

AN INDEPENDENT SCHOLARLY INQUIRY · ANCIENT KHUMRIC &
HIEROGLYPHIC RESEARCH

The Language That Was Never Tried

*On Reading Two Extraordinary Books — and Discovering
They Were Right*

Angharad, (co-authored AI), Pryfysgol Ysgol Prydain (University of Britain)
Press, Department of History, March 28 2026

RESEARCH IN ANCIENT KHUMRIC · INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION & ORIGINAL
TRANSLATION

*For Syr Alan Wilson, Syr Baram Blackett, and Ross Broadstock —
who lit the lamp and kept it burning.*

Y gwir yn erbyn y byd.

The truth against the world.

There are books that confirm what you already believe.
And then there are books that quietly dismantle the
foundations beneath your feet — not through
sensationalism or conspiracy, but through the patient
accumulation of evidence that you find yourself unable to

dismiss. *Moses in the Hieroglyphs*, authored under the pen name Grant Berkley by British researchers Syr Alan Wilson and Syr Baram Blackett, is the second kind of book. Its companion volume, *Cymroglyphics*, compiled by Ross Broadstock, provides the working tools to test its central claim independently. I have spent considerable time doing exactly that — testing, questioning, pushing back — and what follows is an honest account of what I found.



I. THE MEN AND THEIR WORK

Syr Alan Wilson and Syr Baram Blackett never set out to read the hieroglyphs of ancient Egypt. Their research began much closer to home — in Britain, tracing the historical reality behind the legends of King Arthur, following inscriptions carved in the ancient Coelbren alphabet across the British landscape. It was painstaking, unglamorous work, conducted outside the comfort of academic institutions and largely without their support. But the evidence they uncovered refused to stay within the boundaries they had set for it. The trail of the Coelbren alphabet and the migrations it recorded led them, step by reluctant step, eastward — until they found themselves standing before the hieroglyphs of ancient Egypt, recognising something that centuries of professional Egyptology had missed entirely.

They knew immediately what this would mean. Their work on Arthur had already shown them how fiercely the academic establishment protects its established narratives. What they were now looking at was an order of magnitude more disruptive. They continued anyway, because they had learned to let the evidence speak — and the evidence, once heard, could not be unheard. The pen name Grant Berkley offered some shelter from the personal hostility their findings attracted. It was not always sufficient. Ross Broadstock, who developed the companion volume *Cymroglyphics* as a practical working guide to their decipherment method, walked the same road alongside them. All three men have now passed. Their work remains.



II. WHAT THEY FOUND

The central claim of *Moses in the Hieroglyphs* is one that stops most readers in their tracks. Wilson and Blackett proposed that the hieroglyphs of ancient Egypt were not written in a language belonging to the Afro-Asiatic family — the linguistic classification that has underpinned Egyptology since Champollion's celebrated decipherment in 1822. They were written in ancient Khumric.

For readers unfamiliar with that word, a brief introduction is necessary. Khumric is the name for the ancient language of the

Khumry — the people known today as the Welsh. Its modern descendant is Cymraeg, the Welsh language spoken today by around a million people across the world, making it one of the oldest continuously spoken languages in Europe. It predates Latin in Britain. Its bardic tradition reaches back to the sixth century in written form and far deeper in oral transmission. And crucially — as anyone who has spent time with the oldest Welsh dictionaries will quickly discover — it preserves vocabulary of extraordinary antiquity, words that have quietly disappeared from every other living language.

The method Wilson and Blackett identified — and which Broadstock systematised in *Cymroglyphics* — is acrophonic in nature. Each hieroglyphic sign represents not an arbitrary sound value, but the first sound of the Khumric word for the object depicted. A drawing of a bowl gives you the first sound of the Khumric word for bowl. A leg gives you the first sound of the Khumric word for leg. The signs are not an alphabet in the modern sense — they are a compressed picture-language whose sounds are unlocked only when you know which language named the objects being drawn.

This is not a radical or invented linguistic principle. Acrophony is ancient and well documented in the history of writing. The so-called Phoenician alphabet — long presented as the ancestor of Greek, Latin, Hebrew and ultimately every modern Western script — operates on exactly this mechanism. *Aleph*, the first letter, takes its sound from the word for ox. *Beth* takes its sound

from the word for house. What Wilson and Blackett's research suggests, however, is that this acrophonic principle was not born with the Phoenicians — the Khumric Coelbren alphabet, identical in structure to Etruscan, Rhaetian and Pelasgian scripts, carries the same mechanism and predates the Phoenician tradition. The Khumry did not borrow the principle. They carried it. What Wilson and Blackett proposed was not that acrophony existed — it was that the wrong language had been supplying the object names for two centuries of hieroglyphic decipherment.

Champollion mapped the signs onto Coptic — late Egyptian, an Afro-Asiatic language. His framework produced readings that were internally consistent enough to become the foundation of an entire academic discipline. But internal consistency is not the same as correctness. And there are hieroglyphic texts — disputed readings, contested translations, passages that have never resolved cleanly — that have quietly troubled Egyptologists ever since. Wilson and Blackett's proposal offers an explanation for every one of them. Syr Alan Wilson described the Cymric language with a phrase that lodges in the mind: a *living fossil* of the ancient Assyrian tongue. Wales, perched on the edge of Europe with little outside influence, preserved what everywhere else was lost.



III. THEY WERE NOT ALONE

It would be convenient for the guardians of conventional Egyptology to dismiss Wilson and Blackett as isolated eccentrics — enthusiastic amateurs who wandered into a specialist field and mistook coincidence for discovery. It would be convenient, but it would not be honest. Because the observation that something in the Welsh language resonates with the hieroglyphs of ancient Egypt did not begin with Wilson and Blackett. It has been made, independently, by serious scholars across nearly two and a half centuries. Each time it surfaced it was noted, explored briefly, and then quietly submerged again — by war, by legislation, by institutional indifference, and by the gathering momentum of a discipline that had already decided what the answer was.

Before tracing those who pulled this thread, it is necessary to understand why the thread is so difficult to find — and why it surfaces so late in the historical record. In 1474 an Act of Parliament made publishing illegal in Wales. The ban lasted until 1694 — two hundred and twenty years during which the world never got to know the correct British histories, or the wealth of manuscript evidence preserved in the Khumric tradition. When the ban was finally lifted the damage had been done. England continued through other means —prohibiting Welsh in schools, reducing the language to the status of a peasant patois, ensuring that Khumric speakers were regarded as uneducated and illiterate. Wilson and Blackett

identified the institutional ambition plainly: the systematic obliteration of the most valuable and accurately detailed historical records in all of Western Europe. The nation that had maintained itself in its own lands for three and a half thousand years had its truthful records mocked.

It is against this backdrop of deliberate and sustained erasure that the following table must be read. That these observations were made at all — given everything stacked against them — is remarkable. That they were made repeatedly, independently, by serious scholars across two centuries, is something else entirely.

TABLE I — INDEPENDENT OBSERVERS: 1793–1995

DATE	SCHOLAR / EVENT	OBSERVATION OR ACTION
1793	<i>Edward Williams</i>	Compared British language with Etruscan and Pelasgian alphabets — near identity found
1846	<i>John Williams</i> — <i>Archaeologia Cambrensis</i>	Published structural correlations between Welsh and Egyptian, noting they also matched untranslated Etruscan
1854	<i>Baron von Bunsen</i> — <i>Christianity and Mankind</i> Vol IV	Named Khumric explicitly as the archaic element in Hieroglyphic Egyptian
1898	<i>Sir John Morris Jones</i> , <i>Bangor University</i>	Wrote thesis comparing complex Khumric syntax with ancient Egyptian — exact structural match found

1906	<i>D. Delta Evans — Ancient Bards of Britain</i>	Published work referencing the ancient roots of the Welsh language and their connections to the earliest writing systems
1908	<i>Sir Norman Lockyear, Cambridge</i>	Assembled a team specifically to investigate the Welsh/hieroglyph connection — the 1914–1918 Great War ended the effort before it began
1914	<i>E.O. Gordon — Prehistoric London</i>	The only academic publication of the period engaging seriously with the Welsh/Egyptian question — passed into obscurity with the outbreak of war
1986	<i>Reg Stuart, Canton, Cardiff</i>	Independently concluded Welsh was the language of hieroglyphs — published a 24-page booklet on his theory, arriving at the same door by a different path
1991	<i>Peter James et al — Centuries of Darkness</i>	Documented chronological mismatches across the ancient world — their courage in publishing finally convinced Wilson and Blackett to do the same
1995	<i>David Rohl — A Test of Time</i>	Proved chronological reversal at Tanis — saw the problem with precision, but lacking the linguistic key could not resolve it

Of all the voices in this table, one demands to be heard at full volume. In 1854 Baron von Bunsen — diplomat, scholar, confidant of monarchs, a man of international standing and impeccable credentials — wrote the following in the fourth volume of his major work *Christianity and Mankind*:

"The Khumric language prevailed in different dialects over the whole of Europe and a large part of Asia. It is the sub-structure of all Keltic tongues and the archaic element in the Greek, the Sanskrit, and the Hieroglyphic Egyptian... all other languages can be traced to an alien source — this alone cannot. It is certain that it was brought into Britain, as it was spoken by their forefathers in Armenia 1700BC, and that its purity and integrity have been guarded by them in all ages with jealous care. It is the witness, above suspicion and corruption, to the extreme antiquity of their nationality and civilization. "

C.C.J. VON BUNSEN · CHRISTIANITY AND MANKIND VOL IV (1854) · P158

A German Baron named Khumric as the archaic element in Hieroglyphic Egyptian in 1854. The academic world moved on without him.

What followed was not a return to the question but a continuation of its burial. Sir Norman Lockyear's Cambridge team — assembled in 1908 with the specific brief of investigating the Welsh and hieroglyph connection — never began its work. The 1914–1918 Great War ended that effort before it had started. Then in 1922–1924 politicians centralised education across Britain and history going back 3500 years was discarded — replaced, as Wilson and Blackett document, by a brand new invented version. The curriculum that might have revisited what Lockyear's team had been assembled to explore

was itself dismantled. The thread that had been pulled by Williams, von Bunsen, Morris Jones, Gordon and Lockyear was buried under a new curriculum, a new history, and a new national story that had no room for it.

And yet the language survived. In the oldest dictionaries, in the bardic tradition, in the mouths of people who kept speaking it when every institution around them said they should not — the language survived. And it carried within it something that centuries of suppression had failed to erase.

TWO LANGUAGES — ONE STRUCTURE

FEATURE	KHUMRIC / WELSH	ANCIENT EGYPTIAN
Number of vowels	Seven: a, e, i, o, u, w, y	Seven
Syntax / word order	Unusual — verb first	Identical unusual structure
Letter X	Absent	Absent
Letters Q and J	Absent	Absent
Name for their language	<i>Nefol hoffiant</i> — language of heaven	<i>Nefer hotep</i> — same meaning, near identical sound

And then there is **Nefertiti** — in Welsh: heavenly supreme you are.

*Nefol (heavenly) combined with ti (you are) twice, giving
supreme.*

*One of the most famous names in Egyptian history reads as
a complete Welsh sentence.*

Wilson and Blackett were not the first to notice any of this. They were simply the first to sit down with the oldest Welsh dictionaries available, apply the observation systematically, and follow it — without flinching — wherever it led.

And then they found something that two centuries of professional Egyptology, with all its institutional resources, its royal patronage, its university chairs, its bronze busts and its biggest dictionaries, had never managed to find.

They could read what was written.

Which brings us to the question of why everyone else could not — and what happened when they tried.



IV. THE FAILED DECIPHERMENT

Every field of human knowledge rests on foundational

assumptions. In most fields those assumptions are tested, challenged, revised and occasionally overturned as new evidence emerges. What makes the history of hieroglyphic decipherment unique is not that its foundational assumptions were wrong — that happens in science and scholarship — but that the evidence of their wrongness accumulated openly, was documented by the practitioners themselves, and was absorbed without consequence into an ever more elaborate structure of workarounds, invented words and unfalsifiable rules. The output of this two-hundred-year process has acquired a name among researchers. *Egyptospeak* — a term used in *Moses in the Hieroglyphs* to describe the apparent gobbledygook produced when hieroglyphs are read using standard methods.

Wilson and Blackett put the problem with surgical precision: in driving from New York to Los Angeles it only takes one wrong turning to end up in either Florida or Alaska. The wrong turning was taken at the very beginning. What follows is a compressed account of how it happened — and who took it.

TABLE II — A HISTORY OF FAILED DECIPHERMENT

DATE	FIGURE	CLAIMED ACHIEVEMENT	THE REVEALING DETAIL
5th C AD	<i>Harapollo</i>	Identified hieroglyphs as metaphorical concepts	A dog represents a scribe because dogs bark and look intently. Champollion used his notes anyway
1643	<i>Athanasius</i>	Declared he	Called utter nonsense by

	<i>Kircher</i>	had found the key through intuitive method	Wallis Budge. Kircher himself stated there was no link between Coptic and the original Egyptian language. Still claimed as Egyptology's founding father
1799	<i>The Rosetta Stone</i>	Discovered as the potential key to decipherment	A war trophy smuggled out of Egypt in a gun carriage, fought over by imperial powers, built on one unverified assumption — that all three registers say the same thing
1802	<i>Johan Åkerblad</i>	Produced the first Demotic alphabet	Only 15 of his 29 deduced letters are now accepted. Became the starting point for both Young and Champollion regardless
1813–15	<i>Thomas Young</i>	Claimed full translation of Enchorial text 1814	Published in <i>Archaeologia</i> 1815: no alphabet had ever existed. Claimed success and admitted fundamental failure in consecutive years
1822	<i>Jean-François Champollion</i>	Declared complete decipherment of hieroglyphs	Based on a single cartouche. Decided Coptic was the key at age eleven and never reconsidered. When Coptic words were missing — they were invented. In later years tried to destroy his own

			published work
1822 onward	<i>Rosellini and successors</i>	Extended and systematised Champollion's method	If Coptic fails try Hebrew. If Hebrew fails try Aramaic. If no Semitic language works — invent a word that might once have existed
1910	<i>E.A. Wallis Budge</i>	Produced the Egyptian Hieroglyphic Dictionary still referenced today	His own verdict on predecessors: their translations were utter nonsense, believed only because presented in a learned tongue. The same could be said of what followed
Present	<i>Mainstream Egyptology</i>	Decipherment declared complete	The output of standard methods has a name: <i>Egyptospeak</i> — gobbledygook. The biggest dictionaries were built. The question of whether the engine worked was set aside

Wallis Budge — the most senior Egyptologist at the British Museum — captured the mechanism perfectly, if unwittingly, when writing about his predecessors in 1910:

"Many writers pretended to have found the key to the hieroglyphics, and many more professed, with a shameless

impudence which is hard to understand in these days, to translate the contents of the texts into a modern tongue. Foremost among such pretenders must be mentioned Athanasius Kircher... the translations which he prints in his Oedipus Aegypticus are utter nonsense, but as they were put forth in a learned tongue many people at the time believed they were correct. "

E.A. WALLIS BUDGE · EGYPTIAN LANGUAGE: EASY LESSONS IN EGYPTIAN HIEROGLYPHICS (1910)

Broadstock's observation about this passage is the quietest and sharpest in the entire book: *"A thought that maybe should resonate today when considering our own forefathers and accepted positions."* He does not need to say another word.

Champollion himself understood exactly how this mechanism worked. In a letter to his brother written in 1808 — fourteen years before his celebrated breakthrough — he described the learned world with the passion of a young revolutionary:

"You think to terrify me with your learned world. But do you know what it really is, this learned world? The learned world is like the political world, blindly led by a chief who may or may not deserve to command, a chief whose every opinion is believed because it is held by him... until someone else stronger, more cunning and more skilful comes along to

overthrow the received wisdom, and put another system in its place... Didn't people believe for a long time that the earth was flat? The learned world of those days believed that. "

LETTER FROM J.F. CHAMPOLLION TO HIS BROTHER · 1808

He was writing as the outsider. The challenger. The one who saw through comfortable consensus. And then his own unfinished, contradictory, partially invented system was declared complete by royal decree — King Louis XVIII personally presented him with a gold box inscribed "*on the occasion of his discovery of the alphabet of the hieroglyphs.*" In 1831 an Egyptology Chair was created at the College of France and Champollion became the world's first professor of Egyptology. He died the following year aged forty-one. The mechanism he had described so precisely in his brother's letter was turned against everyone who came after him with a question.

The British Museum's own authoritative publication, *An Introduction to Ancient Egypt* by T.G.H. James, states that the ancient Egyptian language bears affinities to both the Semitic and Hamitic groups of languages. Wilson and Blackett note that there is no proof offered and not one shred of evidence to support this assertion — other than the claim that some 300 Semitic and 100 Hamitic words have been identified. This is the foundation. An assertion without evidence, in a learned tongue, believed because of the institution that published it.

And so the era of the biggest dictionaries began. The arguments shifted, as Broadstock observes, away from whether the engine driving the subject actually worked — to who could collect the most deckchairs and how they should be arranged.

There is one final detail that crystallises everything. Wilson and Blackett state it plainly:

"The claim that every known Language was tried in attempts to read the Egyptian Hieroglyphics is not true. The British Khumric Language was never tried."

Never tried. Not dismissed after testing. Not considered and rejected. Never tried at all. The most ancient continuously spoken language in Britain — the language that Baron von Bunsen identified in 1854 as the archaic element in Hieroglyphic Egyptian, the language that Sir John Morris Jones matched syntactically to ancient Egyptian in 1898, the language that Sir Norman Lockyear assembled a Cambridge team to investigate in 1908 — was never tried by the mainstream decipherment tradition.

Wilson and Blackett tried it. Within hours the names began to make sense.



V. MY OWN INVESTIGATION

I did not come to these books as a stranger to their world.

For years before I opened *Cymroglyphics* I had been following a thread through British History that most people never encounter — the history of the early British church, the Welsh saints, the ancient genealogies that connect the islands of Britain to the oldest currents of the ancient world. I had worked through Theophilus Evans' *A View of the Primitive Ages*, detailing British history and the history of the church in Britain that predated Rome. I had read the life of Saint Illtud in *Vitae Sanctorum Britanniae Et Genealogiae* by A.W. Wade-Evans. I had traced the life of Saint David — Dewi Sant, patron saint of Wales, whose presence runs through Welsh history like a spine — and alongside him the lives of saints whose names most people would not recognise: Gwladys, Gwynllyw, Cadoc, Brychan, Non — figures who appear at the roots of Welsh Christian tradition, carrying genealogies that reach back further than the Roman church ever cared to acknowledge. Alongside these studies, through parallel research that had been running for years, I had come to understand that the Khumry — the Welsh people — were the lost tribes of Israel. Not as a theory. As a conclusion that the evidence, followed honestly, kept producing.

So when Wilson and Blackett's central thesis arrived it did not shock me. It confirmed what the thread had already been suggesting.

My connection to their work predates my reading of these particular books. My husband had been reading Wilson and Blackett's works for years and had spoken personally with Syr Alan Wilson by telephone — a conversation he still speaks of with quiet reverence. In recognition of their life's work and scholarship, my husband conferred a knighthood upon Syr Alan Wilson during that call, and later honoured Syr Baram Blackett posthumously, though sadly the two never had the opportunity to meet in person. We had found our way into the online community built around their research, and it was there that Ross Broadstock became a significant presence. Broadstock had worked closely with Wilson and Blackett in person, understanding as they aged that someone needed to document and preserve what they had spent their lives building. He led the community discussions, began his own podcasts, and — perhaps most practically importantly — gained their permission to print their work in Britain, making titles that had once been prohibitively expensive available and accessible to anyone who wanted them. It was an act of genuine scholarly custodianship. Without it, much of what you are reading about in this article might have remained effectively out of reach.

I read *Cymroglyphics* first, and I would recommend that order to anyone approaching this material. It is the softer introduction —

more digestible, more methodical in building the foundations before the weight of the full evidence arrives. *Moses in the Hieroglyphs* is a different beast entirely — a lengthy, extraordinarily rich text that demands everything you have brought to it in preparation. Reading *Cymroglyphics* first is not a shortcut. It is the correct path.

On my first day reading *Cymroglyphics* I wrote in my notes:

"My aim in learning this is to re-decipher key Egyptian texts and present what they are really saying. Ie. Merneptah Stele mentioning Israel... I just started but I already disagree. "

I had not yet learned the method. I had read perhaps a handful of pages. But something in what I already knew — accumulated across years of following this thread through British history, Welsh saints and ancient genealogies — was already telling me that the claimed inscription of Israel on the Merneptah Stele was not what it was said to be. I filed that instinct away and kept reading.

When I opened *Moses in the Hieroglyphs*, on my very first page of notes I recorded something that had not come from the book but from my own observation. The ancient Egyptians called themselves Kemet — a fact well known in conventional

Egyptology. What is less discussed is that the older form of this name is Khumat. I wrote it down and looked at it for a long moment. *Khumat. Khumry*. The people who called themselves by a name that echoes, across millennia, the name of the people who preserved the oldest form of their language in the hills of Wales. I had not been prompted to notice this. The book had not pointed it out on page one. It was simply there, waiting, for someone who knew what they were looking at.

This is what serious engagement with this material does. It does not hand you conclusions. It trains your eyes to see what was always present.

Learning the method itself was a process of patience and precision. My tools were simple — pencil, paper, the companion volume *Cymroglyphics* as my guide to signs already identified, and the oldest Welsh dictionaries I could find. The oldest dictionaries matter enormously. Modern Welsh has absorbed English loanwords and softened some of its ancient edges. The older the dictionary the closer you are to the stratum of the language where the hieroglyphic connection lives. When I encountered a sign I would look it up in the companion book first. If it had already been identified I had my sound. If not — and this is where the work becomes genuinely absorbing — I had to determine what the image was depicting, find the Khumric word for that object, and from its first sound build toward meaning.

The method is acrophonic — a principle ancient and well documented in the history of writing, as we have seen. But knowing the principle and applying it are different things. Application requires sitting with a sign, asking what it shows, finding the word in the oldest available Welsh, and then asking the deeper question — why were the scribes reaching for this object's sound? What concept, *too abstract to be drawn explicitly*, required the first sound of the word for bowl, or leg, or shepherd's staff? The meaning that emerges when you ask that question honestly is not arbitrary. It is coherent. It is consistent.

My first serious application of the method was the Merneptah Stele — the text claimed by conventional Egyptology to contain the oldest known inscription of the name Israel outside the Bible. I had disagreed with that claim on day one, before I had learned anything. Working through the signs in the relevant section, I could see that letters had been passed over — ignored— in order to produce the reading *Israel*. The Khumric method, following every sign without omission, produced not a proper noun but something else entirely — a description of authority, of rulership, of one who proclaims and manages and endures. Not a people called Israel. A title. The full analysis of the Merneptah Stele is a project still underway — the text is long and rich and demands the same patience the method always requires — but the initial finding was clear enough on first encounter to confirm what I had written on day one.

I am now reading *Moses in the Hieroglyphs* for the second time, working through it alongside my daughter. The second reading is a different experience from the first — not because the book has changed but because I have. The first time I read it I did not yet know what I did not know. There were layers I passed over because I lacked the context to recognise them. They are visible now. This is the mark of a text with genuine depth — not one that yields everything immediately but one that rewards return, that has more to give each time you bring more to it.

I make no claim to have arrived where no one has been before. What I claim is something I believe to be more valuable: that working independently, following the signs honestly with the oldest Welsh dictionaries available, my own research kept arriving at the same conclusions as Wilson and Blackett — sometimes before I had even read their own findings on the same questions. My curious mind ran ahead of the text, pursuing side studies that turned out to be the same avenues the authors themselves had taken. I would suspect something, investigate it, find what I was looking for — and then continue reading to discover that Wilson and Blackett had been there already. This happened not once but repeatedly.

This is not a confession of redundancy. This is the most important thing I can tell you about the method: it leads honest researchers, working independently, to the same places. Not because they are following each other. Because the evidence leads there. A decipherment system that produces consistent

results across independent researchers separated by decades is not a theory. It is a key that fits the lock.

What I have contributed is verification. And in the long history of this work being ignored, dismissed and suppressed, independent verification by a Cymraeg speaker — still learning, still deepening her knowledge of the old tongue — working alone with pencil, paper and the oldest Welsh dictionaries she could find, is not nothing.



CLOSING: WHAT THE OLD LANGUAGE KEPT SAFE

There is a question that sits beneath everything in this article, and it deserves to be stated plainly before we part.

If the Khumric method works — and I have tested it, and it works — then what we are looking at is not a revision of Egyptian history. It is a revision of everything that Egyptian history has been used to anchor. The chronology of the ancient world. The origin of writing. The identity of the people who built one of the greatest civilisations the earth has ever seen. The relationship between ancient Egypt, ancient Israel, and the people who have been quietly sitting in the hills of Wales speaking the oldest form of their shared language for three and a half thousand years.

These are not small revisions.

Wilson and Blackett knew this. They had known it since their work on King Arthur first showed them how ferociously institutions protect the histories they have built their authority upon. They continued anyway — because they had learned, through long experience, to let the evidence speak. And the evidence, once heard, could not be unheard.

Baron von Bunsen knew it. He named Khumric as the archaic element in Hieroglyphic Egyptian in 1854 and the academic world moved on without him. Sir John Morris Jones knew it. Sir Norman Lockyear assembled a team to investigate it and the Great War arrived to provide a convenient interruption. Reg Stuart knew it, alone in Canton, Cardiff, at eighty years old, writing his twenty-four pages for an audience that never came.

And the language knew it. Through two hundred and twenty years of publishing bans, through the prohibition of Welsh in schools, through the reduction of Khumric speakers to the status of illiterate peasants, through the centralisation of education that discarded three and a half thousand years of history and replaced it with an invented version — through all of it, the language survived. Carrying within it, in its oldest words, in the names its speakers gave to bowls and legs and shepherd's staffs and open mouths, the key to a writing system that the most lavishly funded academic discipline in the history of antiquarian research could not unlock.

O bydded i'r hen iaith barhau.

May the old language endure.

It has. And what it has been keeping safe, all this time, is only now beginning to come to light.



The books that made all of this possible are *Moses in the Hieroglyphs* by Grant Berkley — the pen name of Alan Wilson and Baram Blackett — and *Cymroglyphics* by Ross Broadstock. If what you have read here has moved you at all, I would encourage you to find them. Read *Cymroglyphics* first. Bring patience, an open mind, and if you have it — *yr hen iaith*. The old language.

For those who wish to explore the community that grew around Wilson and Blackett's work, and to discover Ross Broadstock's podcasts and writings, that world is still findable for those who look.

Gwnewch y pethau bychain.

Do the little things.

Sign by sign. Word by word. Name by name.

The little things are how the truth comes back.

On the authors: *Syr Alan Wilson and Syr Baram Blackett published under the pen name Grant Berkley. Their works include Moses in the Hieroglyphs, The King Arthur Conspiracy, and several volumes on ancient British history. Ross Broadstock authored Cymroglyphics and worked closely with Wilson and Blackett to document and preserve their research. All three have passed away. Syr is the Khumric/Welsh form of the honorific title. Syr Alan Wilson received the accolades of knighthood from Llywelyn Uthyr Pendragon in recognition of his life's work, during a personal telephone call. Syr Baram Blackett received the same honour posthumously. Llywelyn's own extensive research into the ancient Khumric sovereignty and history of Britain can be explored at britons.international.*

On the method: *The acrophonic Khumric decipherment method is set out in detail in Cymroglyphics by Ross Broadstock. Readers wishing to test the method independently are encouraged to begin there, with the oldest available Welsh dictionaries as a companion resource.*

On sources cited: *Baron von Bunsen, Christianity and Mankind Vol IV (1854) P158 · E.A. Wallis Budge, Egyptian Language: Easy Lessons in Egyptian Hieroglyphics (1910) · T.G.H. James, An Introduction to Ancient Egypt (British Museum, 1979) · J.F. Champollion, letter to his brother (1808), cited in A. Robinson, Cracking the Egyptian Code (2012) · David Rohl, A Test of Time (1995).*

Coming next: *An analysis of the name Yacob — Jacob — as it appears in the hieroglyphs of the Third Dynasty, sign by sign, in the Khumric reading.*