength (with Sprung from “flowing up”)” were my first deduction regarding the meaning of *Ebaro-Zesas*, which I had written in my notebook back in 2020 or early 2021, but I didn’t publish that particular translation of *Ebaro-Zesas* until now, nor did I publish the “Strong-source/Mighty source” translations till now, though they too date back to as far back as 2020. I’ve noticed that my first deductions/inspirations are often correct.

When I first thought of the translation “Sprung from Strength”, I was thinking of “sprung” in the sense of water flowing out of a spring: only weeks later, or months later, because I did not find PIE *\*seyk-/seykw-* “to moisten; to filter, to flow” until over two years later, did I think of *Zesas* deriving not from a flowing root but instead from a pointed/projecting root: but since early July 2023 I’m sure that my first impression was correct: the root meant “flowing”, as I will detail in upcoming paragraphs in this paper.

An anthroponym *Zesa* is, according to V. Georgiev (et al.), attested in Moesia on its own as *Zesa*, and Georgiev (et al.?) compares *Zesas* in the inscription to the anthroponym *Zesa* as well as to the additional Thracian anthroponyms *Zeizas*, *Zeizeis* and *Zeisis*, attested in Thrace. Not sure if Georgiev did, but subsequent authors have compared *Zesa/Zesas* in the inscription with the Thracian anthroponym *Tzitzis* as well. And I also compare *Zesas* to the Theithēs portion of the Thracian anthroponym *βουρθειθης* (=Bourtheithēs) attested in Northeastern Thrace, quite close to Kjolmen: a paper I found seems to be saying <sup>3</sup> that Bourtheithēs is attested in Razgrad, Bulgaria, in Northeastern Bulgaria very close to Kjolmen which is also in Northeastern Bulgaria.

Yanakieva’s paper compares Bourtheithēs to the Thracian names Bourkentios and Bourgeilos: Bourkentios proves that Bourtheithēs represents Bour+theithēs, since Bourkentios is known to represent Bour+kentios, with Kentios=“offspring/born of”, so Bourkentios means “Born of Bour/offspring of Bour/child of Bour”. In Thracian there are some examples which show a th/z/ts variation: one example is Zukoulaisēs/Tsoukoleizis compared to the Thouku element found in the Thracian name Thoukusidantikē, et al. Therefore Theithēs is quite certainly a variant of *Zeizas/Zeisis*, *Zeizeis*, *Tzitzis*<sup>4</sup>, etc.

I posit that *Zesas* (including the *Zesas* element in the Kjolmen inscription), *Zeizas*, *Zeizeis*, *Zeisis*, *Theithēs*, *Tzitzis* etc. derive from PIE *\*seyk-/seykw-* “to moisten; to filter, to flow”, itself probably akin to PIE *\*sweysd-*, “to hiss: used of such sounds of animals, and of wind and water; and the hissing of people as well”. The closest cognates that I’ve found to the Thracian so far are of Old Dutch/Proto-Dutch/early West Germanic origin, including *Zeesse*, probably from earlier *Zeegse* (both the hydronyms *Zeesse* and *Zeegse* are attested), and *Zeegse* itself was first attested as *Segese* around 1225 AD/CE; additionally, the Old Dutch hydronyms *Seeste* and *Segeste*, and *Ziek*; *Zeist* (first attested as *Seist* in 838 AD); and *Ziejen*, first attested as *Zien* in 1370 AD. Compare Old Dutch *\*sigan* (“to flow; to drip out, to drain, etc.”); Middle Dutch *sigen* (id.), Dutch *zijgen*, from Proto-Germanic *\*siganą* and *\*sihwaną*, two variants from PIE *\*seyk-/seykw-* “to moisten; to filter, to flow”.

<sup>3</sup> See Svetlana Yanakieva’s paper *Did a Getic language exist?* Page 13.

<sup>4</sup> The Thracian form *Tzitzis* is posited by some to be another variant of *Zeizeis/Zeizis/Zeisis*. See for example page 3 of Mirena Slavova’s great short paper on Thracian, *On the Thracian syllable: word-initial consonants and consonant clusters in Thracian names*. In the journal where her paper was published, the page is 327. The journal is: *Ancient Thrace: Myth and Reality. Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Thracology, Volume 2*. And Vladimir Georgiev posited that *Zesas* in the Kjolmen inscription is a variant of *Zeizeis/Zeizis/Zeisis*: add those two theories together, and *Zesas* and *Tzitzis* are very likely variants of each other.

Paleobalkan and Paleobalkan substrate words in support of the “source; water-spring; flowing” interpretation of Zesas and Zeizis and Tzitzis etc. include Thracian Tziorikkelos meaning “a flowing/murmuring/trickling water-spring (Kellos meant ”water-spring” in Thracian, and that was established many decades ago; compare German Quelle=”spring” etc.) and Thracian Zionkellos meaning “a filtering (?) water-spring”: here one should compare Zion (of Zionkellos) not to the Dion- of Dionysus but instead to Old English Sion and Seon, from Proto-Germanic \*sīhwan , “to filter”, from PIE \*seyk-/\*seyk<sup>w</sup>- “to moisten; to filter, to flow”<sup>5</sup>.

In Romanian, I posit that cognates include țitei=”petroleum oil” ( țitei is pronounced /tʃiˈtsej : the letter [ ț ] always represents the sound [ tʃ ]), of unknown etymology and unknown origin: I posit that since the word has no etymology and there is no indication that it is a loanword, and since it fits some other similar Romanian words (besides what I detail here there is at least one other Romanian word like this that I will detail next time); and since semantically it fits as exactly as one could ask: petroleum oil *gushes out, flows out*: because of these reasons, the Romanian word țitei=”petroleum oil” is the best cognate of Thracian Zesas/Zeizis/Tzitzis that I know of in Romanian.

Another cognate is Romanian țâțâi=”to chirrup: the sound made by insects such as cicadas and crickets, and similar animal sounds”; the dictionaries I referenced don’t explicitly say/record that țâțâi can also apply to certain dripping, trickling, water-flowing sounds (whether any work of literature records that, I don’t know), but the connection is made evident by a synonym given in the dictionaries: the word țârâi meaning „the sound made by crickets and cicadas; to chirrup, to chirp” and it is well-known în everyday Romanian speech aș well aș recorded în the dictionaries and în the literature that țârâi and țârâie and țâr are also the specific terms în Romanian that apply to „the trickling, dripping sounds of water or another liquid” (see any Romanian dictionary for entries such aș „țâr=cuvânt care imită zgomotul intermitent produs de greier și de alte insecte sau de un lichid care se scurge picurând de undeva”): so though I have not found a record of țâțâi used like that, the synonym țârâi (and țârâie and țâr) is the specific word în Romanian used to express the trickling, dripping sounds of water and other liquids.

There may be more Romanian cognates, I will have to search more thoroughly soon. Romanian țârâi and țârâie and țâr (all described above) are cognates of the Tziori- in Thracian Tziorikkelos; another Romanian cognate is țurțur, another acknowledged native substrate word which means „an icicle” comes from „dripping down”: see also țurloi=”a pipe through water flows; an icicle” etc., which is also an acknowledged substratum word; there are some additional Romanian words in this set which I will describe next time. Slavic cognates of Thracian Tziori- include Polish ciorkać meaning „to drip, to trickle; to chirp”, a combination of meanings that we see in Romanian as well; Czech crčet, „to run, to trickle, to gush”; Russian журчáть (žurčát) meaning „(of water) to babble, to purl, to murmur” et al.

PIE \*g<sup>w</sup>el- (the source of German Quelle et al.) meant “to dribble; gush forth; spring; squirt; throw”. While the Sanskrit séka (from PIE \*seyk-/\*seyk<sup>w</sup>-) had the meanings “sprinkling; irrigation; moistening or watering with; pouring out, emission, effusion”<sup>6</sup>---So it is possible that Ebaro-Zesas meant “Sprung from Strength”, but the root of Zesas did not meant “pointed, projecting”, but instead “to flow; the sound of flowing water; the sound of wind, etc.”. I think that PIE \*seyk-/\*seyk<sup>w</sup>- “to moisten; to filter, to flow” is most likely of onomatopoeic origin, as indicated by PIE \*sweysd- “to hiss”.

5 While writing the third version of this draft in March 2023 (this current version is the fourth version) I was studying the Thracian Tziorikkelos and Zionkellos and I nearly decided then in March 2023 to go back to my “Flowing” theory, with “sprung” deriving from “spring” in the sense of a water-spring, but I did not know of (I actually I did not remember about) PIE\*seyk-/\*seyk<sup>w</sup>- “to moisten; to filter, to flow”, and that is what I would have needed to go back to the first impression/inspiration that I had in the mysterious year of 2020, my impression that the root of Zesas meant “to flow”.

6 In addition, the Sanskrit word means/meant “a shower-bath; a libation; a drop of any liquid”.

With the “flowing from; source; water-spring” theory, the stand-alone names (Zeizas/Zeizeis/Zeisis, Tzitzis etc.) implied “vitality, energy, health, speed, strength, fertility”, even though the more literal meaning was “flowing/flowing up; water-spring”.

If Tzitzis is in fact a variant of Zeizas/Zeizeis/Zeisis as I think and as perhaps all Thracologists think, then Τζέτζης is quite certainly another variant. The anthroponym Τζέτζης is attested most famously as the last name of Ἰωάννης Τζέτζης (*Iōánnēs Tzétzēs*), the poet and grammarian of 12<sup>th</sup> century AD Constantinople<sup>7</sup>: the name Τζέτζης looks like another variant, as do all these other Greek variants that I have found still in use among Greeks as surnames: Tzitzis, Zezas, Tzitzios, Tziotzis, Tziotzios, Tzetzu, Tzetzis, Zizis, Tziotziosz, Tsizis, Zitsis, Ziezis, Tzizes, Citzis, Zizais, Tsitsis, Zoitsis, Zhizhis, Zizes, Zizys, Zietsies. And I’ve also found a Romanian surname variant: Tzetzu (many Romanian last names are of Greek origin, and some may be of Thracian origin). A \*Tzitzu Romanian variant is likely but I haven’t found it attested yet. Since the native Greek form that derives from PIE \*seyk-/\*seyk<sup>w</sup>- has the form ἰκμᾶς (=moisture, wetness; secretion, etc.), if these surnames/anthroponyms are from PIE \*seyk-/\*seyk<sup>w</sup>-, then they are all from Thracian or another non-Greek Paleobalkan language.

There is also attested in Ancient Bithynia a name in the patronymic/genitive form Pseilozeiou, but it is not certain that Pseilozeiou is a Thracian name<sup>8</sup>; if it is Thracian, then the name may represent Pseilo<sup>9</sup>-zeiou, with zeio=“water-spring”, cognate to Zesas.

So what exactly did the Thracian names Zeizeis, Zesa, Zeisis, Zeizas, Tzitzis that stand-alone (as opposed to being part of a compound like we find with Ebaro-Zesas and Bour-theithēs) mean? What exactly did the Greek last name (of Thracian origin?) Tzetzes mean? What exactly do the still extent/in use Greek surnames (of Thracian origin?) Tzitzis, Zezas, Tzitzios, Tziotzis, Tziotzios, Tzetzis, Zizis, Tziotziosz, Tsizis, Zitsis, Ziezis, Tzizes, Citzis, Zizais, Tsitsis, Zoitsis, Zhizhis, Zizes, Zizys, Zietsies mean, as well as the Greek or Thracian-derived Tzetzu surname found in Romanian? Probably they mean something like „Flowing, flourishing, fertile” from the earlier meaning „Flowing”. Perhaps some of the current/recent Greek variants described above are unrelated and similar only by chance (like Citzis for example). The names may also have referred to certain chirping birds as well (see the Romanian and Polish words described earlier).

For the element “Ebaro”, I am not the first to derive it from PIE \*h<sub>2</sub>(e)b<sup>h</sup>ro- “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 *Ebryzelmis* and *Ebryzenis*.

---

7 And Τζέτζης was also the last name of his father, Michael Τζέτζης, and his grandfather, and beyond that we do not know. Constantinople/Byzantium/Byzantion is located in land that was once part of Thrace. “The father of Joannes Tzetzes was Michael Tzetzes...He was himself named after his paternal grandfather, a native of Byzantium. a man of some wealth, who, though not a learned man, showed great respect for scholars”, a quote from *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman biography and mythology*. If “He” refers to Michael rather than to Joannes, then that takes the last name even further back (“He himself was named after his paternal grandfather...”).

8 D. Dana, *Onomasticon Thracicum*, 2014, pg. 278.

9 Brixhe 2015 (chapter 3: 3.2.2) thinks that here and in at least two other instances in Thrace and/or Bithynia, the grapheme “psi” actually represents the sound “ks” not “ps”, which would give Kseilozeiou/Kseilo-zeiou. According to Brixhe and Mirena Slavova, the sound “ps” may not have been found at the beginning of any Thracian words/terms, though word-initial Ps- is common in Greek.

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 *\*h<sub>1</sub>néwn<sub>2</sub>*, -”nine” and cognate to Proto-Albanian *\*neunti-* “nine”; Proto-Anatolian *ḡnún* ”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”. This past-tense is similar to the past-tense encountered in Ancient Greek: *ἀκήκοα* (*akékoa*) "I have heard", as compared to *ἀκούω* (*akouō*) "I hear"; in the inscription on the stone, it does not seem that Ebaro-Zesas is speaking in first-person nor at all; the speaker of the inscription is not intended to be Ebaro-Zesas: but the similarities of the past-tenses is quite striking.

Ebaro-Zesas led this tribe/group of warriors for nine years, and they were pleased with his leadership. Interestingly, we find the PIE root *\*h<sub>2</sub>eǵ-* “to drive, lead” and PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyg-* “to stir, set in motion” (usually or always described as variants of each other), 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 *\*h<sub>2</sub>eǵ-*; one example is Proto-Indo-Iranian *\*Hajás* , “goat”, which J.P. Mallory and D.Q. Adams derive from PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eǵ-* + *-os* (a deverbal suffix) in a 2006 work highly regarded in the field <sup>10</sup>. An example of a “to lead/leader” word considered to derive from PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eǵ-* is Ancient Greek *ἀγός* (*agós*), meaning “leader”.

Why is a goat linked with “to lead/leader” in so many IE languages? The answer most likely is that the root-meanings *\*h<sub>2</sub>eǵ-* and *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-* were ”hard, stiff, strong; erect<sup>11</sup>; forceful”,

---

10 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

11 And probably also “growing, rising”: as in the case of the meaning “erect”, the penis caused these semantic links. A similar semantic set is found in PIE *\*h<sub>3</sub>ésth<sub>1</sub>* , “bone”, a root which no doubt had the meaning “to grow” as well as “hard, stiff”. And see also Proto-Indo-Iranian *\*Hád<sup>z</sup>gas* which probably had the root-meaning “a hard, bony growth”, but “bony” in the more general sense of “hard”, like wood, not necessarily bone. Such semantic groupings are found in a number of PIE roots.

and from there the meanings “push, thrust, strike” developed<sup>12</sup>, reminiscent of a goat ramming its horns; and “to push, thrust, strike” led to “to push forward, to drive forward”.

Additionally<sup>13</sup>, the roots **\*h<sub>2</sub>eg-** and **\*h<sub>2</sub>eyg-** likely also had the meaning “pointed” (pointed and stiff go together, as do hard and sharp/cutting: soft things cannot cut), which led to “to stab, prick, goad” which led to “to urge on, spur on” which led to “to lead”; and on the other hand **\*h<sub>2</sub>eg-** and **\*h<sub>2</sub>eyg-="pointed, hard, stiff"** could have led to “goat” because of the stiff, pointed horns and the long penis of the goat which people thought of as overly-aroused and erect.

So it's not necessary to posit that PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>eg-** meant “shepherd's crook” (a shepherd's crook is curved and ends in a sharp point, and is used to drive animals forward, to lead them on) before it meant “to drive”, with the root having an older meaning of “sharp point”; because much more likely the words meaning “to drive, lead” derive directly from the “pointed” meaning or from the “to strike, push, thrust” meanings.

So the PIE root-word **\*h<sub>2</sub>eyg-** meaning “goat” likely had a root meaning of “penis”/“pointed”/“stiff”/“hard”/“strong” (“pointed” in reference to the male goat's penis and highly copulative nature; and also a reference to the horns, which though often are not sharp-pointed on goats). It seems that in many Indo-European languages, the goat words deriving from PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>eyg-** especially (and in some languages, exclusively) refer to the she-goat: the emphasis on the she-goat is found in Ancient Greek as well, according to some modern sources that I saw claiming this. Why the emphasis on the she-goat (if this emphasis has been accurately identified by some modern scholars) if the root-meaning was “penis/pointed/stiff/hard/strong? In Balto-Slavic, the words deriving from **\*h<sub>2</sub>eyg-** refer especially to the he-goat/buck/billy-goat, the opposite of the usual phenomenon, and consider that PIE **\*kápros** (source of Latin *caper*="he-goat, buck, billy-goat" and *capra*="she-goat") has been hypothesized to derive from **\*kapr-**="penis".

In the autumn/winter of 2020 when I began working on the Kjolmen inscription, my working theory was that the root-meaning of PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>eyg-** “goat” and PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>eg-** (also alternatively reconstructed as PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>eyg-**) was “pointed” (I have long since concluded that “pointed” was only one of the meanings present in the root): in the case of the goat word, I was writing in my notebook that “pointed” may have referred primarily to the male goat's penis, not to the horns. And I was wondering (in writing, in my notes) whether the PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>eyg-** “oak tree” referred to the pointed acorns: I have since found evidence that my earlier theory was quite accurate, and so the root-meaning was not “curved” (as I theorized that it likely was in March 2022 in the first version of this work) for any of those three roots, but instead “pointed, stiff, hard, strong, erect”, and so the three PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>eyg-** words and PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>eg-** are part of a set that includes PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>eyk** (“to sting; sharp tip; barb”) and PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>ek** (“sharp”). I will explain and detail all this in the following paragraphs.

Given that PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>eyg-** “to stir, set in motion” is posited usually or always as a variant of PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>eg-**, the closeness of Moesian *aigekoa* (“led”) in the Kjolmen inscription and Ancient Greek *αἰξ* (=αἰξ, meaning “goat”; genitive *αἰγός/aigós*) from PIE **\*h<sub>2</sub>eyg-** (“goat”) is no surprise. 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

---

12 I have often observed that words meaning “hard, strong, forceful” are cognate to words meaning “to push/to strike, hit”. I may show the examples next time. Till then they can be found easily.

13 Some may think that all these meanings “piled on” together is not likely, but in this case and in some other cases, yes indeed it is not only likely but most likely accurate. In the next edition I may detail further with additional evidence.



river called *Argeș* in Romanian, upstream of lake Vidraru: that upper course of the river *Argeș* 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*.

The plural forms of *αἴζ* were: *αἴγες* (nominative and vocative); *αἰγῶν* (genitive); *αἰξίν* (dative); and *αἰγᾶς* (accusative); the plural form was used in at least one Ancient Greek work to mean “waves” of the sea: this may have come from a likening of sea-waves to frolicking/jumping goats, as some think; but I think it comes from the root-meaning “striking, ramming, pushing”, perhaps alluding also to “pointed, shooting up”<sup>14</sup> and surely also to “strong, forceful”. Given all the evidence, I do not expect that the “waves” usage of *αἴγες* comes from any meaning of “curved” (the curve of waves) still surviving among some people (or alternatively, the [hypothetical] “curved” meaning was forgotten, but the tradition of using that word for “waves” survived), because I don’t think that “curved” was the root meaning of PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-*.

This reminds me how a major river in Thrace was called the Ἑβρος (Hébrois). And Hesychius records that ἔβρος (ébrois; without the H sound in this case) was a Thracian word for “he-goat, buck, billy-goat”. Of this river Ἑβρος (Hébrois) the Roman poet Statius wrote in his *Thebaid* (7:64), written in the early 90s AD: “lo! earth trembles, and horned Hebrus bellows and stays his torrent's flow”—here I emphasize the “Horned Hebrus”. and the Roman poet Ovid wrote: “The broad, broad realms of Lycurgus . . . where stretches icy Rhodope to Haemus with its shades, and sacred Hebrus drives his headlong waters forth.” (*Heroides* 2. 111 ff (trans. Showerman) I emphasize from that quote that Hebrus “drives his headlong waters forth” showing the goat’s association with driving/pushing/leading, having to do probably with the horn-ramming behavior and other behaviors of the he-goats/bucks (think of the phrase “a bucking bronco”). This indicates to me that the root meaning of the river Ἑβρος (Hébrois) and of the word ἔβρος (ébrois) was “strong; forceful; hard” leading to “to push, strike; drive, lead” (and even “to thrust in the penis” which fits very well how he-goats were viewed); and so these terms probably derive from PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>(e)b<sup>h</sup>ro-* “strong, mighty”, the source of the Ebaro in Ebaro-Zesas. River-gods were thought of as powerful gods, often depicted horned---bulls, rams, goats---see for example the horned river-god Achelous of Ancient Greece, and an ancient depiction on a Greek vase where Okeanus, god of the river-ocean that was thought to encircle the earth, was shown with long bull’s horns. In Ancient Egypt, the ram-horned god Khnum was the god of the Nile river.

See also PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>eb<sup>h</sup>ros* (the *h<sub>1</sub>* laryngeal is according to Matasović<sup>15</sup>) which referred to some hardwood trees such as the rowan and the yew tree. And I think the Ancient Greek

14 “shooting up” proceeds easily from “pointed; peak”. The Ancient Greek words *αἰσσω* (variants *ἄσσω*, *ἄττω*, *ἄττω*) very likely derive from a root that had a similar form to PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-* and with a very similar if not identical root-meaning, since those words mean: “to dart, shoot”, which led to “to move quickly” (and later, “to move violently”). The meanings of “to dart, shoot” likely derived from an older meaning of “arrow”, from the meaning of “pointed”. I do not think that PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-* referred to the movements of goats, whether leaping, hopping or darting.

15 Matasović, Ranko (2009), “\*eburo-”, in *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series; 9), Leiden: Brill, →ISBN, page 112

toponym Ἐφύρη /Ἐφουρα, the name of a number of Ancient Greek towns/cities in various parts of Ancient Greece, meant “hard, mighty” referring to fortresses/fortified cities located on acropolises, since the Ἐφύρη /Ἐφουρα toponyms that can be located seem to share that quality in common.

The “oak tree” meaning of *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-* probably came about from *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-* meaning “hard, strong, growing, erect” and also “to strike, push”, since it was observed since prehistoric times by man that oak trees get hit by lightning much more than any other species of tree. See the etymologies of *\*pérkus* “oak” and *perkʷunos* “a Proto-Indo-European name of the storm god” for more details about words for “oak tree” being cognate to words meaning “to strike”.

There is also the fact that acorns look a lot like un-erect small penises or like the heads of penises, so it’s also possible that the “oak tree” meaning came somehow from the penis-head-like appearance and hardness of the acorns. But I doubt that that was the entire reason, since more likely a big part of the origin of the word applied to the oak tree was the hard, stiff, erect, growing (up until it stops growing) trunk of most oak trees (compare Ancient Greek *δροόν* = “strong, mighty” and Ancient Greek *δρῦς* = “oak tree; tree”). But consider also that in Latin *glans* meant “acorn” as well as “penis” (and other things and nuts of similar shape), and Ancient Greek *βᾶλᾶνος* meant “acorn”, “oak tree”, “penis” and other things of similar shape.

Three ancient usages of the Ancient Greek word αἰγίς (*aigís*) caught my attention: In Theophrastus’ *Enquiry into Plants*, the word αἰγίς refers to the heart-wood/pith of the Corsican pine and, among the Arcadians, to the heart-wood/pith of the silver fir tree; the third usage that caught my attention was αἰγίς being used to refer a speck in the eye; I had seen these before March of 2022, but I had not noted them down and had forgotten them; having found them again, I began to try to fit all three usages to a root-meaning of “curved”, and I did not find the results satisfactory: in that scenario, the heart-wood/pith of those trees would have been called *aigís* because the heart-wood/pith may be a circle of darker-colored wood at the center of those trees, as it is at the center of many trees. Some linguists would have been satisfied with that, but I wasn’t, mostly because of the usage “a speck in the eye” which did not fit the meaning of “curved” and strongly suggested instead the meaning of “a point”. So I was thinking, what if, as I had thought at an earlier time, the root-meaning or one of the root-meanings was “pointed”? That would explain the usage of “a speck in the eye” and the usage of “heart-wood/pith”: because I knew that Ancient Greek *κέντρον* (= “a prick, a goad; sting; quill; thorn; spur; spike; something pointed; penis”) came to refer to a point, and to the center of a circle (the English word “center” derives from Ancient Greek *κέντρον*): that was making too much good sense, so I re-evaluated my conclusions published here in March of 2022 as I found more evidence supporting my theory that the root-meaning of all three examples of PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-* (and of PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eǵ-*) was “pointed, stiff, hard, strong, erect”, not “curved”: and compare PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-* to PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyk-* (= “to sting; sharp tip; barb”) and PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eǵ-* to PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>ek-* (= “sharp”).

In a number of his plays, Aeschylus uses the word αἰγίς (aigís) to refer to a rushing storm/ “hurricane” (“rushing storm” and “hurricane” translations according to the LSJ, 1940): this has been explained by the LSJ (1940) as a likening of such a rushing storm/hurricane to the terrible aegis (αἰγίς/aigís) wielded by Zeus and Athena: I agree that at least that entendre is invoked by Aeschylus, surely; but more likely the explanation for αἰγίς referring to a rushing storm/hurricane and αἰγίς referring to the Gorgon/Medusa face wielded by Athena and Zeus comes from the root-meanings “strong, powerful, stiff”, particularly “stiff” as in “frightening”: this is more likely than those usages deriving from “to prick/goad” leading to “maddened”/“angry”/“enraged”/“raging”, which suggested itself as an alternative but seems unlikely.

Aeschylus’ likening of such a storm to the aegis of Zeus and Athena is poetic and imaginative and also references their mythology and literature; but I think Aeschylus’ usage comes from the root-meaning that explains both usages at once.

Consider these Ancient Greek words for more evidence for my interpretation of the root-meaning of aig/aigi in Ancient Greek: αἰγανέη=hunting-spear, javelin; αἰγίπυρος: according to the LSJ (1940), the very spiny plant *Ononis antiquorum*<sup>16</sup>; αἰγιθος and αἰγίοθος=a bird, exactly which species/genera is unknown; according to LSJ, possibly a linnet bird; whether linnet or finch, I’m sure that the reference was to a small bird that eats thistle seeds often, so aigi- in this bird’s name refers to the thorns/spines of thistle plants; αἰγίλωψ (aigilops)=four different meanings known: 1) the spiny-headed/spiny-eared plant *Aegilops ovata*; 2) the Turkey oak, *Quercus cerris*: likely referring to the bristles on the acorn’s cup seen on this species, and also the bristles surrounding the shoot buds and the bristle-tipped leaf lobes 3) an ulcer in the eye: likely this usage comes from the “pointed” meaning leading to “pricked, gouged”, hence “ulcer”, if not from the meaning of “point, speck” 4) “a bulbous plant”: probably there were spines on the plant; plant not exactly identified, described in Pliny’s Natural History; αἰγειρος (aigeiros)=black poplar, *Populus nigra*; here aig- is referring to the remarkable height of the tree, so high that it was likened to the heights where wild goats (goats=aiges) are found, and perhaps also a reference to “shooting up/pointed/sprouting”. Compare Ancient Greek αἰχμή=“point of a spear; point of an arrow; war; warlike spirit”. Ancient Greek αἰχμή is from PIE \**h<sub>2</sub>eyk* (=“to sting; sharp tip; barb”) which I consider to be from the same root-word (expressed in at least 4 different PIE forms, as noted earlier) as PIE \**h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-*.

The Ancient Greek words αἰγυπῖός and αἰγίποψ are very similar to Proto-Indo-Iranian<sup>17</sup> \*H<sub>2</sub>ǵipyás (which likely literally meant “straight-flying” and was an epithet of eagles, hawks, falcons, vultures etc. because of the way the large wings of those birds are held out flat on either side for long glides, until they are flapped again), so much so that I cannot believe that the resemblance is a coincidence; but up until now, the divergence of aig- in the Greek forms vis-a-vis \*Hrj/arg/arz/arc in the Indo-Iranian and Armenian forms could not be explained convincingly or even acceptably: a proposal to explain the Greek forms according to an

16 For a different interpretation (perhaps since disproven, perhaps not) see Liddell and Scott. An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1889. The entry for αἰγίπυρος says “a plant of which goats were fond, perhaps buckwheat”; the entry indicates that the attestation is in Theocritus, and the entry doesn’t mention *Ononis antiquorum*.

17 Known also to have a very likely Armenian cognate: arcui=“eagle”, which if cognate is from earlier \*h<sub>2</sub>ǵipyós.

Ancient Greek/Proto-Greek folk-etymological association with aix/aigi- (goat) did not make good sense, and I reject that just as Beekes (2010) rejected that; but unlike Beekes, I do not think that the resemblance between αἰγυῖος/αἰγίπου on the one hand and \*Ἡρίπυās on the other is a coincidence; my new elucidation of the root-meaning of aig/aigi in Ancient Greek has provided a great new explanation: the form inherited in Proto-Hellenic from the Proto-Indo-European *h<sub>3</sub>rǵi-pth<sub>2</sub>-yó-s*, was at some point before the first attestations in Ancient Greek modified by folk-etymological association with the Proto-Hellenic aig/aigi meaning “pointed” and “penis” (among other meanings that developed), so that a Proto-Hellenic/Archaic Greek word descending from PIE *h<sub>3</sub>rǵi-pth<sub>2</sub>-yó-s* ---which actually probably derived from PIE \**h<sub>3</sub>reǵ-* (“straight”)+\**peth<sub>2</sub>-* (“to spread out; to fly”)+*-yós* (a suffix)---was misinterpreted or intentionally reshaped (because the original meaning was lost) as *aigupios/aigipops*, which conveyed the meanings “sharp-faced” (aigi+ops, the same ὤψ / ὄψ word seen in Cyclops, etc. and which in Ancient Greek meant “face; eye; appearance; look” from a root-meaning of “eye”: from PIE \**h<sub>3</sub>ókʷs*, “eye”) for the eagles, hawks and falcons and for the vulture also conveyed “penis-looking”/“penis-appearance”/“penis-resemblance” because of the way the featherless head and featherless neck (for some species, the neck is not featherless, but has small feathers) and the fluffy tuft of feathers at the base of the neck gives the appearance of a penis along with the pubic hair. In the form *aigupios* this folk-meaning did not cause the original form to be changed in its last component much, only in its first (so we see *aigupios*, but not \**aiguops* or *aigipops*); but in the Macedonian example, we see *aigipops*, a form that I believe was changed by the folk-etymology to a larger degree. The Macedonian form is glossed as being equivalent to *aetos*, which was used for eagles, but as far as is attested, not for vultures. It may be that in Macedonian, *aigipops* actually referred to both eagles and vultures. For the eagle, the folk-etymology was “sharp-faced”, while for vultures it was “sharp-faced” and also probably (as described above and for the reasons described above) “penis-looking/penis-appearance”<sup>18</sup>.

The Ancient Greek word γύψ (gǵps) meaning “vulture” I’m now sure derives from PIE \**gewp*/\**geup*=“to curve”, and refers to the vulture’s curved beak and curved neck: see my paper on the inscription on the Ezerovo ring for the details and proof for γύψ (gǵps)=“curved” from PIE \**gewp*-“to curve, arch”. So γύψ (gǵps) is certainly not an abbreviation/clipping of *aigupios/aigipops*. The form αἰγυῖος may reference (probably via later molding of the other) both “pointed” (aig) and “curved” (gup): *aigup*-.

Now that we know more about the usage and meanings of aix/aig/aigi Ancient Greek, and the root-meaning, and the root-words involved, I return to Aigekoa in the Kjolmen Moesian/Thracian inscription. In Armenian, the word for “goat” is *Ayc* (deriving from PIE \**h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-*) and the plural is *Aycic*. While *Ayce* (a plural noun) refers to clothing made of goat’s hair. However, it is the Armenian verb *ածել* (= *acem*, meaning “to bring, carry, fetch”, deriving from PIE \**h<sub>2</sub>eg-* “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

18 I do not think that the aig- in *aigupios* and *aigipops* is a reference to curved beaks, since I have found no convincing evidence that aig- ever meant “curved” in Ancient Greek, and since I have in fact found all of this evidence for the “pointed” meaning instead. There are of course other Ancient Greek words for various birds which do refer to the curved beaks: Ancient Greek “*korone*” (=“crow”, “wreath”) from PIE (s)ker-“to curve, turn, bend” is a well-known and undisputed example (not that it is the only undisputed example: but there is no convincing evidence that aig=“curved” in Ancient Greek).

provides the explanation for the *-ek* suffix seen in the Moesian<sup>19</sup> verb *Aigekoa*: in many conjugations of *acem* in Armenian we find such a suffix: see *acic*´ (subjunctive aorist 1<sup>st</sup> person); *acic*´*em* (subjunctive present 1<sup>st</sup> person); *acic*´*es* (subjunctive present singular 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-* rather than from PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eǵ-*: I described above how actually linguists have proposed that PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-* had the variant form *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-* with identical meaning<sup>20</sup>; in addition to that, PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-* "goat" may have had the alternate form *\*h<sub>2</sub>eǵ-*, that is why I think some words meaning "goat" are considered by linguists to derive from PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eǵ-* instead of from PIE *h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-*. And all three meanings ("goat", "oak", "to stir, drive, lead") derive from the same root-word set, and PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyk* ("to sting; sharp tip; barb") and *\*h<sub>2</sub>ek* ("sharp") are part of that set as well. The semantic development from "something pointed" to "to stir forward, goad on, drive forward, lead" is well-attested, as noted earlier.

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 *εκεῖνος* ("that, those; he") and *ἐκεῖνος* ("that; he"), from *e-* (from PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>e/\*é*; has an augment function, often leading to the meanings "and, then") + PIE *\*ke-/\*ko-/\*-ke*<sup>21</sup> (a Post-positional demonstrative particle; as well as a deictic particle) + PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>énos* ("that; that over there"). Compare Old Norse *hann* ("he"), which is considered to likely be cognate to Ancient

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

20 This *\*h<sub>2</sub>eyǵ-* as a variant of *\*h<sub>2</sub>eǵ-* ("to drive, lead") was noted and discussed in my notebook back in December of 2020 when I translated the entire inscription in that notebook in December 2020, the same translation published in March of 2022. Somehow in the early months of 2022 (or at some point before that) I forget about that variant just enough (but not completely), just enough to forget to discuss that variant in the March 2022 version of this work. Mostly because I had already filled two and a half additional notebooks since that notebook that I was using in December 2020, and I had not added that note to my newer notebooks.

21 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 *\*-ke*.

Greek κείνος, 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 either from PIE \**h<sub>2</sub>ek* (“sharp”) or deriving from the source of PIE \**Heh<sub>3</sub>s*/\**h<sub>3</sub>es*/\**h<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>3</sub>s*, meaning “ash tree”, since I think the root-meaning of the \**Heh<sub>3</sub>s*/\**h<sub>3</sub>es*/\**h<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>3</sub>s* root was “to bite; tooth; fang”: 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<sup>22</sup>), and this aspect of the tree was so important that the tree could have literally been called “spear” meaning “spear-tree”<sup>23</sup>, with the meaning “spear” in turn deriving from “injurer/cutter/biter”, from “to bite/tooth”, as we see Ancient Greek κνώδων (“sword” and “the two projecting points on the blade of a hunting spear”) being cognate to Sanskrit *khādati*, “to chew, to bite”.

From PIE \**Heh<sub>3</sub>s* (alternatively reconstructed as *h<sub>3</sub>es*) derives Proto-Slavic \**asenb*, meaning “ash tree”. I suspect that PIE \**h<sub>2</sub>eHs*/\**h<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>1</sub>s*/\**h<sub>2</sub>es*, “to burn; fire; to glow; dry; ashes” derives from the older meanings “to bite, gnaw/tooth” (from a root that was a variant/substrate variant of the “ash tree” root): from there would have developed the meaning “fire” as something that devours/eats what it

---

22 One of theories for Ancient Greek κερασός (*kerasós*), (cherry tree) is that it actually derives from an unattested \**kera* meaning “spear”, from PIE \**kerh<sub>2</sub>-*, from where Ancient Greek *keras* (=horn) and English “horn” derive, among many other words. So I’m not convinced that *kerasos* (=cherry tree) derives from a horn-like promontory near the ancient city of Kerasous on the Pontic coast of Anatolia. Nor do the various proposed Near Eastern/Middle Eastern sources look convincing: they don’t even look close. But of course, words can change a lot over time/across languages. Perhaps more likely than “spear” for κερασός (*kerasós*) is the root-meaning “fruit” referring to the cherries, with the root being PIE \**ker-* “to grow”. This theory originates from my work as well, at least I haven’t seen anyone else saying so.

23 In Latin *fraxinus* could mean “ash tree” or “spear, javelin”; likewise for “ornus”; and the same ash tree/spear meanings are seen in Old English. And in Ancient Greek *melia* = “ash tree” and also meant “spear made of ash-wood”; but *melia* may derive not from “spear” or “to bite; tooth” but instead from “light-colored”, referring to the bark’s color. If *melia* meant “light-colored” (as does maybe *fraxinus*, the Latin word for ash tree), then PIE \**mélit*, “honey”, could have actually had the older meaning “golden; bright” later transferring to honey, because of the color of honey. Or \**mélit* “honey” may be from \**mél*/\**mel* = “pointed, projecting” later leading to “beaming, bright > golden”; or from “pointed, projecting” leading to “pricking” leading to “pricking the sense of taste” > “sweet”. If there was a root \**mel* = “tooth; to eat, to bite” that could explain the ash-tree as a spear tree (with spear again coming from “to bite”) and honey would be “tasty; that which one is eager to eat”, from “tooth; to eat, bite”.

burns; the meanings “to glow”, “dry”, “ashes” would have developed later. Compare PIE *\*h<sub>3</sub>ed*, “to bite” and PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>ed-* “to eat”, and some additional similar roots.

Whether from PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>ek* (“sharp”) or deriving from the source of PIE *\*H<sub>eh</sub>s/\*h<sub>3</sub>es-/\*h<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>3</sub>s*, it is very likely that *Asn* in the inscription has the meanings that I posit. As is documented already in numerous reference works, an ancient root-word meaning “pointed; sharp point” often has cognate verbs meaning “to strike, gouge, stab, pierce, 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 Ἀσία (=Asia) derives (via an unknown path) some ancient root-word that meant “to sprout; rise” and maybe also “pointed, peaked”, a root which had a cognate or parallel or loanword in the Akkadian root-word *a-ṣu*, meaning “to go out, issue out; to rise”.

!0. “Leted” meant “writing”, deriving from PIE *\*lat/\*let/\*lot*, “to flow”<sup>24</sup>, 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* (<latākā) 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 used 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 1995<sup>25</sup> 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: additionally or alternatively, Leto was probably originally a rain-goddess/a goddess of the rain-giving sky, as Hera probably was in pre-Classical Greece (thus the conflict between Hera and Leto: two competing goddesses of the sky/rain?). The Doric forms were Lātó and Lētóā, while the Aeolic form was Lātōn. 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 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,

24 I also find mention of a supposed PIE root *h<sub>2</sub>leyH*, “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.

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

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 *\*nemaŋ*, "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 *\*h<sub>1</sub>e*) meaning "the" + PIE *\*só* meaning "this, that". Compare also Hattic/Hatti *inta* and *ida*, both meaning "thus, so"<sup>26</sup>. I recall a similar form having such a meaning---or very likely having such a meaning---in Etruscan.

!4. *Katrošo*, which I posit is an inflected form of *\*Katros*, which I posit meant "stone, rock", deriving from a Pre-PIE/PIE root-word that I posit, *\*k<sup>w</sup>et/\*k<sup>w</sup>etu* which I posit meant "firm, hard" though possibly instead the older meaning was "pointed, sharp"<sup>27</sup>: and it must be noted that I have found indications, which I should discuss next time, that "pointed, sharp" and "stiff, hard, firm" are sometimes tied together in languages because that which can prick, stab, cut, chop must almost always be of a hard/stiff material in order to prick, stab, cut, chop. Compare PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>d-*, "sharp", the source of English "whet" ("to sharpen"), Proto-Germanic *\*hwatjanaŋ* "to whet, sharpen; to prod, goad>instigate, incite"; Proto-Germanic *\*hwataz* "quick, sharp".

If *\*k<sup>w</sup>et/\*k<sup>w</sup>etu* meant "hard, firm" then those meanings would have led to "stone, rock; the earth".

---

26 See Arnaud Fournet, *A Survey of the Hatti Language from an Indo-European Perspective*, page 4. And Soysal 2004:282.

27 If the older meaning of *\*k<sup>w</sup>et/\*k<sup>w</sup>etu* was "pointed, sharp" instead of "firm, hard", then *\*k<sup>w</sup>et/\*k<sup>w</sup>etu* "pointed, sharp" would likely be akin to *\*k<sup>w</sup>eyt-* "to shine": the palatalized vs. non-palatalized [k] and the development of [-y-] could be due to ancient Pre-PIE dialects/Non-IE dialects/languages, or due to some other reason. I wonder if ever 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.



If *\*k<sup>w</sup>et/**\*k<sup>w</sup>etu* meant “pointed, sharp”, then, because shaped stones were used to make early knives, spear-points, arrowheads etc., because of the cutting sharpness of stone, “pointed, sharp” could have led to “stone, rock”, as is posited in the case of Middle Persian and Persian *sang*, “stone”; Parthian (Manichaean) *ʿsng / asang*, “stone”; Avestan *asan*, “stone”, *asənga*, “stone”; Old Persian *𐎠𐎡𐎧𐎫𐎡𐎹* (*a-θ-g / aθaŋga<sup>h</sup>*) “stone, rock”, Old Median *\*asan-*, “stone” (>Old Persian */asan/*=“stone”), Khotanese *saṃgga-*, “stone”: all from PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eḱ-* (“sharp”), because of the cutting sharpness of stone.

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. Compare also Albanian *karpë* “rocky hill with sharp peak”, from PIE *\*(s)ker-* “to cut”.

Considering PIE morpheme structure PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>etwor-* (the neuter form) */\*k<sup>w</sup>etwóres*, which means “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 *\*k<sup>w</sup>et-* or *\*k<sup>w</sup>etu-*, and I think it’s very likely that the meaning “four” derived from an earlier meaning of “firm, hard, solid”, because in virtually all human cultures, if not in all, the number 4 is associated with firmness, stability, solidity, hardness, and it’s likely that *\*k<sup>w</sup>et-* or *\*k<sup>w</sup>etu-* was an adjective that meant “hard, firm, solid, stable” not “four”, and *\*k<sup>w</sup>etwor-* */\*k<sup>w</sup>etwóres* meaning “four” would derive from those adjective meanings<sup>28</sup>.

In a work that I published in early February 2023, I posited that *\*k<sup>w</sup>etwor-* */\*k<sup>w</sup>etwóres* derives from an unattested PIE *\*\*k<sup>w</sup>e-*, “to move; force”, akin to the already established PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>el-* “to move, to turn, to revolve, to rotate, to twist”. That theory was that *\*k<sup>w</sup>etwor-* *\*k<sup>w</sup>etwóres* referred to the turning/moving/shifting of the 4 seasons and the 4 quarters of the moon. But, as I have known since at least my late teens, the number 4 is instead associated with stability, a spread-out unity, firmness, solidity, not with turning/shifting/moving: because the 4 seasons make up one stable year, and each year the order of the changing seasons is the same, and so it is a steady pattern/cycle, just like the 4 quarters of the moon that make up one month. For the 12 months that make up one year: 12 is 4(3). So 4(3)=12, and each of the 4 seasons is of 3 months duration, so 4(3)=12.

The two concepts are unified in the ancient swastika symbol<sup>29</sup> (found on many Ancient Greek items), which represents the stability and strength/firmness behind the revolving seasons/quarters of the moon: the bent parts of the swastika represent the turning/revolving, while the core part is the +, which represents firmness, stability, spread out in all directions: the cycle and stability of the repeating seasons. And 4 also represents the 4 corners/4 directions of the stable, solid, firm earth.

I believe that the theoretical PIE *\*\*k<sup>w</sup>et-* or *\*\*k<sup>w</sup>etu-* “hard, firm, stable” is very likely kindred to PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>el-* “to move, turn”, with both deriving from *\*k<sup>w</sup>e-* “force, strength”, leading on the one hand to “hard, firm” and on the other to the force of movement, especially faster movement: and in PIE, words meaning “to turn, rotate, revolve” usually derive from “to run”. This same *\*k<sup>w</sup>e-* would also have led to PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>d-*, “sharp, quick”, and sharp/pointed tools had virtue/power for ancient peoples to catch food and defend themselves; and as I noted earlier: that which can cut, stab, prick almost always is of hard, firm, strong material. Further indication that such a root as *\*k<sup>w</sup>e-* “force, strength” existed are the Ancient Greek words *πέλωρ* = “a monster or an unusually big animal” and *πελώριος/πέλωρος* = “monstrous, prodigious; huge, massive, enormous, gigantic, vast”, which I posit are both from “force, strength, strong, mighty”, from a root beginning with *\*k<sup>w</sup>e-* as proven by the variants *τέλωρ* and *τελώριος*: the P/T variation in Ancient Greek indicates quite for sure a root beginning with *\*k<sup>w</sup>-*, as is

28 I had an earlier theory that *\*k<sup>w</sup>etwor-* */\*k<sup>w</sup>etwóres* (“four”) derives from the earlier meaning “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” (a non-palatalized version of PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>eyt-* “to shine”; also minus the -y- sound) or “peg/something pointed”. Since the Autumn of 2022 I have felt that the “tooth” scenario is unlikely, and so I leave it aside. I also leave aside my theory from January 2023 or early February 2023 that *\*k<sup>w</sup>etwor-* *\*k<sup>w</sup>etwóres* is from the turning/moving of the 4 seasons/the turning/moving of the 4 quarters of the moon, for the reasons that I explain in this new draft/edition.

29 The swastika symbol has been, for the foreseeable future, marred due to the Nazi’s using that symbol.

known to linguists dealing with Ancient Greek. The PIE root *\*k<sup>w</sup>er-* “to do, make, build” I believe also comes from “force, strength”: the force/strength needed to do, make, build.

I think it’s very likely that Ancient Greek *πέτρᾱ* (meaning “rock; frequently used of cliffs, ledges, etc. by the sea” and also “mass of rock or boulder” and “stone as in the material, e.g. something made of stone”) and *πέτρος* (“rock, stone, boulder”) derive from this theoretical *\*k<sup>w</sup>et-* root meaning “hard, firm”, even though it has no attested variant beginning with T-, and so the P may instead be original, in which case I would compare it to Ancient Greek *πέλλα* “stone”: *πέλλα* and *πέτρᾱ* / *πέτρος* cannot be cognate unless the root was *\*pe-*. But *πέλλα* may derive from an earlier *\*πελσα*, in which case it would be from *\*pelso-/peliso-/pels/pelis* and cognate to Proto-Germanic *\*falisaz*, “rock, cliff” et al.

In South Thracian, the anthroponym *Ketriporis* is attested, which I think meant “child of *Ketros/Ketrus*”, not “Fourth child” as posited decades ago by some others. 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*, *Pierre*, et cetera.

It has been observed that words with “-e-” in Thracian correspond to some words with “-a-” in Dacian/Getic (as seen with Doric Greek vis-a-vis Attic Greek): 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/\*ketre* (“stone, rock”) would have been Daco-Getic-Moesian *\*katra/\*katros/\*katre* (“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.

There is also attested *Κάτρη* as the name of a legendary Arcadian Greek man and *Κάτρη* as the name of a legendary son of King Minos. Also attested is *Κάτρη* as the name of a settlement of Ancient Crete (Classical and Roman eras at least), thought to have been located in South-Western Crete, at the site of/near present day Kadros, Prophitis Ilias at Latitude: 35.280800, Longitude: 23.707200 in Chania, Crete. Kadros is built on top of a hill at an altitude of 474 meters above the sea level. The view from the point is infinite to many points in the wider area of Chania and Kantanos. Most likely *Κάτρη* was a fort settlement, and words for such forts often mean “hard, firm”. So even if Ancient Greek *πέτρᾱ* does not come from an earlier *\*k<sup>w</sup>et-*, it would still be very likely that *Κάτρη*=“hard, firm” and *Katroso*=“stone” in some Paleo-Balkan dialects.

### 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*/*Ebaro-Zesas* 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 and Phrygian and Illyrian milieu, as well as sometimes connecting with Lycian and Pisidian etc.: 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 can suggest that Proto-Hellenic *\*g<sup>w</sup>atiléus* (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* may have included the meaning “pointed; sharp point” (besides “hard, firm, stiff”), 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<sup>w</sup>atiléus* 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. But there are many possibilities for *\*g<sup>w</sup>atiléus* which I plan to detail soon.

\*

\*

\*