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Notes on catalogue entries

Designation of items

Where multiple inscriptions are associated with the same site, I have retained the numbering used in my sources. Occasionally there is disagreement about the numbering of items (as in the case of the two items from Neudingen-Baar) or their designation (the Bezenye finds are referred to in the older literature by the German name Pallersdorf, for example). Where necessary, I have added a note below the heading.

Concordance

For items which appear in existing catalogues, catalogue numbers are given here. For items from Looijenga (2003a), I give the chapter number in Roman numerals, followed by the item number within the chapter.

Find-site

This section includes latitude and longitude co-ordinates, rounded to the nearest minute.

Context

Where information is available about the context of the find, brief comments and references are given here.
Provenance

This section includes information about the cultural/ethnic classification of the region and the find-site; the place of manufacture of the object; and/or the possible linguistic classification of the inscription. These types of information are frequently conflated in the literature (especially in older sources). I have attempted to be as clear as possible about the type of evidence being presented.

Datings

The date-ranges proposed for a find are arranged in chronological order of source (on the grounds that more recent authors have access to more information, and in some cases to more precise and reliable methods of dating). Here, as in the Provenance section, we find a certain amount of ambiguity about evidence: many sources do not state explicitly whether the proposed dating refers to a burial, or to the manufacture of the object, or to the production of the inscription. Where additional information about the type and nature of dating is available, I have commented on it briefly.

Readings

Where I am quoting transliterations from different authors, I adhere for the most part to their own formats and divisions of the text. However, I have normalised the transliteration of Þ as ð (although the sources use a wide range of symbols, reflecting the disagreement about the original value of the rune – see text, §5.2.4); Þ as z; and ø as ŋ (where some authors (e.g., Antonsen 1975)
use **ng** to reflect the view that that the rune represents two segments */ng/ = [ŋg]).\(^1\) In my own transliterations, I use the following conventions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>| or |</td>
<td>physical break in the inscribed surface;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>illegible sign (where some sources use x or other marks);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>unknown amount of illegible material;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dot below</td>
<td>uncertain or disputed reading;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parentheses</td>
<td>uncertain whether a rune is present or not;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capitals</td>
<td>Roman letters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where multiple readings exist for an inscription, I have listed them in chronological order. In the main text I use my own “synthetic” reading. In general, I favour the majority transliteration of disputed signs, unless the majority view has been discredited, or on the few occasions where I am confident that it is open to serious doubt. In these cases, the rune is transliterated with a dot below to indicate that the reading is not certain.

Where I see no strong basis for a decision, I follow the practice of (*inter alios*) Nedoma (2004a) and give the alternatives superscripted and subscripted, divided by a stroke, e.g., ³⁴.

In my own synthetic readings, text-dividers and other paratextual marks are represented as a single dot where the source has a single dot, and otherwise

---

\(^1\) In dealing with various authors’ treatment of this rune, we should bear in mind that here more than elsewhere, runologists have been inconsistent in distinguishing between form, transliteration, and phonemic and phonetic value (Barnes 1994:18-19).
with a colon. The sources use various signs such as ’≡ for various paratextual marks. I have not attempted to distinguish between these.

**Images**

In addition to the various drawings and photographs available in the published literature, I have also had access to high-resolution digital photographs of some items, kindly provided to me by Michelle Waldispühl at the Universität Zürich, who with her colleagues has been engaged in detailed re-examination of many of the items. At the time of writing, none of these images has been published. In the individual catalogue entries, I refer to them as “Waldispühl (pers.comm.)”. 
1. Aalen

Concordance

L VII.1.

Object

Silver gilt neckring with almandine inlay.

Find-site

Aalen, Ostalbkreis, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48°50’ N, 10°06’ E).
The precise find-spot is unknown.

Context


Provenance

Martin (2004:173) notes that the object is atypical in Alamannia; a similar neckring (without runes), dated to the 5th century, was found in a woman’s grave at Herrenberg (Kr. Böblingen). According to Looijenga, neckrings of this sort, “Celtic and classical Roman in origin” (2003a:226), were known across Europe and centred on the Main (see also Wamers 2000).

The inscription could plausibly be PNorse or WGmc (see text, §4.1).

Datings

400-450 or mid-5th century (Düwel 1987; 1994b:295).

Possibly late 5th or early 6th century. The object shows signs of having been in use for some time before it found its way into the ground (Nedoma 1999a:11; 2000:24; 2004a:390).
1. Aalen

400-450; almandine inlay added some time in 6th century (Looijenga 2003a:226).

**Location of inscription**

Inner edge (Looijenga 2003a:226).

On the back, opposite the clasp, running left to right (Düwel 1987:12; Martin 2004:173; Nedoma 2004a:389).

**Readings**


**References**


**Images**

Looijenga (2003a plate 14a) (photograph); Wamers (2000, *passim*) (drawings and photographs).

2. Aquincum

**Concordance**

An 102; KJ 7; O 1; L VII.2; RMR F4.

**Object**

Silver gilt bow fibula.

**Find-site**
Near the entrance to the amphitheatre at Aquincum (Budapest, Hungary) (47° 30’ N, 19° 05’ E).

**Context**

Part of a hoard, excavated in 1940. The hoard included a matching fibula with various non-runic signs carved on the back (Krause 1966:23).

**Provenance**

Looijenga (2003a:226), following Krause (1966:26), designates the item “probably Langobardic”. Martin rejects this on stylistic and chronological grounds, and states that it is typical of bow fibulae manufactured in the Danube region and therefore of “East Germanic” origin (2004:170).

Antonsen (1975:102) classifies the inscription as WGmc, though he does not state his reasons (linguistic or otherwise).

**Datings**

c.530 (Krause 1966:23).


Martin does not date the Aquincum fibulae directly, but the finds he offers as parallels (see Provenance) are dated mid-late 5th century (2004:170).


**Location of inscription**

On the back. Complex II is to the right of the pin-holder; complex I runs parallel to it. Looijenga (2003a:227) states that the pin-holder was added after the runes were cut. She concludes that the inscription might have been made during the production process, and that the first part of it is covered by the pin-holder. Both complexes are read left to right.
2. Aquincum

Readings


The n-rune in complex II seems sufficiently clear to me (from Krause’s photograph) that I am content to reject Looijenga’s reading g. The ŋ-rune in this inscription has the so-called “lantern” form ℓ.

Synthetic reading: [I] fuþarkgw  [II] ?lain:kŋia

References


Images

Krause (1966 Taf. 4) (photograph); Martin (2004:169 Abb. 1) (drawing).

3. †Arguel

Concordance

O Anhang.

Object

Limestone pebble.

Find-site
3. †Arguel

Besançon (near Arguel), Franche-Comté, France (47° 15’ N, 6° 02’ E).

**Context**

Stray find, near a spring at the foot of the Arguel rock. The find was first published in 1921 (Bizet 1964:41).

**Provenance**

Bizet identifies the inscription as probably Burgundian (Bizet 1964:41). Arguel is about 100km northeast of Charnay, find-site of another inscription (no. 16) to which a Burgundian identity and EGmc dialect features have been ascribed.

**Datings**

5th century (Bizet 1964:49; Opitz 1987:52). This dating is a tentative one, based on Bizet’s identification of the inscription as Burgundian, and on his interpretation of the text as a heathen charm. The Burgundians were probably Arian Christians by the end of the 4th century (Anton 1981:240), but heathen practices may have continued after their conversion.

**Location of inscription**

Complexes I-IV on one face of the stone, complex V on the other side. All are read left to right, and are separated by spaces in the transliterations (the numbering of the complexes is mine).

**Readings**

arbitah wodan luoiphanglei kim (Bizet 1964:45).

arbitag wodan luïgowhaŋ zej kim (Opitz 1987:53).

arbitag:wodan:luïgo(1?)haŋzej:kim (Kiel).
The discrepancies between Bizet and Opitz do not reflect divergent readings of rune forms, but are a matter of transcription (or rather, of Bizet's failure to distinguish between transliteration and transcription). They agree on the reading of the forms, but not the assignment of sound-values to them. Bizet reads ḷ at R.7 and 16, but transliterates it ħ because he believes it to represent /h/ (1964:44; see text, §3.1.1). Similarly, he reads R.15 as ǣ, but transliterates it as i rather than ĩ. Bizet is not claiming that a regular ƿ-rune is present here. The transliteration of R.22 as r rather than z is motivated by the common practice of transliterating it R (intended to represent an intermediate stage between PGmc */z/ and OIc /r/) in Scandinavian inscriptions. Bizet argues that, at least in the present inscription, this rune varies freely with ḷ for the phoneme /r/.


References


Images

4. Arlon

Concordance
AZ 42; KJ 146; L VII.3; O 2; RMR D6.

Object
Silver capsule.

Find-site
Arlon, Prov. Luxembourg, Belgium (49° 41’ N, 5° 49’ E).

Context
Female grave (no. 17) in a small row-gravefield, excavated in 1936 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:431; Krause 1966:286). The inscription was discovered in 1938, after the capsule had been cleaned (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:432).

Provenance
Designated Frankish by Arntz and Zeiss (1939:431), Krause (1966:286), and Fischer and Lémant (2003:242, 244).

Datings
650-700 (Werner, cited by Arntz and Zeiss 1939:432 (Zeiss does not commit himself to any more precise dating than 7th century); Opitz 1987:8).
600-633 (Roosens and Alenus-Lecerf 1965:15, 76; McKinnell et al. 2004:63 (rounding off the end of the range to 630)).
Mid 7th century. (Krause 1966:287; Fischer and Lémant 2003:244). This dating is based on comparison with other capsules from the Middle Rhine region.
600-650 (Looijenga 2003a:227).


**Location of inscription**

Running around the middle of the capsule, left to right.

**Readings**

godun : ṷlo : ṭes : rasuwa(.)müş( nu, nu)d( :?)worth(br)oph…g (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:435).


godun o e srasuwa(m)ud wo?g(f) (Looijenga 2003a:227).

godun - - e srasuwa - udwo?oph (Fischer and Lémant 2003:245).


godun(?) y(0-1?)(u)lo ' ṭe(0-1?)s ' rasuwa(1-2? u)d(0-1?)wo(1-2?)oph[?] (0-1?) (Kiel).

The suggestion that a bind-rune un/nu follows rasuwan is peculiar to Arntz. Krause mentions that the stave is crossed by a diagonal mark, but he dismisses it as meaningless or accidental (1966:286). I have transliterated the later bind-rune as br rather than rh or a simplex r in accordance with the opinio communis, rather than as an assertion of my own (see Nedoma 1992 for further discussion).

Synthetic reading: godun : (?)ṷlo : ṭes : rasuwan(?)worth(oph)(...)
4. Arlon

References


Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 38) (photographs); Fischer and Lémant (2003:264) (drawings).

5. Aschheim II

Aschheim I is a bow fibula with an uninterpretable inscription – see Appendix 1.

Concordance

None.

Object

Silver disc fibula.

Find-site

Aschheim, Kr. München, Bavaria, Germany (48° 10’ N, 11° 43’ E).

Context

Female grave (no. 221) in the Aschheim-Bajuwarenring row-gravefield. Graves 220 and 221 form a double burial (Düwel 2003c:13 notes that this
5. Aschheim II

gravefield contains numerous multiple burials, which may be the graves of plague victims).

**Provenance**

No specific comments in the available literature. The site is in Bavarian territory.

**Datings**

Mid-late 6th century (Düwel 2003c:11).

Undated, but probably c.550 (Nedoma 2004a:271).

**Location of inscription**

On the back of the fibula, running left to right.

**Readings**

kan (Düwel 2003c:11; Kiel).

**References**


**Images**


---

6. Aschheim III

**Concordance**

None.

**Object**
Silver S-fibula.

**Find-site**

See 5. Aschheim II.

**Context**

Female grave (no. 49) in the same gravefield as Aschheim II. Graves 48-50 form a triple burial.

**Provenance**

See Aschheim II.

**Datings**

Mid-late 6th century (Düwel 2003c:12). Nedoma (2004a:271) notes that no definite date has been established.

**Location of inscription**

On the back of the fibula, running left to right.

**Readings**

đađo (Düwel 2003c:12; Kiel; Nedoma 2004a:271).

Düwel and Nedoma both accept the reading of the first three runes as dad as reasonably reliable, even though the metal is badly corroded.

**References**


**Images**

Düwel (2003c:12, 13) (drawings).
7. Bad Ems

Concordance

AZ 12; KJ 142; L VII.4; Ma B6; O 14; Sch F.

Object

Fragment of a silver gilt bow fibula.

Find-site

Bad Ems, Rhein-Lahn-Kreis, Rheinland Pfalz, Germany (50° 20’ N, 7° 43’ E).

Context

Found by workmen in 1878. The precise circumstances are not known; Zeiss speculates that a row-gravefield may have existed in the area (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:193).

Provenance

Designated Frankish by Arntz and Zeiss (1939:193), and by Krause (1966:281).

Datings

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:193) cite various datings in earlier and contemporary literature, ranging from 6th-8th centuries.

- c.600 (Krause 1966:282).

Nedoma (2004a:369) describes this dating as erroneous, but does not explain why.
7. Bad Ems


**Location of inscription**

On the back of the footplate, either side of the pin; both complexes run left to right.

**Readings**


madali(1?):ubada (Kiel).

The sign here marked \(\times\) (Nedoma \(\equiv\)) is a small cross, which Krause identifies as a word-separator (1966:282). It is about a third the height of the preceding runes, so unlikely to be a \(g\) (as proposed by Klingenberg 1974:126 Anm.40). Looijenga (2003a:228) suggests that it might be a Christian symbol. Opitz (1987:18) does not mark this sign in his reading, but he later suggests that it is either a Christian cross or a Greek letter \(X\) for \(ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ\) (1987:133-134). With the orientation of the symbol and its reduced size in mind, I share Nedoma’s (2004a:370) scepticism about the cross-interpretation; Opitz’ suggestion of a Greek abbreviation (partial Christogram?) is likewise unjustified.

Synthetic reading: [I] madali? [II] ubada
7. Bad Ems

References


Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 10) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 61) (photographs); Krause and Werner (1935:329, 331) (drawing and photographs).

8. Bad Krozingen A

[The paired fibula (Bad Krozingen B) has a single sign (f-rune?) on the back; see Appendix 1.]

Concordance

None.

Object

Almandined silver gilt disc fibula.

Find-site


Context

Female grave (no. 172) in a small gravefield excavated in 2001 (Fingerlin 1998:200; Fingerlin et al. 2004:226). The quality of the fibulae and other
grave-goods indicate that the woman was of high social standing (Düwel 2002b:14; Fingerlin et al. 2004:226).

**Provenance**

The design of the fibulae suggests that they were manufactured in the Frankish Rhineland; the woman who owned them may have been a migrant from that region, or have married into a small Frankish elite ruling a predominantly Alamannic population (Düwel 2002b:14; Fingerlin 1999:30; Fingerlin et al. 2004:226, 242-243).

**Datings**

The grave is dated to c.600 (Düwel 2002b:14; Fingerlin et al. 2004:226; Nedoma 2004a:152). On stylistic grounds, the fibulae have been assigned to the period c.580-600 (Fingerlin et al. 2004:228).

**Location of inscription**

On the back of the fibula. Complex II is upside-down relative to complex I and above it (as the fibula is oriented in Düwel’s drawing). Both complexes run left to right.

**Readings**


**References**

Düwel (2002b:14-16); Fingerlin (1998; 1999); Fingerlin et al. (2004); Nedoma (2004a:151-158, 244).

**Images**
8. Bad Krozingen A

Düwel 2002b:15 (drawing); Fingerlin et al. 2004:231 (drawings) Taf.1

(photographs).

9. Balingen

Concordance

AZ 7; KJ 160; L VII.5; Ma F1; O 3; Sch A.

Object

Gold disc fibula on a silver backing-plate.

Find-site

On the eastern side of the Kleiner Heuberg, Balingen, Zollernalbkreis,
Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 17' N, 8° 51' E).

Context

From a row-gravefield excavated by amateurs in 1872 (Arntz and Zeiss
1939:121; Nedoma 2004a:184). The inscription was not discovered until 1887
(v. Grienberger 1908:257).

Provenance

Zeiss identifies the gravefield as Alamannic, but typologically the fibula is
believed to have been manufactured in Burgundia or eastern Francia (Arntz
and Zeiss 1939:121).

Datings

600-650 (Krause 1966:303; Opitz 1987:9).

600-633 (Roth 1981a:65).
c.600 or before (Martin 2004:181).

**Location of inscription**

On the back, running right to left.

**Readings**

`aïkdnloamuluq` (v. Grienberger 1908:274).

`a` + 3(2?) signs + `dnloam` + 1 sign `lu` [+ 2(1?) sign(s)] (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:128). The sign following `m` is probably `i`, but it is angled towards the `m`, so it is possible that a bind-rune `mu` was intended (see v. Grienberger 1908). Arntz favours the reading `mi`.

`axuŋdnloamiluk` (Krause 1966:302).

`aŋuŋdnloamiluk` (Opitz 1987:9; Schwerdt 2000:201).

`a u/r zdnloamiluk` (Looijenga 2003a:229).

`(?u)ŋdnloamilu`? (Nedoma 2004a:185)

`a(suz)dnloa(m1?)lu(k)` (Kiel).

Synthetic reading: `a(?u)ŋdnloamilu`?

**References**

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:120-133); von Grienberger (1908); Klingenberg (1973); Krause (1966:302-303); Looijenga (2003a:229); Nedoma (2004a:184-189, 273-276); Opitz (1987:9, 78, 112-121); Söderberg (1890).
10. Beuchte

Concordance

An 106; KJ 8; L VII.6; Ma D2; O 4; RMR F5.

Object

Silver gilt bow fibula.

Find-site

Near Beuchte, Kr. Goslar, Niedersachsen, Germany (51° 59’ N, 10° 31’ E).

Context

From a richly appointed female grave (no. 1), part of a small gravefield discovered in 1955 (Düwel 1992a:353).

Provenance

Krause infers from the form of the j-rune (which is similar to forms found in Scandinavian inscriptions such as Fonnås (KJ 17)) that the rune-carver might have been an Angle or a Warn (1966:28). The fibula is of a Scandinavian type, possibly a Continental imitation. The other grave-goods are similar to material found in Thuringia and the lower Elbe (Looijenga 2003a:229). It has also been argued that the gravefield better fits the Saxon

**Datings**

550-600 (Antonsen 1975:78; Krause 1966:28; Opitz 1987:10). Krause’s dating is based on rune forms (see Provenance).

Mid 6\textsuperscript{th} century (Roth 1981a:65).

6\textsuperscript{th} century (Looijenga 2003a:229).

c.550 (Nedoma 2004a:261, citing Roth (op.cit.)). This dating is an estimate for the grave; the fibula is believed to have been manufactured sometime in the first half of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century.

c.500-550 (Düwel 1992a:354; 2008:18; McKinnell et al. 2004:88). This is a date-range for the gravefield as a whole. Noting that the fibula shows many signs of wear, while the runes are clear and in good condition, Düwel concludes that the inscription was carved shortly before the burial. He suggests a date of c.500 for the manufacture of the fibula (1992a:355).

534-566 (Siegmund 2000:365). This is a dating for the interment burials in the gravefield (compare Düwel’s dating, above).

**Location of inscription**

On the back of the headplate, both complexes running left to right.

**Readings**

10. Beuchte

Below complex II is an hourglass-shaped symbol, which is not read as a d-run on account of its size (it is much larger than the runes, being about as wide as the whole of complex II).

References


Images


11. Bezenye I

[aka Bezenye A, Pallersdorf A].

Concordance

AZ 27; KJ 166; L VII.7; Ma B4a; O 5.

Object

Silver bow fibula. Bezenye I and II (no. 12, below) are a pair.

Find-site


Context

Female grave (no. 8) in a row-gravefield excavated in 1885 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:320).
Provenance

Both Zeiss (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:321) and Krause (1966:310) identify the site as Langobardic.

Datings

The find “belongs…to the first decades after the Langobardic migration (568)”\(^2\) (Zeiss in Arntz and Zeiss 1939:321).

On archaeological grounds (unspecified) Krause places the find in the “Pannonian phase” of Langobardic settlement, 530-568 (Krause 1966:310).

533-566 (Roth 1981a:65).


Location of inscription

On the back of the fibula, complexes I and II either side of the pin-holder, both running left to right.

Readings

\textit{godahid} \mid \textit{unj} (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:323-324; Kiel; Krause 1966:308; Opitz 1987:11). (\textit{\textbar} is how Krause represents the pin-holder).


[I] \textit{uxx}\(^{\prime}\)\(_n\) (\textit{\textbar} \textit{unj}\?) [II] \textit{godahid} (Nedoma 2004a:203). Nedoma notes that complex I is badly damaged, and expresses reservations about the earlier readings.

Synthetic reading: [I] \textit{unj} \quad [II] \textit{godahid}

\footnote{\textit{…gehört…in die ersten Jahrzehnte nach der langobardischen Einwanderung (568)}}

2 \textit{…gehört…in die ersten Jahrzehnte nach der langobardischen Einwanderung (568)}
Although I have followed Nedoma’s ordering of the complexes, I do not at this stage wish to commit to reading them in this order rather than the one used by the other sources.

**References**


**Images**

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 24) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 71) (photographs).

---

**12. Bezenye II**

[aka Bezenye B, Pallersdorf B]

**Concordance**

AZ 28; KJ 166; L VII.9; Ma B4b; O 6.

**Object**

Silver bow fibula, the pair of 11. Bezenye I.

**Find-site**


**Context**

See Bezenye I.
12. Bezenye II

Provenance

See Bezenye I.

Datings

See Bezenye I.

Location of inscription

On the back, complexes I and II either side of the pin-holder, both running left to right.

Readings


karsḫodā | segun (Krause 1966:308; Opitz 1987:11).

ʔarsiboda segun (Looijenga 2003a:230).


(k)arsi(1?)oda | segun (Kiel).

The first sign is read by Arntz and Krause as a k in the “roof-form” ^, i.e., the normal < rotated through 90°. Nedoma regards it not as a rune but as a paratextual symbol marking the beginning of the text (2004a:203-204).

Synthetic reading: [I] ?arsḫoda [II] şekun

References
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12. Bezenye II

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 25) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 71) (photographs).

13. Bopfingen

Concordance

L VII.9; Ma G1; O 7.

Object


Find-site

Bopfingen, Kr. Heidenheim, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 51’ N, 10° 21’ E).

Context

Female grave (no. 115) in a row-gravefield.

Provenance

Alamannic (Düwel 1994b:277).

Datings

6th century (Opitz 1987:12).

600-633 (Roth 1981a:65).

576-600 (Düwel 1994b:277, citing Matthias Knaut without references).


Location of inscription
13. Bopfingen

On the back, running left to right.

Readings


References


Images


14. Borgharen

Concordance

L IX.18

Object

Bronze belt-buckle.

Find-site


Context

Provenance


Datings

c.600 (Dijkman 2003:218; Looijenga 2003b:232, 2003c:390). This is a date for the burial, based on typology of the grave goods and on coin evidence.

576-600 (Looijenga 2003a:322).

Nedoma cites Looijenga’s (2003b; 2003c) record of the accompanying finds, which include a coin that would give a terminus post quem of 550-585 (Nedoma 2004a:245).

Location of inscription

On the front, running left to right.

Readings


References
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Looijenga (2003a plate 27a) (photograph).
15. Bülach

Concordance

AZ 10; KJ 165; L VII.11; Ma E6; O 9; Sch B.

Object

Silver disc fibula with almandine inlay.

Find-site

Bülach, Kanton Zürich, Switzerland (47° 31’ N, 8° 32’ E).

Context

Female grave (no. 249) in a row-gravefield excavated in 1927. The inscription was discovered during restoration of the fibula in 1933 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:168-169).

Provenance

In Zeiss’ view (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:168) both the fibula and the inscription are Alamannic. Krause identifies the text Alamannic (likewise Seebold et al. 2001:16); but he also cites the view of Werner (1953:10-11) that the fibula is of Frankish manufacture (Krause 1966:308). Nedoma too refers to Werner’s opinion that the object was made in the Middle Rhine region; the inscription could have been made in the same region, or at a later date in Alamannia (Nedoma 2004a:297; Schwerdt 2000:203).

Datings

600-650, based on the decoration, which shows evidence of Langobardic influence (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:169; Opitz 1987:13).
Beginning of 7th century (Krause 1966:308; Klingenberg 1976b:308).

Location of inscription

On the back of the fibula, in three rows, all running left to right.

Readings


frifridil du a f tmu (Looijenga 2003a:235).


frifridil(0-1?) | d(u) | ftm(ik 0-1?) | (0-2?) (Kiel).

Microscopic analysis cited by Nedoma (2004a:298) shows no trace of the sign read by Krause as an l-rune to the right of complex III, nor of the mark seen by Klingenberg at the end of complex I and read as a small horizontal l (1976b:310) (both of these are interpreted as Begriffsrunden, for *laukaz “leek” → “prosperity, fertility”; see Krause 1966:246-249). In complex III, the material preceding t is obscured by damage to the object, and what is visible
does not look to me like an f. Following m is a clear stave (i-rune?) followed by a cluster of marks resembling disembodied “twigs”. The reading mik does not seem at all justified.

Synthetic reading: [I] ffrid[ū] [II] dū [III] (I)tūn?
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Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 8) (photographs); Krause 1966 Taf. 70 (photographs); Nedoma 2004a:299 (photographs); Schweiz.Landesmus. 2006:151 (photographs).

16. Charnay

Concordance

An 105; AZ 11; KJ 6; L VII.12; Ma D1; O 10; RMR F3.

Object

Silver bow fibula.

Find-site
On the banks of the Saône near Charnay-lès-Chalon, Dép. Saône-et-Loire, France (46° 56’ N, 5° 06’ E).

**Context**

Row-gravefield, excavated in the 1830s; further details of the site and the inventory are not available (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:174; Krause 1966:20). The inscription was not discovered until 1857 (Düwel 1981a:373).

**Provenance**

According to Krause (1966:22-23), the fibula is of Frankish or Alamannic manufacture, and the inscription has characteristically “South Germanic” rune-forms (double-barred h; z with two pairs of twigs, χ); but the text has EGmc features (see text, §3.2.1; §7.1.2.3). Arntz and Zeiss (1939:174-175) draw similar conclusions, although where Krause explains the EGmc linguistic forms as fossils in the language of 6th-century Burgundians, Arntz’ view is that the text is Ostrogothic.

Roth (1981b:372) remarks that the only identifiably “Burgundian” characteristic of the archaeological record at Charnay consists of large silver-plated belt fittings. According to Roth, the population of Burgundia was chiefly “native” Gallo-Roman, ruled by a Burgundian military elite from 443AD until its defeat by the Franks in 534.

Formally, the fibula resembles Scandinavian bow fibulae and their Continental imitations; fibulae of this type (though not close parallels for Charnay) have been found at Anglo-Saxon, Thuringian, Frankish and Alamannic sites, while the decoration is comparable to that on fibulae from Frankish and Langobardic territory, as well as having some similarities with 2.
Aquincum, which Martin (2004) classifies as typologically East Germanic.
The Charnay item is most likely of Frankish manufacture (Düwel 1994b:278; Roth 1981b:373). Following Martin (1981:257), Düwel (1994b:279) suggests that fibulae of this sort found in Burgundia belonged to women who had migrated to that region from northern Francia. All of this implies that neither the maker nor the owner of the fibula is likely to have been a Burgundian.

In his work on names in Continental inscriptions, Nedoma disregards Charnay on the grounds that the pers.n. liano is probably EGmc (2004a:364). Antonsen, on the other hand, is confident that it is WGmc (1975:77-78; see text, §7.1.3).

**Datings**

c.600 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:175).
550-570 (McKinnell et al. 2004:87).

**Location of inscription**

On the back, complexes I-III around the border of the headplate, complexes IV-V on the footplate (see readings; the numbering of complexes in the synthetic reading is mine). All of the complexes are read left to right.

**Readings**


[left-hand side] dan:liano [footplate:border] ïia [below the pin-


[I] fuþarkgwhnijïpzstbem .uþfnþai:id dan:liano [II] $^\ell{j}a$ [III]

$k\ r$ (Düwel 1981a:373-374).

[headplate] fuþarkgwhnijïpzstb??? :uþfnþai:id dan:liano [footplate]

$i\a$ (Looijenga 2003a:236).

fuþarkgwhnijïpzstbem | ' uþf(1?)þai ' id | dan ' (l)iano | $i\a$ | (1?)$r$ (Kiel).

The $l$ in complex III resembles the “Anglo-Frisian” $k$-rune $k$, but its identification as a form of $l$ is generally accepted. A similar form is also found on 30. Griesheim. Krause (1966:22) claims that similar forms of $l$ are found in bracteate inscriptions, an assertion which Düwel regards as uncertain (1981a:374). The $k$ and $l$ runes in the fuþark have the more normal forms, respectively $< k$ and $\ell l$ (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:180; Looijenga 2003a:236).
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16. Charnay

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 9) (photographs and drawing); Düwel (1996b:547) (photographs); Krause 1966:21 Abb. 1 (drawing); Roth 1981b Taf.20-21 (photographs).

17. Chéhéry

Concordance

L VII.51; Ma K1.

Object

Gold disc fibula with almandine and filigree decoration (Fischer and Lémant 2003:244; Martin 2004:184).

Find-site

Chéhéry, Dép. Ardennes, France (48° 39’ N, 4° 52’ E).

Context

Richly-appointed female grave in a small gravefield excavated in 1978 (Fischer and Lémant 2003:243-244).

Provenance

The archaeological evidence indicates that Chéhéry was under Frankish control by the early 6th century (Fischer and Lémant 2003:242). From the point of view of the material record, the occupant of the grave is culturally Frankish, but Fischer and Lémant suggest that she came originally from the Rhineland or Alamannia (2003:244, 257).

Datings

c.600 (Fischer 1999:12).

Early 6th century (Looijenga 2003a:264).

The burial dates from the early 7th century, the grave-goods from the late 6th (Fischer and Lémant 2003:244). The fibula shows signs of long use and repair, and Fischer and Lémant infer that its manufacture predates the burial by at least 30-50 years (2003:255).

551-600 or c.600 (Nedoma 2004a:280). I assume these datings are drawn respectively from Düwel and Fischer.

**Location of inscription**

On the back. Complex II is immediately below and parallel to complex I; complex III is below and at an angle relative to complexes I-II. Fischer reads complexes I and III left to right, complex II right to left (i.e., boustrophedon), presumably because this allows a continuous reading of all the Roman letters. Düwel reads all the complexes left to right.

**Readings**


DEOS ' DE | E ' dita(n) | s(um)|1-2?] (Kiel).

The inscription is badly worn in parts, which leads Fischer and Lémant to suggest that these parts were carved at an earlier date than those which are in
better condition. The fibula appears to have been repaired at least once, and
the Latin inscription may have been added after the pin mechanism was
replaced. The Latin and runic inscriptions show signs of having been carved
with different types of tool (Fischer and Lémant 2003:249).

sūm(Ūk)

References

Düwel (1991:277-278; 1994b:235-236); Fischer (1999:12-13); Fischer and
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Fischer (1999:13) (drawing); Fischer and Lémant (2003:263) (drawing);

18. Dischingen I

[aka Dischingen A].

Concordance

KJ 155; L VII.13; Ma C1a; O 11; Sch C.

Object

Silver gilt bow fibula, one of a pair. The other (Dischingen II (or
Dischingen B) – see Appendix 1) also has an inscription, for which only
Begriffsrune interpretations have been proposed.
18. Dischingen I

Find-site

Dischingen, Kr. Heidenheim, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 42’ N, 10° 22’ E), excavated in 1954.

Context

Female grave (unnumbered) in a row-gravefield to the south of the modern town (Krause 1966:297; Nedoma 2004a:414). In contradiction to Krause’s description of the site as a gravefield, Opitz (1987:16) describes this burial as an isolated grave.

Provenance

Alamannic (Krause 1966:297).

Datings


c.550 (Nedoma 2004a:414, citing Roth (op.cit.)).

Location of inscription

On the back, next to the pin-holder, running left to right.

Readings


wįŋka or winka (Looijenga 2003a:236).

wiŋ/ŋka (Nedoma 2004a:415).

Synthetic reading: wiŋ/ŋka.

References

**Images**

Arntz and Jänichen (1957 Taf. 64-65) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 66) (photograph).

---

**19. Donzdorf**

**Concordance**

L VII.14; Ma D4; O 15; Sch D.

**Object**

Silver gilt bow fibula.

**Find-site**

Donzdorf, Kr. Göppingen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 41’ N, 9° 49’ E).

**Context**


**Provenance**

The gravefield is classified as Alamannic, but the style of the fibula, the single-barred h in the inscription and the “tremolo” style of decoration all point to a Scandinavian origin (Düwel 1994b:237; Düwel and Roth 1977:409-410,

**Datings**


500-520 (Düwel and Roth 1977:410; Düwel 1994b:237; Schwerdt 2000:206). This is a dating based on the fibula style.

Mid 6th century (Roth 1981a:65).


The above datings are estimates for the manufacture of the fibula. The grave has been assigned various dates in the period 550-600 (Nedoma 2004a:288). Jänichen (1967b:234) dates the grave to the 7th century, but does not propose a more specific dating for the fibula.

**Location of inscription**

On the back, incorporated into a field of decoration consisting of lines, crosses and V-shapes. The inscription is not incised, but made using the “tremolo” style (Düwel and Roth 1977:410; Jänichen 1967b:234; Nedoma 2004a:288). It is read left to right.

**Readings**


h is single-barred H.

**References**
19. Donzdorf


**Images**

Düwel (1997a:493) (photograph); Düwel and Roth (1977 Abb.35) (photographs); Jänichen (1967b Taf.43.2) (photograph); Looijenga (2003a plate 15a) (photograph); Nedoma (2004a:289) (photograph).

20. Eichstetten

**Concordance**

Gr H3; IRF 34; L VII.15; Ma Wa3; Sch E.

**Object**

Silver fitting for the mouth of a spatha sheath.

**Find-site**

Eichstetten, Kr. Breisgau-Hochschwarzwald, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 05’ N, 7° 44’ E).

**Context**

Male grave (no. 186) in a row-gravefield, excavated in 1980 (Sasse 2001).
No comments about ethnic or linguistic origin are made in the literature on the inscription. The gravefield is identified as Alamannic (Kokkotidis 1999:45-50).

**Datings**


526-600 (Martin 2004:185). This dating is based on archaeological context and follows Sasse (2001).

533-566 (Grünzweig 2004:126).

520-560 (Fischer 2007:133, also citing Sasse 2001).

**Location of inscription**

On the back, running left to right. The joint of the fitting immediately follows the sign read by Düwel as a chi-rho and by Looijenga as nb.

**Readings**


fiaginb muni wiwogan (Looijenga 2003a:238). Looijenga has drawn the bind-rune nb, but has transcribed it without marking it as a bind-rune.

-an/- muniwiwol (Fischer 2007:133). Fischer offers several possible readings of the first sequence: danil/hanil/manil.

(1?)a(1?)i(1?)[?]mun(1?)wiwol (Kiel).
The object is badly scratched, rendering the first part extremely difficult to read. I am inclined to favour the reading muni over munt (I can see no trace of side-twigs on this stave).

The sign which Looijenga reads as g in fiaginh resembles the “star-rune” ☖, which appears at different times and places with a number of values: it is j in the Anglo-Saxon fuþorc (Page 1999:39; Parsons 1994:201-204); A (in contrast to Ꞅ → q → [ã]) in Scandinavian inscriptions assigned to the later part of the Older Fuþark period (e.g., Gummarp, KJ 95 (Krause 1966:205-209)); and h in the long-branch forms of the Younger Fuþark (see also 42. Kärlich). In Looijenga’s reading, the other g (in wiwogan) is a normal x. Looijenga’s reason for transcribing the “star-rune” as g seems to be that in Anglo-Saxon and Frisian inscriptions it seems to stand for the palatalised allophone of OE /g/, e.g., Dover jïslheard; Westeremden A adujislu jisuhldu (Looijenga 2003a:238, n.2).³

Synthetic reading: (?){a?i [chi-rho/nb/nw] munjwiwo?}³
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³ On the question of whether this rune is historically a form of j, a variant g or an additional rune for palatalised /g/, see Parsons 1999:124-126.
20. Eichstetten


21. Engers

Concordance

AZ 13; KJ 143; L VII.16; Ma C4; O 15; Sch G.

Object

Silver gilt bow fibula.

Find-site

Kaltenengers, Kr. Mayen-Koblenz, Rheinland-Pfalz, Germany (50° 25’ N, 7° 33’ E). The object is customarily identified with Engers, which is on the opposite (east) side of the Rhine (Nedoma 2004a:354).

Context

Female grave in a row-gravefield (unnumbered), excavated by amateurs in 1885 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:202). The fibula was stolen and melted down in 1922 (Krause 1966:283).

Provenance

Frankish, based on an evaluation of the whole gravefield (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:202; Krause 1966:283).

Datings
21. Engers

C. 600 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:203).

End of 6th century (Krause 1966:283).


**Location of inscription**

On the back, between the headplate and the pin-holder.

**Readings**


**References**


**Images**


---

22. Erpfting

**Concordance**

None.

**Object**
Silver gilt bow fibula.

**Find-site**
Erpfing, Kr. Landsberg am Lech, Bavaria, Germany (48° 02’ N, 10° 50’ E).

**Context**
Female grave (no. 104) in a gravefield (Düwel 2003c:13-14).

**Provenance**
No comments are made in the literature.

**Datings**
526-550 or 533-566 (Düwel 2003c:14).

**Location of inscription**
On the back of the footplate.

**Readings**
Ida-gabu (Düwel 2003c:14; Kiel).

Düwel (2003c:15) mentions another mark resembling a u-rune, which in his view is probably a probatio pennae.

**References**

**Images**
Düwel (2003c:14) (drawings); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).
23. Ferwerd

Concordance

AZ 14; L IX.2.

Object

Comb case made of antler (Looijenga 2003a:303) or bone (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:207).

Find-site

Terp Burmania I, to the southwest of Ferwerd, Gem. Ferwerderadeel, Friesland, Netherlands (53° 20’ N, 5° 50’ E).

Context

Found in the terp during commercial digging in 1916 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:206; Looijenga 2003a:303). No further information about the circumstances of the find is available.

Provenance

The object may be an import from the Rhine region (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:206); in Arntz’ opinion, the inscription was probably made in Friesland.

Datings

6\textsuperscript{th} - 7\textsuperscript{th} century (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:207; Looijenga 2003a:303), based on comparison with similar combs and comb-cases found in Germany.

Location of inscription
On one side of the case, on the border above the main portion of the case (which is decorated with geometric designs). The inscription is read right to left.

**Readings**

- **tluræ** (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:208-209).
- **me ura** or **me uræ** (Looijenga 2003a:303).

The transliteration of ñ as æ presupposes that the dialect of the text has undergone first fronting. If this is so, Ferwerd cannot be classified as “Continental” in the narrower sense (see text, §1.2.2) and should be excluded from the present study. However, I have retained it because there are no textual reasons for its exclusion (such as the presence of any additional “Anglo-Frisian” runes, or rune-sequences which can only represent Frisian words).

**Synthetic reading:** ?(?)ura

**References**


**Images**

24. Freilaubersheim

Concordance

AZ 15; KJ 144; L VII.18; Ma B1; O 16; Sch H.

Object

Silver gilt bow fibula.

Find-site

Freilaubersheim, Kr. Bad Kreuznach, Rheinland-Pfalz, Germany (49° 48’ N, 7° 54’ E).

Context

A relatively well-appointed female grave (unnumbered) in a small row-gravefield excavated in 1873/74 and 1876 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:211).

Provenance

Rhine Frankish (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:213; Krause 1966:283, 284). This appears to be based on the location of the find combined with the identification of the language as “German” in the widest sense.

Datings

c.575 (Krause 1966:284).


Location of inscription
On the back of the footplate, complexes I and II either side of the pin-holder. Both are read left to right.

Readings


boso ' wraetruna ' | þk ' da(1?)ïna ' go(0-3? da) (Kiel).

In some of the earlier literature, the initial d of da/uni16A6ïna was read as m (see Arntz and Zeiss (1939:223, 226-228); this reading is no longer accepted (Nedoma 2004a:279). Both of the d-runes in complex II resemble the Anglo-Saxon form ᛇ.

Alternative readings to ᛇ are discussed by Arntz (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:228-229). These are not accepted in subsequent literature.

Synthetic reading: [I] boso:wraetruna:     [II] þk-daþïna:go/uni16DA/uni16C1da
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24. Freilaubersheim

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 13, 40) (photographs and drawings); Düwel (1996b:546) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 61) (photograph).

25. Fréthun I

[Another sword pommel from the same site (Fréthun II, IRF 12) has a single rune(?), †]

Concordance

IRF 11.

Object

Gilt copper alloy sword pommel (Fischer 2007:71).

Find-site

Fréthun, Dép. Pas-de-Calais, France (50° 55’ N, 1° 50’ E).

Context


Provenance

Frankish (Routier 1996).

Datings

c.560 (Fischer 2007:72, citing Routier 1996:547).

Location of inscription

On one side of the pommel, running left to right.
25. Fréthun I

Readings

h?e-- (Fischer 2007:72).

The second rune has a discernible twig pointing down to the left of the stave. Fischer suggests the rune could be k, l, n, r or s (2007:72).

Synthetic (normalised) reading: h?e?(?)

References


Images


26. Friedberg

Concordance

AZ 16; KJ 141; L VII.19; Ma E2; O 17; Sch I.

Object

Silver disc fibula.

Find-site

On the southern slope of the Wartberg, just to the south of Friedberg, Wetteraukreis, Hessen, Germany (50° 21’ N, 8° 46’ E).

Context

**Provenance**

Both the gravefield and the fibula are identified as Frankish (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:232, 233; Krause 1966:281).

**Datings**


C.600 (Krause 1966:281).

Beginning of 7th century (Opitz 1987:21).


533-600 (Schwerdt 2000:212).

526-550 or up to c.600 (Martin 2004:180).

**Location of inscription**

On the back, below the pin, running left to right.

**Readings**


**References**

26. Friedberg

**Images**

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 14) (photographs).

---

27. Gammertingen

**Concordance**

AZ 17; KJ 161; L VII.20; O 18; RMR D8; Sch J.

**Object**

Cylindrical ivory capsule.

**Find-site**

To the east of Gammertingen, Kr. Sigmaringen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 15’ N, 9° 13’ E).

**Context**

Richly-appointed (unnumbered) grave of a girl (aged 8-10) in a row-gravefield, excavated by amateurs in 1901/02. The inscription was not discovered until 1931 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:235-236).

**Provenance**

Arntz classes the gravefield as Alamannic, but the capsule as probably an import from Italy. The dialect of the inscription could, in that case, be Alamannic or Langobardic (Arntz 1935a:359; Arntz and Zeiss 1939:236). Krause, on the other hand, cites Werner’s opinion that the capsule was produced in the Middle Rhine area (Krause 1966:304; likewise McKinnell et al. 2004:63).
Datings


c.575-600 (McKinnell et al. 2004:63).

Location of inscription

Complex I on the edge at the bottom; complex II on the lid. Both are read left to right.

Readings


ado (twice) (Looijenga 2003a:242).


ado[0-?] | a(1?)o (Kiel).

Synthetic reading: [I] adąż | II) a^d/mo

References

Arntz (1935a); Arntz and Zeiss (1939:235-240); Düwel (1994b:295); Fischer (2004:283); Krause (1966:303-304); Looijenga (2003a:242);

28. Geltorf II

[This numbering is used by DR and IK. Geltorf I-A (IK 254) has an inscription consisting of rune-like signs which do not appear to constitute a comprehensible text (Nowak 2003:582)].

Concordance

DR Br 2; IK 255.

Object

Gold A-bracteate.

Find-site

Geltorf, Kr. Schleswig-Flensburg, Schleswig-Holstein, Germany (58° 28’ N, 9° 37’ E).

Context

Hoard found in a field in 1876, precise circumstances unknown (Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:2,1:69).

Provenance

No comments in the literature.

Datings

None more specific than the bracteate period in general (c.450-c.550).

Location of inscription

Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 14) (photographs).
Below the head and on the neck, running left to right (Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:2,1:71; Nowak 2003:583).

**Readings**

וכלג'ו (Arntz 1937:7).

לאף (Nowak 2003:583).


לגלג(1?)ע(1ז) (Kiel).

R.3 has a noticeably more angular form than R.6, which is clearly u. This suggests that R.3 is intended to be a different rune – the reading l is therefore probably to be preferred.

Synthetic reading: לגלג'ו [swastika]

**References**


**Images**

29. Gomadingen

Concordance

L VII.52; Ma E1.

Object

Silver disc fibula with almandine inlay.

Find-site


Context


Provenance

Neither Düwel (1996a) nor Looijenga (2003a) comments on the provenance of the fibula. The find-site would be in Alamannic territory.

Datings


This dating (the grounds for which are not specified) originates with Dieter Quast, who discovered the inscription. Typologically, the item is a “pomegranate” disc fibula (*Granatscheibenfibel*), a type found in graves within the date-range 526-600 (Martin 2004:180-181, 202)).

Location of inscription
29. Gomadingen

On the back. Düwel (1996a:13) does not specify the location of complex I. Complex II runs left to right, beginning to the right of the hinge, and complex III is to the right of the pin-holder.

**Readings**

[I] a cross which could be a g-rune. [II] iglug (or iglun) [III] additional carvings which might be runes, but are not legible (Düwel 1996a:13; Looijenga 2003a:264 (without mention of complex III); Nedoma 2004a:345).

(1?) | iglu(1?) | (1?) (Kiel).

Synthetic reading: [I] (g) [II] iglu₄n [III] ?...

**References**


**Images**

None available at the time of writing.

30. Griesheim

**Concordance**

L VII.21; Ma C2; O 20; Sch K.

**Object**

Silver gilt bow fibula.

**Find-site**

Griesheim, Kr. Darmstadt-Dieburg, Hessen, Germany (49° 52’ N, 8° 35’ E).
Context

Female grave (no. 43) in a row-gravefield, excavated in 1975 (Opitz 1987:23).

Provenance

Nedoma (2004a:149) identifies the dialect as Frankish.

Datings

No dating available (Opitz 1987:23).


534-566 (Düwel 2008:60).

Location of inscription

On the back.

Readings


The form transliterated l (Nedoma – l¹) appears in 16. Charnay liano. The l¹ form of k, appears in Scandinavian inscriptions from the latter part of the Older Fuþark period (e.g., Eggja (KJ 101)) (Nedoma 2004a:148). It is also found on Charnay, and on 57. Nordendorf II.

Synthetic reading: [I] koło:  [II] ašilaprub

References
30. Griesheim


Images

Düwel (1996b:545) (photographs).

---

31. Hailfingen I

Concordance

AZ 18; Gr H6; KJ 159; L VII.62; Ma Wa6; O 21.

Object

Iron sax.

Find-site

Hailfingen, Stadt Rottenburg, Kr. Tübingen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 32’ N, 8° 58’ E).

Context

Male grave (no. 381) in a row-gravefield, excavated in 1931 (Moltke and Neckel 1934:36).

Provenance

Typologically, the weapon is similar to 75. Steindorf; both are identified as Alamannic (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:241; Krause 1966:302).

Datings

7th century (Moltke and Neckel 1934:36). This dating is based on stylistic evaluation of the grave goods and of the decoration on the sax.
31. Hailfingen I

Mid-7th century or 651-700 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:241; Krause 1966:302).
This is based on comparison with a similar piece found at Hintschingen (Kr.
Tuttlingen), in a grave dated on the evidence of coins; and also on the
decoration of the blade, which Krause classifies as Animal Style II.

600-650 (Roth 1981a:65).
651-700 (Opitz 1987:24).
560-600 (Düwel 1994b:270, citing Stein 1987:1400).4
551-575 (Grünzweig 2004:127).

**Location of inscription**

On the blade, towards the tip. The transliterations are based on left-to-right
reading.

**Readings**

Most sources are agreed that the inscription contains signs which resemble
runes and/or Roman letters, but which do not comprise an intelligible text.
Many commentators do not attempt a transliteration (Düwel 1991:281;

**i wr N þeihu** (Moltke and Neckel 1934:38-40)

**alï=rhlaþawihu** (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:245-248).

**îkxrxkwîywixu** (Opitz 1987:230).

**ʔxkxrxkxîṭîx(x)** (Nedoma 2004a:286).

**(3?)r(N 4?)i(Nu)** (Kiel).

4 Looijenga (2003a:266) follows this dating, citing Düwel, but erroneously states 7th
century instead of 6th.
The transliterations are so divergent that I have not attempted to produce a synthetic reading. The 5th and 11th signs in the readings of Arntz (who transliterates them h) and Opitz (who transliterates x) resemble Roman N. Page (1968:139 n.21) compares it to the form of s in gisl on the back of the Franks Casket. The appearance of peculiar signs and of characters which more closely resemble a Roman letter than a rune leads me to suspect that we are dealing with script-imitation rather than a genuine text.

**References**


**Images**

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 15, 40) (photographs and drawings); Krause (1966 Taf. 68) (photographs).

---

**32. Hailfingen II**

**Concordance**

L VII.63; Ma I3; O 22.

**Object**

Silver gilt S-fibula.
Find-site

Hailfingen, Stadt Rottenburg, Kr. Tübingen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 32’ N, 8° 58’ E).

Context

Female grave (no. 406) in a row-gravefield, excavated in 1931. The inscription was not discovered until 1960 (Jänichen 1962:156; Opitz 1987:112).

Provenance

Not specified in the literature. The gravefield has been identified as Alamannic (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:241; Krause 1966:301).

Datings


Mid-6th century (Looijenga 2003a:266; Roth 1981a:65).

Martin (2004:184) dates S-fibulae in general to the period c.526-575.

Location of inscription

On the back, complex I towards the top, complex II at bottom right, both running left to right.

Readings


x/// ///daanl (Opitz 1987:25).

??daana/l (Looijenga 2003a:266).

[1-?] | [0-1?]daa(1?)n(1?) (Kiel).

Synthetic reading: [I] (a)????(?) [II] (?)da่าน?
References


Images


33. †Hainspach

Concordance

AZ 19.

Object

Bronze axe-shaped pendant.

Find-site

Hainspach (= Lipová), Bez. Děčín, Czech Republic (51° 01' N, 14° 21' E).

Context


Provenance

The find also included a bronze disc, which Arntz and Zeiss (1939:249) identify as Alamannic on typological grounds; Arntz also regards the text on the axe as Alamannic. Krause (1935b:126) is noncommittal on the ethnic identity of the object and the linguistic identity of the text.
33. ¹Hainspach

**Datings**

5th or 6th century (Krause 1935b:125-126). This is a rather impressionistic dating, relying largely on what Krause sees as parallels with 10. Beuchte, and with the 3rd-century Sedschütz pot (AZ 5).

“From an archaeological standpoint, there is no reason to believe that Hainspach is older than the 7th century”⁵ (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:250).

**Location of inscription**

On the head of the axe, transliterated left to right.

**Readings**

lþsr (Krause 1935b:122-123).

(3-4?) (Kiel).

**References**

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:248-253); Kern (1935); Krause (1935a:38; 1935b; 1937:468).

**Images**

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 16) (photographs); Kern (1935 Taf. 2) (photographs); Krause (1937:468) (photograph).

---

⁵ “Vom archäologischen Standpunkt aus spricht nichts dafür, daß Hainspach älter als das 7. Jh. wäre”
34. Heide

Concordance
An 83; IK 74; KJ 103 Anm. 1; L VI.17; RMR E28.

Object

Find-site
Heide, Kr. Norderdithmarschen, Schleswig-Holstein, Germany (54° 12’ N, 9° 06’ E).

Context
Stray find, possibly displaced from a grave (Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:1,2:135; LooiXenga 2003a:207).

Provenance
No comments in the literature.

Datings
None more specific than the general limits of the bracteate period (c.450-c.550).

Location of inscription
In front of the head of the figure.

Readings
34. Heide

References


Images


35. Heilbronn-Böckingen I

[Another grave at the same site contains a belt fitting with non-runic carvings, designated Heilbronn-Böckingen II; see Appendix 1.]

Concordance

KJ 153; L VII.22; Ma Gü2; O 23; Sch L.

Object

Silvered bronze belt fitting.

Find-site

Heilbronn-Böckingen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (49° 08’ N, 9° 13’ E).

Context

Alamannic, according to Krause (1966:296); he offers no further comment or explanation.

**Datings**


Late 6th century (Martin 2004:186).

**Location of inscription**

On the front, running right to left.

**Readings**

\( \text{i}k\text{a}/\text{u} \text{wi} \) (Arntz and Jänichen 1957:124).

\( \text{xarwi} \) (Krause 1966:295). R.1 may be \( \text{l} \).

\( \text{karwi} \) (Opitz 1987:26). R.1 could be \( \text{ik} \) (see Arntz and Jänichen, above).

\( \text{ikarwi} \) (Düwel 1994b:264, citing Pieper’s examination of the original in 1992).

\( \text{ikarwi} \) (Looijenga 2003a:243).

\( \text{karwi} \) (Nedoma 2004a:210).

\( \text{(1-2?)arwi} \) (Kiel).

The disputed part of the inscription (\( \text{ik}/\text{ik}/\text{k}/\text{l}/\text{lk} \)) is partly covered by rivets (Düwel 1994b:264; Schwerdt 2000:213). The marks interpreted as \( \text{k} \) resemble a regular \( \text{ç} \), but placed at the bottom of the preceding stave, so that the sequence resembles \( \text{l} \).

Synthetic reading: \( (?)?\text{arwi} \)
35. Heilbronn-Böckingen I

References


Images

Arntz and Jänichen (1957 Taf. 64-65) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 65) (photograph).

36. Hitsum

Concordance

IK 76; L VI.19; SUR 39.

Object

Gold A-bracteate.

Find-site

Wurt Hitsum, Gem. Franekeradeel, Friesland, Netherlands (53° 10’ N, 5° 31’ E).

Context


Provenance

Usually regarded as an import from Scandinavia, probably from Denmark (Düwel 1970:284; Krause 1971:150). The design bears a striking similarity to
that of 71. Sievern, and also a resemblance to Undley (IK 374). Seebold (1996) argues that these bracteates and St. Giles-A (IK 323) represent a group manufactured in the “Saxon-South English-Frisian” region rather than in Denmark. This does not necessarily mean that the inscription is Frisian, however, and he prefers to identify it as LFrk.

**Datings**

c.450-550 (i.e., the bracteate period in general) (Düwel 1970:284).

476-500 (Seebold 1996:183). This is a conventional, general dating for A-type bracteates of the “pure” type (i.e., with a human head but no accompanying animal motifs). See also 71. Sievern.

**Location of inscription**

Complex I behind the neck of the human profile, complex II in front of the head. Both complexes run right to left. (Düwel 1970:284, 286; Nowak 2003:500).

**Readings**


**fozo** (remainder illegible) (Krause 1971:150).


**fozo | g(1?)o(1?)a** (Kiel).

Synthetic reading: [I] **fozo**  [II] **g?o^b/?a**

**References**

**Images**


---

### 37. Hoogebeintum

**Concordance**

L IX.22.

**Object**

Antler comb.

**Find-site**

Hoogebeintum, Gem. Ferwerderadeel, Friesland, Netherlands (53° 20’ N, 5° 51’ E).

**Context**

Inhumation grave within the terp, excavated in 1928.

**Provenance**

No comments in the literature.

**Datings**

651-700 (Düwel and Tempel 1968/1970:358-359). This dating is based on comparison with similar finds elsewhere.
37. Hoogebeintum

7th century (Looijenga 2003a:324).

**Location of inscription**

Complex I (or B) on one broken half of the comb, complex II (or A) on the other.

**Readings**


?nlu dēd (Looijenga 2003a:325). Looijenga describes dēd as a triple bind-run, but does not mark it as such in her transliteration.

Düwel and Tempel at first describe complex II as a group of non-runic signs (marks of this sort being common on early medieval combs and other bone implements); later on, however, a reading is proposed (Düwel and Tempel 1968/1970:355, 368).

Synthetic reading: [I] ?nlu  [II] (dēd)

**References**


**Images**


---

38. Hüfingen I

**Concordance**
RMR D16-17 (two exempla).

**Object**

Gold *Kleinbrakteat* (imitation of the reverse of a Byzantine solidus) (Fischer in Fingerlin et al. 1998:804; Heizmann 2004:372). Josef Fischer uses the term “Kleinbrakteat” to reflect the items’ status as coin-imitations, their size (15mm diameter, about the same as a triens), the presence of runic inscriptions, and their presumed amuletic function (Fischer in Fingerlin et al. 1998:799-800). Their exclusion from the *IK* implies that they are not considered “true” bracteates.

**Find-site**

Hüfingen, Kr. Schwarzwald-Baar, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (47° 55’ N, 8° 29’ E).

**Context**

Female grave (no. 318) in one of the region’s largest row-gravefields, excavated in 1976. The inscription was not discovered until 1996 (Düwel 1997b:18). Two exempla from this stamp, two of 39. Hüfingen II and another *Kleinbrakteat* with a Latin inscription were strung together on a necklace. All five have loops attached and were evidently designed for hanging (Fingerlin et al. 1998:790, 798; Heizmann 2004:371; Nowak 2003:250).

**Provenance**

According to Düwel, the *Kleinbrakteaten* were probably made in Langobardic Italy, although it is possible that they were produced in Frankish or Alamannic territory, perhaps in Hüfingen itself (1997b:18). This is also the joint conclusion of Fingerlin, Fischer and Düwel (Fingerlin et al. 1998:789,
Heizmann (2004:381-382) argues against an Italian origin on the grounds that no runic inscriptions have surfaced in Italy, although the runic script may have been known to the Langobards prior to their migration, c.568 (Langobardic identities have been proposed for several runic inscriptions in eastern Europe: 2. Aquincum; 11-12. Bezenye I-II; 77. Szabadbattyán). Moreover, no bracteates have been found in Italy.

**Datings**

The grave is dated in the period 550-570 (Düwel 1997b:18).

A Langobardic S-fibula in the grave gives a *terminus post quem* of 568 (Fingerlin et al. 1998:793-794).

The *terminus post quem* for the Kleinbraketeaten is 518 or 565 (Fischer in Fingerlin et al. 1998:800-806).

C.570-590 (McKinnell et al. 2004:68).

**Location of inscription**

Complex I (Roman capitals) to the right of a standing figure, complex II (runes) to the left. Both inscriptions run right to left.

**Readings**

alu (Düwel 1997b:18; McKinnell et al. 2004:68; Schwab 1999a:14).

VVIT^:\::\::\::\:: \alu (Düwel in Fingerlin et al. 1998:812-813).

VITA alu (Heizmann 2004:373).

VVIT(1? 1Z 1? 1Z) | alu (Kiel).

Synthetic reading: [I] VVIT(????) [II] alu

**References**
38. Hüfingen I

Düwel (1997b:18); Fingerlin (1977); Fingerlin et al. (1998); Fischer (2004:293); Heizmann (2004); McKinnell et al. (2004:68); Nowak (2003:214, 250); Schwab (1999a:14-15).

Images


39. Hüfingen II

Concordance

RMR D18-19 (two exempla).

Object

Gold *Kleinbrakteat*, probably an imitation of the obverse of a Byzantine or Ostrogothic triens from the time of Justinian I (527-565) (Fischer in Fingerlin et al. 1998:802; Heizmann 2004:372). For further details, see 38. Hüfingen I.

Find-site

Hüfingen, Kr. Schwarzwald-Baar, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (47° 55’ N, 8° 29’ E).

Context

See Hüfingen I. Two exempla from the same stamp were found in the grave.

Provenance

See Hüfingen I.
**Datings**

See Hüfingen I.

**Location of inscription**

On the right-hand side, between the forehead and outstretched arm of a human figure depicted on the item. The inscription runs left to right.

**Readings**


^X'IV ota (Düwel in Fingerlin et al. 1998:813-814).

(3?) | (1?) | ota (Kiel).

The signs preceding the legible runic sequence are regarded as meaningless capital-imitation (Düwel in Fingerlin et al. 1998:813; Heizmann 2004:372).

Synthetic reading: (???) ota

**References**

Düwel (1997b:18; 2008:54); Fingerlin et al. (1998); Heizmann (2004); McKinnell et al. (2004:68-69, 100); Nowak (2003:214, 250); Schwab (1999a:17-25).

**Images**

Düwel (1997b:18) (photograph and drawing); Fingerlin et al. (1998:802, 815) (photographs); Naumann (2004 Taf. 6-17) (photographs).
40. Hüfingen III

[This numbering is mine, and is not used in the previous literature.]

Concordance

None.

Object

Silver gilt bow fibula.

Find-site

Hüfingen, Kr. Schwarzwald-Baar, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (47° 55’ N, 8° 29’ E).

Context

Rich female grave (no. 336) in the row-gravefield “Auf Hohen”. Like grave 318 (see 38-39. Hüfingen I-II), this was excavated in 1976; but the inscription was not discovered until the recent restoration of the object (Düwel and Pieper 2004:11).

Provenance

The form of b with separate loops is “typical” for Alamannia (Düwel and Pieper 2004:11)

Datings

Fingerlin (cited by Düwel and Pieper 2004:12) dates the grave to c.570 or later, and estimates that the fibula was made in the mid-6th century or slightly earlier.

Location of inscription
On the back of the footplate.

**Readings**

bi (Düwel and Pieper 2004:11).

bi (Kiel).

There is a gap of c.7mm between the two runes, which fact raises some doubt about whether the second is actually a rune at all (Düwel and Pieper 2004:11).

Synthetic reading: bi

**References**


**Images**


---

**41. Igling-Unterigling**

[Sometimes referred to simply as Unterigling].

**Concordance**

L VII.53.

**Object**

Silver gilt bow fibula.

**Find-site**
Unterigling, Kr. Landsberg am Lech, Bavaria, Germany (48° 05’ N, 10° 49’ E).

**Context**

Female grave (no. 91) in a row-gravefield.

**Provenance**

No comments in the literature.

**Datings**


**Location of inscription**

On the back of the footplate, running left to right. Complex II is above the end of complex I and at 90° to it.

**Readings**


[I] **aunrød** [II] d (Nedoma 2004a:221).

The uncertain 5\(^{th}\) rune (Düwel – ŋ; Nedoma – x) is damaged – only the lower part remains, which could be the lower half of ų, or conceivably of ų.

Complex II is an hourglass-shaped sign; if it is to be read as a d-rune, it is at 90° to the rest of the inscription.

Synthetic reading: [I] **aunrød** [II] d
41. Igling-Unterigling

References


Images


---

42. †Kärlich

Concordance

AZ 23; O Anhang.

Object

Silver gilt bow fibula.

Find-site

Kärlich, Kr. Mayen-Koblenz, Rheinland-Pfalz, Germany (50° 23’ N, 7° 29’ E).

Context

Found in 1886 under uncertain circumstances; possibly from the Kärlich row-gravefield (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:266; Opitz 1987:53).

Provenance

The Kärlich gravefield is identified as Frankish; earlier claims that the inscription was Burgundian or Gothic are groundless (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:266).

Datings

**Location of inscription**

On the back of the headplate.

**Readings**


\( h \) is the “star-rune” ʰ, which is the *hagall*-rune in the Scandinavian Younger Futhark. This feature is one of the pieces of evidence indicating that the inscription is a modern forgery (see Appendix 2).

Synthetic reading: **wodani : hailag**

**References**


**Images**

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 19) (photographs).

---

43. “Kent”

[aka Bateman fibula].

**Concordance**

L VII.23.
Object

Silver gilt radiate-headed bow fibula.

Find-site

Unknown.

Context

Unknown. The fibula is in the British Museum (catalogue no. 235, 93, 6-18, 32) and is recorded as having been found probably in Kent (Hawkes and Page 1967:18-19; Page 1995:158; Looijenga 2003a:65-66; Parsons 1999:70).

Provenance

Although (apparently) found in England, the fibula is believed to be an import, of Frankish origin (Hawkes and Page 1967:19; Looijenga 2003a:244; Parsons 1999:70-71).

Datings

526-550 or “the middle of the sixth century” (Hawkes and Page 1967:19).

6th century (Looijenga 2003a:244, citing the description in the British Museum catalogue; Parsons 1999:70).

Location of inscription

On the back of the footplate. The transliterations are based on a left-to-right reading.

Readings

No satisfactory reading (Hawkes and Page 1967:19).

“The brooch…has an undoubted but uninterpreted runic inscription which could be either Anglo-Saxon or Continental Germanic.” (Page 1995:172).
“…a (very obscure) runic inscription clearly incised” (Parsons 1999:70).

**ik w?f?? gadu** (Looijenga 2003a:244). This reading is tentative, allowing for the poor execution (in Looijenga’s opinion) of the inscription.

Looijenga remarks on the uncertain runes here transcribed with ?. The first of these (following w) resembles a retrograde †; Looijenga compares this to a similar form on the inscription on a piece of yew from Britsum (L IX.11), which she transliterates æ (2003a:310). However, in the case of Britsum the justification for this reading is that the rune may be a variant of Danish long-branch † æ, a Younger Fuþark rune which we have no reason to suppose was in use in the 6th century.

From the image on the British Museum’s website (see Images), the inscription seems to consist of three distinct complexes:

[I] **gam(:)u** [II] **iku** [III] **w?fafa**

In complex I, the third rune seems to be a clear m. If it were an English d (H), I would expect the staves to extend far beyond the loops; as it is, the cross-twigs do not quite meet the staves, giving the impression that the staves “overshoot” slightly. Following this rune are two small dots or pits, which may be a separator or simply incidental marks. After these are two strokes which might be a u-rune, or might belong to the border decoration.

The runes of complex II are much larger than those of complexes I and III, approximately twice the height.
In complex III (the runes of which are about the same height as those of complex I), the first two signs resemble a w and a retrograde ų, as Looijenga says. The stave of a merges with that of the large u in complex II. If both are part of the same text, it is conceivable (though rather unlikely, in my view) that we are here dealing with a bind-rune ua/au (again, Looijenga makes this suggestion, though she does not see this ligature as following ik directly).

References


Images

British Museum website (photograph).

44. Kirchheim/Teck I

Concordance

L VII.24; Ma D5; O 27; Sch M.

Object

Silver gilt bow fibula.

Find-site

Kirchheim unter Teck, Kr. Esslingen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 39’ N, 9° 27’ E).
Female grave (no. 85)\(^6\) in the “Rauner” gravefield, to the southeast of the town centre (Fiedler 1962:24; Martin 2004:176; Nedoma 2004a:375).

**Provenance**

The site is in Alamannic territory. Martin (2004:193) groups this fibula together with Aschheim I (Düwel 2002b; Ma D3) and 19. Donzdorf as being of Nordic manufacture.

**Datings**

6\(^{th}\) century (Opitz 1987:29).

Mid-6\(^{th}\) century (Looijenga 2003a:245; Roth 1981a:65; Schwerdt 2000:214).

567-600 (Martin 2004:179). This dating is based on coin evidence and refers to the burial, not necessarily the manufacture of the fibula.

**Location of inscription**

On the back of the headplate, read left to right.

**Readings**


badaghiiali dmiu (Looijenga 2003a:245).

Badaňxali (Nedoma 2004a:375).

(1?) | bada(h 1? ali) (Kiel).

---

\(^6\) This is the grave number cited in the runological literature, but there appears to be some confusion; grave 85 is a male burial, to which this item does not belong (Fiedler 1962:30). From Fiedler’s report, I have not been able to identify which grave is the correct one.
What Looijenga reads as a bind-rune gi is a cross or swastika-like sign above the following h in her drawing, which she interprets as a rune-cross. 

Nedoma mentions this sign, but does not regard it as a rune. Opitz (1979:366; 1987:127-128) mentions the sign, but does not incorporate it into his transliteration.

Synthetic reading **bāda(?)/h?ali**

**References**


**Images**


---

### 45. Kirchheim/Teck II

**Concordance**

L VII.54.

**Object**

Silver disc fibula.

**Find-site**
Kirchheim unter Teck, Kr. Esslingen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 39’ N, 9° 27’ E).

**Context**

Female grave (no. 166) in the “Rauner” gravefield, excavated in 1970. The inscription was not discovered until 1995 (Düwel 1996a:13; Nedoma 2004a:209).

**Provenance**

No comments in the literature. The site is in Alamannic territory.

**Datings**


**Location of inscription**

On the back.

**Readings**

- arugis (Looijenga 2003a:264).
- ar(1?)gis (Kiel).

Synthetic reading: **arugis**

**References**


**Images**
None available at the time of writing.

46. †Kleines Schulerloch

Concordance

KJ 150; O Anhang.

Object

Cave wall.

Find-site

Kleines Schulerloch, a cave in the Altmühltal, close to Essing, Kr. Kelheim, Bavaria, Germany (48° 56’ N, 11° 47’ E).

Context

In situ.

Provenance

No comments in the literature.

Datings

If genuine, there is nothing to date the inscription more precisely than 6th-7th century (the general period of Continental inscriptions).

Location of inscription

Carved into the cave wall above the entrance to a side-chamber. Close to the inscription is a carved animal, which may or may not be contemporary with the text (see Appendix 2). The authenticity of the animal-carving is also disputed. The inscription is read left to right.
Readings


References


Images


47. Lauchheim I

Concordance

L VII.55.

Object

Silver bow fibula.

Find-site

Lauchheim, Ostalbkreis, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 52’ N, 10° 15’ E).

Context

Female grave (no. 911) in a row-gravefield (Stork 2001).
Provenance

Not specified in the literature. Düwel (1997b:19) describes the fibula as of “Nordic type”, although it is not clear whether this implies an import or a locally-produced imitation of Scandinavian fibulae. According to Fischer, “the dominant family of Lauchheim and their followers were given to ostentatious display of foreign contacts and/or ethnic origin” (2004:279).

Datings


Location of inscription

On the back of the headplate, running left to right.

Readings


aoŋofada (Nedoma 2004a:194).

Synthetic reading: aŋŋofada

References


Images

Düwel (1997b:19) (drawing); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).
48. Lauchheim II

Concordance
L VII.56.

Object
Bone comb.

Find-site
Lauchheim, Ostalbkreis, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 52’ N, 10° 15’ E).

Context
Female grave (no. 1007) in the Lauchheim row-gravefield.

Provenance
No comments in the literature. The site is in Alamannic territory.

Datings

Location of inscription
In the middle of the handle, running left to right.

Readings


odag (Schwab 1999a:20).

(1?)dag (Kiel; Nedoma 2004a:272).

Synthetic reading: ?dag
References


Images

Düwel (1998a:16) (drawing); Schwab (1999:27) (photograph); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).

49. Liebenau

Concordance

Gr F2; KJ 139; L VII.25.

Object

Silver-plated bronze disc, possibly a fitting from a sword-belt (Düwel 1994b:268; Grünzweig 2004:100; Looijenga 2003a:245).

Find-site

Liebenau, Kr. Nienburg, Niedersachsen, Germany (52° 36’ N, 9° 06’ E).

Context


Provenance

The gravefield is identified as Saxon (Bohnsack and Schöttler 1965:248; Häßler 1985). Krause does not mention provenance in the main entry, but in his indices he suggests that the item may be Cheruscian (1966:315).
**Datings**

Beginning of 5\textsuperscript{th} century (Krause 1966:279).

End of 4\textsuperscript{th} century (Düwel 1972:135; 1994b:268).

c.400 or 401-450 (Bohnsack and Schöttler 1965:255; Häßler 1985:44; Nedoma 2004a:398).

4\textsuperscript{th} century (Looijenga 2003a:245).

401-450 (Grünzweig 2004:100; Martin 2004:167).

**Location of inscription**

On the upper surface, cutting through a decorative pattern of concentric circles (Krause 1966:279). The transliterations are based on a left to right reading.

**Readings**

- **ra{xzy}** (Bohnsack and Schöttler 1965:252).
- **ra…m** \textit{(ar)} (Krause 1966:279).
- **ra{z}yi** (Looijenga 2003a:246).
- **raxx(x)** (Nedoma 2004a:398).
- **ra(1-? i) | (ar)** (Kiel).

Reading the inscription is extremely difficult, as the object is severely abraded.

**Synthetic reading:** **ra…**

**References**

Images

Bohnsack and Schöttler (1965 Taf. 29-31) (photographs); Düwel (1972 Taf. 1-4) (photographs and drawing); Krause (1966 Taf. 60) (photograph).

50. Mertingen

Concordance

L VII.59; Ma D6.

Object

Silver gilt bow fibula.

Find-site

Mertingen, Kr. Donau-Ries, Bavaria, Germany (48° 39’ N, 10° 47’ E).

Context

Female grave (no. 26) in a row-gravefield, excavated in 1969. The inscription was not discovered until 1998 (Babucke and Düwel 2001:161; Düwel 2000a:14; Nedoma 2004a:224).

Provenance

The fibula is of “Nordic” type (Düwel 2000a:14), but was probably produced on the Continent, rather than in Scandinavia (Babucke and Düwel 2001:168; Martin 2004:179 n.45).
Datings

The burial is dated c.567-600; the fibula is 1-2 generations older (Düwel 2000a:14).

c.550 or a little earlier (Looijenga 2003a:266).

Location of inscription

On the back, midway between the foot and the bottom of the headplate.

There is a significant gap between the sequences I have designated complexes I and II. Both are read left to right.

Readings

**ieok aun** (Düwel 2000a:14).

**ieok \_\_ aun** (Babucke and Düwel 2001:169; Nedoma 2004a:224).

**ieok aun** or **arn** (Looijenga 2003a:266).

**ieo(k) | aun** (Kiel).

From the close-up photographs in Babucke and Düwel (2001), I am satisfied that the second rune of complex II is u, not r. I share the view of these authors that, although a transliteration of the final rune of complex I as l is not impossible, k in the “roof” form ^ is more plausible.

Synthetic reading: [I] **ieo̞k** [II] **aun**

References

Babucke and Düwel (2001); Düwel (2000a:14); Looijenga 2003a:266;
50. Mertingen

Babucke and Düwel 2001:164 (drawing), 166-169 (photographs); Düwel 2000a:14 (drawing of the inscription).

51. München-Aubing I

Concordance

L VII.26; Ma A1a; O 28.

Object

Silver gilt bow fibula, one of a pair with 52. München-Aubing II.

Find-site

München-Aubing, Stadt München, Bavaria, Germany (48° 10’ N, 11° 25’ E).

Context

Female grave (no. 303) in a row-gravefield.

Provenance

The gravefield is identified as Bavarian (Dannheimer 1998:I.10). On linguistic grounds, Opitz (1987:174) argues that the maker of the inscription may have been West Frankish or Langobardic.

Datings

No date given by Opitz (1987:30).

Mid-6th century (Looijenga 2003a:246).
501-550 or mid-6th century (Düwel 1998b:76). This is a dating for the fibulae; the marks of wear on the objects suggests that the inscriptions were made closer to the time of manufacture than to that of burial.


Martin’s dating is based on the evidence of gold medallions copied from a coin of Justinian I (527-565) and the beads found in the grave (see Nedoma 2004a:400).

**Location of inscription**

On the back, complex I on the headplate, complex II on the footplate (both running left to right) (Opitz 1987:172).

**Readings**


**References**


**Images**

52. München-Aubing II

Concordance
L VII.67; Ma A1b; O 29.

Object
Silver gilt bow fibula, the pair of 51. München-Aubing I.

Find-site
München-Aubing, Stadt München, Bavaria, Germany (48° 10’ N, 11° 25’ E).

Context
See München-Aubing I.

Provenance
See München-Aubing I.

Datings
See München-Aubing I.

Location of inscription
On the back, transliterated left to right.

Readings
(bd) (Opitz 1987:30; Kiel).

bd (Düwel 1998b:77; Looijenga 2003a:266).

bdd (Nedoma 2004a:399).

Synthetic reading: bdd
References

Dannheimer (1998); Düwel (1998b:77-78); Looijenga (2003a:266);

Images

Dannheimer (1998:II Taf. 34, 95, 118-119) (drawings and photographs);

53. Neudingen-Baar I

[Numbering after Looijenga (2003a). Nedoma (2004a) labels this item
Neudingen-Baar II, and the following one as Neudingen-Baar I].

Concordance

L VII.27; Ma D8.

Object

Bronze bow fibula, gilded on the front, tin-plated on the back.

Find-site

Neudingen, Schwarzwald-Baar-Kreis, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (47°
54’ N, 8° 34’ E).

Context

Rich female grave (no. 319) in a row-gravefield, excavated in 1988 (Düwel
1990:8).

Provenance
The square headplate points to a Frankish origin, according to Düwel (1990:8). The fibula is elsewhere identified as Langobardic (Fingerlin and Düwel 2002:111; Fischer 2004:293; Nedoma 2004a:243).

**Datings**

Late 6th century (Düwel 1990:8; Looijenga 2003a:247).


**Location of inscription**

On the back of the headplate, in three rows underneath one another. All are transliterated left to right.

**Readings**

[I] udi(m)  [II] midu  [III] klef[i]/ (or perhaps klef[i]) (Düwel 1990:8; Fingerlin and Düwel 2002:110).


udi(m) | midu | (k)lef(i 1-2?) (Kiel).

There may be a sign (perhaps g or o?) preceding the u of complex I.

Synthetic reading: [I] (?)udi(m)  [II] midu  [III] klef[i]?

**References**

53. Neudingen-Baar I

Düwel (1997a:492) (photograph); Martin (2004:177) (drawings);
Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).

54. Neudingen-Baar II

[On the numbering, see 53. Neudingen-Baar I].

Concordance

L VII.28; Sch N.

Object

Tapered wooden stave of uncertain function. It may be part of the loom which was found in the grave (Düwel 1989a:45; 2002c:27; Looijenga 2003a:248; Roth 1994:309; Scardigli 1986:353; Schwab 1998a:416), or a separate object used in textile production (Nedoma 2004a:241, citing personal communication from Fingerlin).

Find-site

Neudingen, Schwarzwald-Baar-Kreis, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (47° 54’ N, 8° 34’ E).

Context

Richly appointed female grave (no. 168) in the Neudingen row-gravefield, excavated in 1979 (Düwel 1989a:45).

Provenance

Alamannic (Opitz 1982:486).

Datings

532-535 (Düwel 2002c:27; Fingerlin and Düwel 2002:110; Nedoma 2004a:241). This is a dendrochronological dating of the wood used for constructing the burial chamber.

Late 6th century (Düwel 2008:58).

**Location of inscription**

On the “front” portion (i.e., at the tapered end), running left to right (Nedoma 2004a:240).

**Readings**


The tip of the object is badly worn, and the material before *uba* is indistinct. Nevertheless, all sources agree on the transliteration.

The replica photographed by Martin Graf (Waldispühl, pers.comm.) contains an error, with *hae* for *hamale*. The whole sequence is discernible on Opitz’ photographs (see Images).

**References**

Images

Düwel (1997a:494) (photograph (showing part of the inscription only) and drawing); Fingerlin and Düwel (2002:111) (drawing); Opitz (1982:487, 489) (drawings and photographs); Scardigli (1986:353) (reproduction of one of Opitz’ drawings); Waldispühl (pers. comm.) (photographs of a replica).

55. Niederstotzingen

Concordance

Gr H0; L VII.29; Ma Gü4; O 32.

Object

Silver strap end. This may be a secondary use, the object perhaps originally having been a sheath fitting. The rivet holes and a stamped decoration on the edge of the strap end partially obscure the runes, which suggests that the inscription predates the modification of the object (Düwel 1994b:264, 2002a:194; Jänichen 1967a:45, 1967b:234-235). Grünzweig (2004:128-129) and Martin (2004:186 n.68) both argue to the contrary, that the inscription was made after the folding and riveting of the strip (see also Nedoma 2004a:344).

Find-site

Niederstotzingen, Kr. Heidenheim, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 33’ N, 10° 14’ E).

Context

**Provenance**

The gravefield is classified as Alamannic (Jänichen 1967b:234).

**Datings**


Up to or about 600 (Martin 2004:186).

**Location of inscription**

Complex I on one side, running left to right; complex II on the other side, read left to right by Jänichen, Opitz and Looijenga, and right to left in the other readings (including my own transliteration and the synthetic reading).

**Readings**


The reading given here is a summary based on Jänichen’s drawings and his discursive descriptions. He does not lay it out in precisely this format.

bigws: xliub x ud l d x x e u (Opitz 1987:32).


b(i)g(w)s(1-2?)liub | (ue 2?) d(1?)du(1?) (Kiel).
The inscription is obscured by the border decoration and by scratches on the object, making it very difficult to read (Jänichen 1967a:45).


References


Images

Jänichen (1967b Taf.44) (photographs and drawing); Looijenga (2003a plate 15b) (photograph); Martin (2004:185) (drawings).

56. Nordendorf I

[aka Nordendorf A]

Concordance

AZ 24; KJ 151; L VII.30; Ma D7; O 33; RMR B4; Sch O.

Object

Silver gilt bow fibula.

Find-site

Nordendorf, Kr. Augsburg, Bavaria, Germany (48° 36’ N, 10° 48’ E).
Context

From a row-gravefield – the grave was probably that of a female, but the archaeological details are not available (see Grønvik 1987:111; Kabell 1970:2; Rosenfeld 1984:166 for further discussion). The gravefield was discovered in 1843-4 during railway construction; the inscription, however, was not discovered until 1865 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:275; Krause 1966:292).

Provenance


Datings


Mid-6th century (Roth 1981a:65).


Mid-6th century (Looijenga 2003a:249; McKinnell et al. 2004:48).

c.550 or later (Nedoma 2004a:225).

Location of inscription

Inscription A in 3 rows on the back of the headplate; inscription B to the right of row A.III, inverted relative to inscription A. Both inscriptions are read left to right.
Given the different styles and orientation of the two inscriptions and the fact that the end of inscription B encroaches on the end of A.III, a widespread view is that the two were made at different times, and furthermore that inscription B was made after inscription A (Düwel 1982:78; Kabell 1970:2). Shaw (2002:108-109) also distinguishes the epigraphical style of line A.III from A.I-II, and concludes that there are in fact not two but three separate inscriptions. Grønvik (1987:126), on the other hand, maintains that both the A and B inscriptions are the work of the same hand; as does Kabell (1970:2), who argues that since the runes of A.III are larger than those of A.I-II, it was carved first. While I remain neutral on this issue, Grønvik’s point is well made that to have two (or even three) independent inscriptions on the same small object is a situation without parallel on the Continent.

Without wishing to commit myself on this point, in the readings below I nevertheless follow the opinio communis in the division of the inscription.

Readings


wodan wigipnonar logaporë awaleubwinii (Kabell 1970:3-10). Kabell does not explain what the tranliteration ē is supposed to signify. From his discussion of the sequence it is clear that it represents /-e/. 

106
66. Nordendorf I


(Grønvik 1987:112).


[α] [I] logapore  [II] wodan  [III] wig/þonar  [β] áyaleubwini≡

(Nedoma 2004a:225).

loga(1?)ore | wodan(0-1?) | wig(1-2?)þ(0-1?)onar | (awal)eubwini(1-3?)

(Kiel).

The beginning of inscription B is obscured by damage to the fibula which apparently occurred since its excavation. A lithograph and plaster cast taken before the fibula broke support the reading áwał (Kabell 1970:11).

The mark following leubwini (transliterated ë by Arntz and Opitz, ã by Kabell, I by Schwab, ≡ by Nedoma) resembles an ï-rune, but is commonly treated as a paratextual mark separating the end of inscription B from the end of A.III (Krause 1966:292; Nedoma 2004a:225). Against this view, see Grønvik 1987:124-126.

The small I-like mark in row A.III, which Klingenberg and Opitz read as a ligature with o, is dismissed as a probatio pennae by Krause (1966:293). Nedoma (2004a:225) follows Günter Neumann’s explanation of the mark as a malformed first attempt at the roof of o, which was then corrected. Kabell (1970:3) makes a similar observation.
56. Nordendorf I

Synthetic reading: [A] [I] logapore [II] wodan [III]

wig[a]þonar [B] ąwaľeubwini?

References

Arntz (1939b); Arntz and Zeiss (1939:274-300); Bammesberger (1989);
(1987); Klingenberg (1976d); Kabell (1970); Krause (1966:292-294);
Looijenga (2003a:249-251); McKinnell et al. (2004:48-49); Nedoma
(2004a:225-227, 361-364); Opitz (1987:33, 64-78, 96-100); Rosenfeld (1984);
111); Stanton Cawley (1939:324-325); Steinhauser (1968a:27; 1968b); Trier
(2002); von Unwerth (1916); Wagner (1995).

Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 20-21) (photographs); Düwel (1997a:495)
(photograph); Krause (1966 Taf. 65) (photograph and drawing).

57. Nordendorf II

[aka Nordendorf B]

Concordance

AZ 25; KJ 152; L VII.31; Ma B5; O 34.

Object

Silver gilt bow fibula.

Find-site
Nordendorf, Kr. Augsburg, Bavaria, Germany (48° 36’ N, 10° 48’ E).

**Context**

See 56. Nordendorf I. The Nordendorf II fibula was probably found in 1844, later than Nordendorf I. The inscription was not discovered until 1877 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:275).

**Provenance**

On typological grounds, Zeiss identifies the fibula as of Frankish manufacture. The inscription may also have been produced in the Middle Rhine region (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:276).

**Datings**


c.600 (Krause 1966:295).


The form of the fibula is typical for mid-late 6th century (Martin 2004:178).

**Location of inscription**

On the back of the headplate above the clip, transliterated left to right.

**Readings**

b/lþ/lir/n/iolŋ (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:303-305).


ãirlxioelx (Opitz 1987:34).

birlnioelk (Looijenga 2003a:251). In spite of the difficulties experienced by other authors, Looijenga states that “[t]he runes are clearly legible”.

(1?)irl(1?)ioel(1?) (Kiel).
The final rune is †, a form resembling the k of the Younger Fuþark. This form appears and is transliterated k in a number of other inscriptions (e.g., 30. Griesheim). The earlier sign transcribed ? is another anomalous form resembling a short-twig Younger Fuþark n † (Düwel 2002a:276).

Synthetic reading: börl?ioel?

References

Images
Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 22, 40) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 64) (photographs); Martin 2004:176 (drawings).

58. Oberflacht

Concordance
L VII.32; O 35; Sch P.

Object
Silver perforated spoon (Sieblöffel). Spoons of this type may have been used in Christian baptisms and/or the Eucharist, perhaps including communion in the home. Their function remains uncertain, however (Klingenberg 1974:82-84; Düwel 2002e:479). Numerous silver spoons have been found in
Gmc graves, many with Latin inscriptions; but there are no others with runes (Düwel 1994b:244; 2002e:479).

**Find-site**

Oberflacht, Kr. Tuttlingen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 01’ N, 8° 43’ E).

**Context**

Unknown. Possibly from a female grave; part of a collection of finds belonging to graves 78-81 in the Oberflacht gravefield (Düwel 1994b:244; Schiek 1992:53).

**Provenance**

The find-site is in Alamannic territory. Klingenberg (1974) argues that the language of the inscription is Gothic, but that since it does not use Wulfila’s script, it may have been made locally, being connected with a putative Gothic Arian mission in Alamannia.

**Datings**

Unknown (Opitz 1987:34).


**Location of inscription**

On the back of the handle, running left to right.

**Readings**

...saidu...þafd (Jänichen 1967b:237; Schiek 1992:53).

gba’dulþafd (Klingenberg 1974:84; Düwel 2002e:479).

According to Düwel (1994b:244), this reading is based on Klingenberg’s, and was taken over by Opitz without its uncertainties being marked.

(2-?)a(1?)du(1?)pafd (Kiel).

Synthetic reading:  gba'/dupafd

References


Images


59. Oettingen

Concordance

L VII.33; Ma E5.

Object

Silver disc fibula.

Find-site

Oettingen, Kr. Donau-Ries, Bavaria, Germany (48° 57’ N, 10° 35’ E).

**Provenance**

The gravefield is classified as Alamannic, but Betz (1979:244) argues from his analysis of the inscription (see text, §3.3.1) that the inscription is closely related to Scandinavian models and that the occupant of the grave may have been an immigrant from Denmark.

**Datings**


526-550 or up to 600 (Martin 2004:180). This is a general date range for the group of “pomegranate” disc fibulae (*Granatscheibenfibeln*) (see 29. Gomadingen; 68. Schretzheim II.

**Location of inscription**

On the back, running left to right.

**Readings**

āuijabirg (Betz 1979:242).

ḥpxjabrg (Düwel 1991:280. Martin’s drawing also reflects this reading (Martin 2004:182)).

auijabrg or auisabr (Looijenga 2003a:252).

xxjabr (Nedoma 2004a:137).

(1-2?)ijabirg (Kiel).
The rune transliterated ḟ resembles a reversed ʰ, which could be a retrograde s or the “Danish” form of j (this form of j appears in the fuþark on 16. Charnay).

Synthetic reading: ??jlabrg

References


Images

Betz (1979:245) (photograph); Martin 2004:182 (drawings); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).

60. Osthofen

Concordance

AZ 26; KJ 145; L VII.34; Ma H1; O 36; RMR B5; Sch Q.

Object

Gilt bronze disc fibula.

Find-site

Osthofen, Kr. Worms, Rheinland-Pfalz, Germany (49° 42’ N, 8° 20’ E).

Context

From a row-gravefield, dug up in 1854 under uncertain circumstances (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:307).
Provenance

The area was under Frankish control after Chlodwig’s defeat of the Alamanni at the beginning of the 6th century (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:307).

Datings

567-600 (Stein, cited by Düwel 1994b:276 Anm. 74).
c.600 or in the decades before 600 (Martin 2004:181).
570-660 (McKinnell et al. 2004:49).

Location of inscription

On the back, between two decorative concentric rings, running left to right.

Readings

go furadi di le+ (Looijenga 2003a:253).
go[1?] ' furad[1?] (h)d(e)(o)f(ile (1Z) (Kiel).

The rune transliterated ḷ could be a (Krause 1966:285; Schwerdt 2000:221); all the available interpretations are based on the reading h, however.

Synthetic reading: go?:furad?ḥdəOfFile?

References
60. Osthofen


Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 23, 41) (photographs); Düwel (1996b:543) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 62) (photographs).

61. Pforzen I

Concordance

L VII.35; Ma Gü1; RMR C7; Sch R.

Object

Silver belt buckle.

Find-site

Pforzen, Kr. Ostallgäu, Bavaria, Germany (47° 56’ N, 10° 37’ E).

Context


Provenance

The buckle is characterised as possibly a Langobardic or Gepid imitation of late antique style (Düwel 1994b:290; Nedoma 2004a:158; 2004b:342).
Schwab (1999b:55, 75) describes it as of Mediterranean origin, but not Langobardic. The Pforzen gravefield also contains a number of finds which are of definitely East Germanic character, according to Babucke (1993:17-19; see also Nedoma 2004a:161). Schwab (1999b:75) argues that the dialect of the inscription may be EGmc. In spite of this controversy, Seebold appears confident that the dialect is Alamannic (Seebold et al. 2001:16).

From the contents and context of the grave, it is not possible to draw any inferences about the ethnic origin of the man buried in grave 239 (Babucke 1999a:20).

**Datings**


c.550 (Schwab 1999b:55).


Mid 6th century (Looijenga 2003a:253).

576-600 (Martin 2004:186).

c.570-600 (McKinnell et al. 2004:57).

**Location of inscription**

Front, running left to right in two rows.

**Readings**


aïgilandaïlrun ' (?-1) Itahugasokun (Kiel).

Looijenga’s placement of the marks presumed to be word-dividers is somewhat at variance with Nedoma’s. They do not appear in Düwel’s earlier readings as they were only discovered during restoration of the buckle (Pieper 1999:27-35; Nedoma 2004a:158).

One point of contention is the sequence transliterated ai in most readings, al by Pieper and ha by Seebold. Both twigs of the a appear oddly elongated to meet the following stave, and the upper twig crosses it. I have some sympathy with Pieper’s assessment that this is an incidental feature, and that al (or al) might be the correct reading (Pieper 1999:30). This would give us a doubled ll, which is unusual, but not unknown (compare, e.g., 89. Wremen ksamella).

Seebold’s ha reading has little to recommend it, as it depends on an arbitrary assumption that the a-component is either malformed or has been
damaged. For this reason, I have not attempted to incorporate it into the synthetic reading.

Preceding r in complex I is a trace of a u-rune, giving a possible reading ...urun. The mark that would make the arch of u is much fainter than the other strokes, suggesting that it represents an error or emendation on the part of the carver (Pieper 1999:30-32). Following a microscopic examination, Nedoma dismisses this mark as an incidental scratch (2004a:158). Marold (2004:221) argues that a u-rune was intended, at least at the planning stage of the carving process (see text, §4.1).

Pieper (1999:33) supports the reading of a bind-rune el at the beginning of complex II, as does Marold (2004:225). On examining Waldispühl’s recent high-quality photographs, as well as those in Bammesberger and Waxenberger (1999:286), I am not persuaded. They appear to show quite clearly two distinct runes lt, with no visible indication that the twigs are intended to meet to form e (see also Nedoma 2004b:347; Wagner 1999a:92).

The paratextual marks which Nedoma transcribes ≡ are generally believed to be decorative marks to fill out the line (Nedoma 2004a:158). Wagner regards the former as part of the inscription, anji (perhaps as a triple bind-rune); against this view, Nedoma (2004b:346) argues that the “staves” of these marks are inclined to the right, whereas those of the runes are vertical; and that they are deeper and less carefully cut than the runes.

Synthetic reading: [I] aigil-andi-aIRTHrun?(...) [II] ḫahu-gasokun?
References


Images

Babucke (1999a:17, 19; 2003:116) (drawings); Bammesberger and Waxenberger (1999:281-290 Taf. 1-4) (drawings and photographs); Düwel (1993:10) (drawing); Düwel (1996b:549) (photograph); Düwel (1997a:496) (photograph); Düwel (1997c:282) (drawings); Naumann (2004 Taf. 3-4) (photographs); Nedoma (2004a:159-160) (photographs); Nedoma (2004b:343) (drawing); Fingerlin et al. (2004 Taf.3-4) (photographs); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).

62. Pforzen II

Concordance

L VII.57.

Object
Ivory ring framing a bronze disc, probably a belt decoration (Babucke 1999b:121, 125; Düwel 1997b:19; 2002c:32; Nedoma 2004a:189). Babucke (1999b:126) suggests that it may have had an apotropaic or other amuletic function (see also Düwel 2002c:33-34).

**Find-site**

Pforzen, Kr. Ostallgäu, Bavaria, Germany (47° 56’ N, 10° 37’ E).

**Context**

Female grave (no. 255) in the Pforzen row-gravefield (for more archaeological details, see Babucke 1999a; 1999b; 2003). The inscription was discovered during restoration of the object in December 1996 (Babucke 1999b:121; Nedoma 2004b:341).

**Provenance**

The style of the object is characteristic of the eastern part of the Merovingian cultural sphere (the Rhine-Frankish, Alamannic and Bavarian regions) (Babucke 1999b:125). Seebold classifies the inscription as dialectally Alamannic (Seebold et al. 2001:16).

**Datings**

c.600 (Babucke 1999b:126; Düwel 1997b:19; 2002c:32; 2003a:117; Looijenga 2003a:256; Nedoma 2004a:189). This dating is based on the styles of jewellery and pottery found in the grave.

**Location of inscription**

Complex I on the outside of the ring, complex II on the inside, both running left to right.
Readings


[0-1?](1? e) ' aodlip ' urait ' runa ' | (1?)l(u)(1?u) ' gisali (Kiel).

It remains uncertain whether both inscriptions were made by the same carver (Nedoma 2004a:189). Only part of the object has survived, so it is possible that the texts are incomplete, or that more texts originally existed (Nedoma 2004b:341).


References


Images

\(^7\) Düwel here numbers the inner inscription I and the outer II, conversely to Nedoma (and to my synthetic reading). I have not cited his numbers in order to avoid confusion.
Babucke (1999b:122) (drawings); Bammesberger and Waxenberger (1999:291-297 Taf. 5) (photographs); Düwel (1997b:19) (drawing); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).

---

63. Pleidelsheim

**Concordance**

L VII.58; Ma A3.

**Object**

Silver gilt bow fibula.

**Find-site**

Pleidelsheim, Kr. Ludwigsburg, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 58’ N, 9° 12’ E).

**Context**

Female grave (no. 20) in a gravefield (no further details available at the time of writing).

**Provenance**

The gravefield has both Alamannic and Frankish periods of use. Grave 20 belongs to “family 5”, which is identified as being of Thuringian ancestry; but the fibulae worn by the occupant are typologically Frankish (Koch 2001:386).

**Datings**

551-575 (Düwel 1999a:15).
555-580 (Koch 2001:359). This is a dating for the burial, based on the inventory of grave-goods.

End of 6\textsuperscript{th} century (Looijenga 2003a:265).


**Location of inscription**

On the back, on the footplate, running left to right.

**Readings**

inha (Düwel 1999a:15; Looijenga 2003a:265).

iiha (Nedoma 2004a:349).

(in)ha (Kiel).

From Nedoma’s photograph, the first two staves are quite clear, but I can see no trace of any side-twigs; I am therefore inclined to favour Nedoma’s transliteration.

Synthetic reading: \textit{iiha}

**References**


**Images**

64. †Rubring

Concordance

O 37.

Object

Fragment of an oval piece of limestone (Haas 1958:71; Nedoma 2003:482).

Find-site


Context

Reputedly a stray find, discovered by schoolchildren in 1943 or 1946/47 (Nedoma 2003:481-482; Steinhauser 1968a:1). For further details, see Appendix 2.

Provenance

Unknown.

Datings

8th century (Steinhauser 1968a:16). Nedoma rejects this dating on the grounds that runic epigraphy in the “South Germanic” region ceases in the mid-7th century (Nedoma 2003:484-485).

Location of inscription

On one flattened surface of the stone, in three rows reading left to right (insofar as transcription is possible).

Readings
64. *Rubring


kīndo[I] irīŋ wp (Steinhauser 1968a:4-6).

kīndo // irīŋ wp (Opitz 1987:37).


(1-2?)īnd(1?)[?] ? (1? r) iŋ(0-1?)[?] ? w(1?) ? (Kiel).


References

Haas (1958); Nedoma (2003); Opitz (1987:36-37, 179); Steinhauser (1968a).

Images

Haas (1958:71-72) (drawing and photograph); Nedoma (2003:482-483) (photograph and drawings); Steinhauser (1968a:3) (photograph).

65. *Rügen

Concordance

None.

Object

Small piece of sandstone, described by its discoverer, Dr. H. Piesker-Hermannsburg, as an amulet (Arntz 1937:7). This identification appears to be based on the presence of a hole which might indicate that the object had been worn or hung (Eggers 1968:7).
†Rügen

Find-site

Reportedly from the island of Rügen, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Germany. More precise details unknown.

Context


Provenance

On the basis of his interpretation of the text (see text, §4.1), Arntz sees the inscription as closely related to the bracteates and produced by the same tribe(s). He suggests that it may be Danish, or perhaps produced by remnants of the Rugii (Arntz 1937:8). On the settlement of Rügen and the possible connections between the island name and various ethnic groups with similar names (e.g., Rugi(i) (Tacitus, Germ. 44); Rugini (Bede, Hist.eccl. 11.7)), see Leube (2003:425-426); Udolph (2003). Linguistically, the text as interpreted by Arntz could as well be WGmc as PNorse.

Datings

Probably before 500 (Arntz 1937:8). This dating is based on the putative relationship between this inscription and the bracteate tradition (see Provenance, above).

Location of inscription

On the stone, beginning near the tip and running left to right.

Readings

fgiu (Arntz 1936b:152; 1937:7; Kiel).

agil (Eggers 1968:7).
Synthetic reading: /aʁgiˈl/. 

References

Arntz (1936b:152; 1937; 1939a); Eggers (1968); Sierke (1939:66-67).

Images

None available at the time of writing.

66. Saint-Dizier

[Numbered Saint-Dizier 1 by Fischer (2007). Saint-Dizier 2 (IRF 24) does not have an inscription.]

Concordance

IRF 23.

Object

Silver gilt pommel of a ring-sword.

Find-site

Saint-Dizier, Dép. Haute-Marne, France (48° 38’ N, 4° 57’ E).

Context


Provenance

No comments in the literature. Fischer (2007:105) classifies the pommel as the “Bifrons-Gilton” type, of which there is a concentration of examples in
Kent. Hawkes and Page (1967:19) regard the practice of inscribing runes on sword parts as distinctly Kentish, although a number of parallels in Frankish territory have since been found, and Fischer seems to favour a Frankish origin (Fischer 2007:15-21).

**Datings**

c.540, based on other grave finds. The inscription points to c.520-535 (Fischer 2007:108).

**Location of inscription**

On one side of the pommel.

**Readings**


Synthetic reading: ɬu

**References**


**Images**


---

67. Schretzheim I

**Concordance**

AZ 29; KJ 157; L VII.36; O 38; RMR D7; Sch S.

**Object**
Cylindrical bronze capsule (bulla?), containing a yellow bead and remains of plant material (which were not identified by earlier archaeologists, and which are now lost) (Koch 1977:86).

**Find-site**

Schretzheim, Kr. Dillingen an der Donau, Bavaria, Germany (48° 36’ N, 10° 31’ E).

**Context**


A fibula with an uninterpretable inscription (Schretzheim IV, Ma B3) was found in the same grave (see Appendix 1).

**Provenance**

According to Arntz (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:334), the gravefield is Alamannic, but the capsule may be an import from Langobardic Italy. Werner, on the other hand (1950:91, cited by Krause 1966:300) claims that capsules of this type were produced in the Middle Rhine region and that it is therefore of Frankish origin. Seebold classifies the inscription as Alamannic, without further comment (Seebold et al. 2001:16).

**Datings**


Mid 6\textsuperscript{th} century or 551-575 (Martin 2004:179).

7\textsuperscript{th} century (McKinnell et al. 2004:63).

Medallions based on coins of Justinian I (527-565) were found in the grave and give us a \textit{terminus post quem} for the burial (Martin 2004:179).

**Location of inscription**

Complex I around the side of the lower half of the capsule; complex II around the side of the lid, to the left of the hinge. Both inscriptions run left to right, with complex II upside-down relative to complex I.

**Readings**


\textit{alagup ' leuba ' d(e)dun}   \textit{arog(i)sd} (Kiel).

The \textit{e} of \textit{d\textsuperscript{e}dun} is irregular and could conceivably be a bind-rune \textit{ek/ke} (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:337-338). The inscription as a whole is very faint.

Synthetic reading:  [I] \textit{alagup:leuba:d\textsuperscript{e}dun}   [II] \textit{arogisd}
References


Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 26-27) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 67) (photographs).

68. Schretzheim II

Concordance

KJ 156; L VII.37; Ma E3; O 39; Sch T.

Object

Silver disc fibula.

Find-site

Schretzheim, Kr. Dillingen an der Donau, Bavaria, Germany (48° 36’ N, 10° 31’ E).

Context

Female grave (no. 509) in the Schretzheim row-gravefield (see 67. Schretzheim I). The grave was excavated in 1932, but the inscription was not discovered until 1946 (Krause 1966:297-298).
Provenance

Alamannic (so Krause 1966:298, with no further comment).

Datings

601-650 (Jänichen 1951:226).

Beginning of 7th century (Krause 1966:298).


526-550, up to c.600 (Martin 2004:180-181). This is a time-span for the “pomegranate” disc fibulae (Granatscheibenfibel) in general (see 29. Gomadingen; 59. Oettingen).

Location of inscription

On the back, complex I on the edge, complex II more central and inverted relative to it. Both complexes run left to right in the commonly accepted reading; Jänichen reads complex I right to left.

Readings


In the text, I follow the majority reading of this text, rather than that of Jänichen.

References
68. Schretzheim II


Images

Jänichen (1951:226) (photographs and drawing); Krause (1966 Taf. 66) (photograph).

69. Schretzheim III

Concordance

Gr H2; L VII.38; Ma Wa2; O 40; Sch U.

Object


Find-site

Schretzheim, Kr. Dillingen an der Donau, Bavaria, Germany (48° 36’ N, 10° 31’ E).

Context

Male grave (no. 79) in the Schretzheim row-gravefield, excavated in 1894 (Grünzweig 2004:131-132; Klingenberg and Koch 1974:118; Koch 1977:10). The inscription was not discovered until the sword was examined with X-rays in 1972 (Klingenberg and Koch 1974:123).
Provenance

The gravefield is identified as Alamannic (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:334), but the sword is believed to be of Scandinavian origin (Klingenberg and Koch 1974:122; Martin 2004:195). Martin appears to infer that the man who owned the sword was a migrant from the north (2004:197).

According to Grünzweig (2004:125-126, 132), the construction of the blade has parallels which point to an origin in the Frankish Rhineland.

Datings

551-600 (Düwel 1994b:267; Klingenberg and Koch 1974:121-123; Looijenga 2003a:256; Roth 1981a:66; Schwerdt 2000:227). This dating is based on stylistic comparison with other ring-swords from the region.


Location of inscription

On the blade, in front of the guard (on directions of reading, see below).

Readings

(g)abau (Opitz 1987:40; Schwerdt 2000:227).

gabar or abar g (Looijenga 2003a:256).

"aḥa (Nedoma 2004a:197).

(g)aba(u) (Kiel).

The inscription is a “rune-cross” (the cross itself possibly to be read as g). Nedoma reads clockwise, Opitz and Looijenga anticlockwise. While the synthetic reading follows the majority, it must be recognised that neither the
beginning of the text nor the intended direction of the reading can be ascertained.

Synthetic reading: \( (g)aba^u/r \)

**References**


**Images**

Düwel (1997a:495) (photograph); Klingenberg and Koch (1974:120) (drawings); Looijenga (2003a:257) (drawing); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).

---

**70. Schwangau**

**Concordance**

L VII.39; Ma I5; Sch V.

**Object**

Silver gilt fibula, variously described as a disc fibula (Düwel 1994b:277; Kiel) or a disc-shaped S-fibula (Martin 2004:181; Nedoma 2004a:147).
Find-site

Schwangau, Kr. Ostallgäu, Bavaria, Germany (47° 35’ N, 10° 44’ E).

Context

Female grave (no. 33) in a row-gravefield, excavated in 1981.

Provenance

Alamannic (Looijenga 2003a:257).

Datings


526-575 (Nedoma 2004a:147 (following Martin 2004:184)). Martin is extrapolating from the datings of a number of other S-fibulae (Ma I1-3).

Location of inscription

On the back, running left to right.

Readings


æbi (Kiel).

Looijenga’s reading, based on her examination of the original, is generally held to supersede the previous reading.

Synthetic reading: æbi
References


Images

Martin (2004:183) (drawings); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).

---

71. Sievern

Concordance

An 70; IK 156; KJ 134; L VI.37; SUR 84.

Object

Gold A-bracteate.

Find-site

Sievern, Kr. Wesermünde, Niedersachsen, Germany (53° 39’ N, 8° 36’ E).

Context

Part of a hoard found in a bog, along with a number of other bracteates (Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:1,2:271; Hauck 1970:134).

Provenance

Antonsen includes this item in his list of NWGmc inscriptions. Like most other bracteates, it is associated with Denmark or southern Scandinavia and believed to be linguistically NWGmc/PNorse. Seebold, however, classifies the inscription (with reservations) as OLG (Seebold et al. 2001:16).
Datings

None more precise than the bracteate period in general (c.450-550). The A-
type bracteates are considered to be relatively early (Clavadetscher et al. 1984-
narrower range 476-500 for “pure” A-bracteates with no animal motif. Sievern
also belongs to this class of bracteates.

Location of inscription

Below the head, running right to left.

Readings

\( \text{rwrilu} \) (Krause 1966:270; Hauck 1970:135).

\( \text{rwrilu} \) (Krause 1971:163; Looijenga 2003a:215).

\( \text{rwritu} \) (Antonsen 1975:65).

\( \text{rwrilu} \) (Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:1,2:271; Nowak 2003:537).

\( (1? \ w)\text{ri}(1?)u \) (Kiel).

The above readings differ only in respect of the authors’ confidence about
the transliterations \( r, w, l \). Hauck (1970:134) notes that the object is badly
worn.

Synthetic reading: \( \text{rwrilu} \)

References

Antonsen (1975:65); Clavadetscher et al. (1984-1989:1,2:271-272); Hauck
(1970:133-136); Krause (1957; 1966:270-272; 1971:163); Looijenga
Images

Clavadetscher et al. (1984-1989:1,3:201-202) (drawing and photograph);
Hauck (1970 Abb.6) (photographs and drawing); Krause (1966:271, Taf. 58)
(drawing and photograph).

72. Skodborg

Concordance

An 103; DR Br 8; IK 161; KJ 105; L VI.38; RMR E25; SUR 85.

Object

Gold B-bracteate.

Find-site

Skodborg, Sønderjylland, Denmark (55° 25’ N, 9° 09’ E). There seems to
be a lack of certainty about whether the find-site is actually Skodborg or
nearby Skodborghus (55° 27’ N, 9° 09’ E); Nowak (2003), for example, labels
the bracteate Skodborghus-B/Skodborg. Since the places are very close
together and the item represents an outlier in my corpus, I leave this
uncertainty aside. In the maps, the co-ordinates for Skodborg have been used.

Context

Found as part of a hoard(?) in 1865 (Krause 1966:241).

Provenance

Krause (1966:241-242) handles this item together with the other Danish
bracteates as part of the PNorse runic corpus. Antonsen, on the other hand,
includes it in the list of inscriptions which he classifies as linguistically WGmc (Antonsen 1975:76).

Stiles (1984:30-31) notes and rejects Marstrander’s (1929:119-121) identification of the item as Gothic, based on linguistic arguments (which Stiles rebuts).

**Datings**

Krause states that no dating is possible beyond the general period of bracteate production (c.450-c.550), although the type B bracteates are generally held to have been produced somewhat later than types A and C (Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:1,1:21-22; Krause 1966:238).

   c.500 (Antonsen 1975:76).

**Location of inscription**

Running all the way around the edge of the decorated face, read right to left (Nowak 2003:540).

**Readings**


**References**

72. Skoborg

Images


73. Skonager III

[This is the numbering used by DR and IK. The other rune-inscribed bracteates from the same location are Skonager I-A (DR Br 14; IK 41.2); and Skonager II-A (DR Br 15; IK 162.1).]

Concordance

An 101; DR Br 16; IK 163; KJ 118; L VI.39; RMR E22; SUR 86.

Object

Gold C-bracteate.

Find-site

Skonager, Ribe Amt, Jylland, Denmark (55° 38’ N, 8° 34’ E).

Context

3 exempla from the same stamp found in a hoard with a number of other bracteates (Krause 1966:254).

Provenance

Antonsen (1975:76) includes this item among those inscriptions which he classifies as linguistically WGmc.

Datings

c.450-c.550 (i.e., the bracteate period in general) (Antonsen 1975:76).
As far as I am aware, no more precise datings for the find have been suggested.

**Location of inscription**

Complex I below the head of the horse depicted on the bracteate, running left to right. Complex II is between the horse’s legs, read right to left, and inverted relative to complex I and the horse.

**Readings**


Synthetic reading: [I] niuwila [II] ḫu

**References**

Antonsen (1975:17, 76); Clavadetscher et al. (1984-1989:1,2:283-284); Düwel et al. (1975:159-165, 172-178); Jacobsen and Moltke (1941-1942:504-506); Krause (1966:254-255; 1971:163); Looijenga (2003a:216); McKinnell (2004:75-76); Nowak (2003:288-292, 544 *et passim*).

**Images**

Clavadetscher et al. (1984-1989:1,3:211-212) (drawing and photograph); Düwel et al. (1975 Taf. 25) (photograph); Krause (1966 Taf. 56) (photograph); Looijenga (2003a plate 7c) (photograph).
74. Soest

Concordance

AZ 30; KJ 140; L VII.40; Ma E7; O 41.

Object

Gold disc fibula.

Find-site

Soest, Kr. Soest, Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany (51° 35’ N, 8° 07’ E).

Context

Female grave (no. 106) in a row-gravefield, excavated in 1930.

Provenance

The gravefield is commonly identified as Frankish, as is the inscription (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:345; Krause 1966:281). According to Zeiss, however, the fibula may have been made in Italy (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:345). In favour of Frankish origin is the presence of two very similar fibulae in the grave of the Frankish queen Arnegundis († c.580) (Nedoma 2004a:213).

From the historical and archaeological evidence, it is not certain whether the site was in Frankish or Saxon territory in the late 6th century. Nedoma (2004a:215) cites Siegmund’s (2000:309-312) argument that the gravefield conforms to a Saxon cultural model.

Datings


Towards the end of the 6th century (Krause 1966:280-281).

551-600 (Opitz 1987:40).

The grave contains coins of Justinian I, probably minted in Ravena between c.555-565. These give us a terminus post quem for the burial (Krause 1966:280; Nedoma 2004a:213).

**Location of inscription**

On the back. Complex I is to the right of the pin-holder, complex II between the pin-holder and the loop. Complex I runs left to right; the rune-cross in complex II is read clockwise in the readings below.

**Readings**


**rada:daþa gatano** (Opitz 1987:40).

**rada:daþa gatano** (Looijenga 2003a:257).

**rada' daþa | (0-?)atano | (0-?)** (Kiel).

Holthausen (1931:304) and Krause (1966:280) note a d-like form to the right of the loop. Nedoma (2004a:215) describes several other markings, including the d-like form and several crosses which could conceivably be g-runes.

\(^8\) “ein aus der Rune O und den Binderunen NT und AA zusammengesetztes Monogramm”
Synthetic reading: [I] rada:daþa [II] atano or gatano

References


Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 28) (photographs); Klingenberg and Koch (1974:119) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 60) (photographs).

75. Steindorf

Concordance

AZ 31; Gr H4; KJ 158; L VII.41; Ma Wa7; O 42; Sch W.

Object

Iron sax.

Find-site

Steindorf, Kr. Fürstenfeldbruck, Bavaria, Germany (48° 13’ N, 11° 0’ E).

Context

According to Zeiss (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:350-351) the region east of the Lech was under Bavarian control in the 7th century, but was previously Alamannic. The design of this sax has parallels in Alamannia (including Hailfingen I), but none in Bavarian graves. Krause likewise identifies the object as Alamannic (1966:301).

**Datings**

Mid 7th century or 651-700 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:351).

Early 7th century (Krause 1966:301).

7th century (Bamnesberger 1969:7).


551-600 or 567-600 (Düwel 1994b:271; Looijenga 2003a:258; Schwerdt 2000:228).

C.550 or later (Martin 2004:185 Anm. 66).

570/580-600/610 (Grünzweig 2004:127; Nedoma 2004a:335, citing personal communication from Jo Wernard).

**Location of inscription**

On the blade, running parallel to the edge and reading left to right.

**Readings**

**whus…ald…** (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:352).

**husiβald**// (Krause 1966:300).


**husiβaldxx?** (Düwel 1981b:158).

**huisi?ald** (Looijenga 2003a:258).
I am inclined to reject Looijenga’s reading of R.1-2 as **huis**, both because it finds no agreement elsewhere in the literature and because I can see no justification for it from my own inspection of the available photographs. The initial **h** and **u** are clearly distinct, not a bind-rune as Looijenga states.

Preceding the text is a triangular sign (represented by Nedoma as ≡) of unknown significance – possibly a maker’s mark or indicator of the beginning of the text (Düwel 1981b:159; Krause 1966:301; Nedoma 2004a:335). Arntz reads this as a retrograde **w**-rune. A similar sign appears on the Schweindorf solidus (L IX.8). It is perhaps significant that the legible inscription on another weapon, the Wurmlingen spearhead (no. 90), is preceded by a non-runic sign of unknown function.

Following the legible part of the inscription are some more marks which may contain more text and/or decoration.

**Synthetic reading:** ?**husi?ald??(?)**

**References**


**Images**
76. Stetten

Concordance

Sch X.

Object

Silver hemispherical object, described by Pieper as “one half of a silver capsule… [which] might have been part of a so-called bobble-earring, or part of a needle” (1990:6); by Düwel (1994b:292; 2002c:29) and Nedoma (2004a:182) as part of the head of a pin (probably a hairpin or a pin for a veil; and by Looijenga (2003a:22 n.10) as a rivet. According to Weis (Weis et al. 1991:311-312), it is most likely to belong to a pin for a veil (since the grave contains a pair of wire earrings, and no indication that bobble-earrings are also present).

Find-site

Stetten an der Donau, Kr. Tuttlingen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 21’ N, 8° 49’ E).

Context
Female grave (no. 133) in a gravefield excavated between 1984 and 1987. The object was found several centimetres above the body, but is nevertheless thought to belong to the burial (Pieper 1993:81; Weis et al. 1991:309-311).

**Provenance**

Pieper describes the gravefield as Alamannic (1990:6).

**Datings**


**Location of inscription**

On the outside, running left to right.

**Readings**


`amelkudf` (Pieper 1993:82; Schwerdt 2000:229).

`amelkud | f` (Kiel).

The f-rune is above the main ductus of the inscription, between a and me. According to Pieper (1990:7), its lower twig crosses the bind-rune me, indicating that it was cut afterwards.

The marks are extremely small (2mm high), but I am inclined to agree with Pieper (1990:7; Weis et al. 1991:312) that they appear to have been deliberately cut, and are not simply incidental scratches. Nevertheless,
Nedoma regards the identification of a runic inscription as very doubtful, and also regards the late date as grounds for scepticism (see text, §1.1.2).

Synthetic reading: amelkud ʃ

References


Images

Pieper (1990:7) (drawing); Weis et al. (1991 Taf. 55-56) (photographs); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).

77. Szabadbattyán

Concordance

An 98; AZ 32; KJ 167; L V.39; O 43.

Object

Silver buckle.

Find-site

Szabadbattyán, Kom. Fejér, Hungary (47° 07’ N, 18° 23’ E). Because of the uncertain origin of the item, the association of the item with this location is unverifiable.

Context

**Provenance**

Unknown (Krause 1966:311). In spite of the find-location, many sources classify the inscription as linguistically WGmc (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:355-356; Düwel 1994b:289 n.83; Nedoma 2006a:113). Zeiss (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:356) comments that elements of the “Suebi” migrated into Pannonia and Dalmatia in the second half of the fifth century, and implies that this makes the presence of a WGmc inscription in this region plausible.


Nedoma (2004a:378) refrains from any commitment on this point.

**Datings**


426-450 (Martin 2004:168).

**Location of inscription**

On the back, running left to right.

**Readings**

marŋ s(d) (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:357-358).

marŋ sq (Krause 1966:310).
marŋs (Antonsen 1975:74). Antonsen actually transliterates marings, with ing representing the ◦-rune.

marŋs sd (Klingenberg 1976c:364; Opitz 1987:43).

marings≡ (Nedoma 2004a:377).

mar(0-1?)ŋ | s(1-2?) (Kiel).

ŋ is the “lantern-rune”, which is perhaps interpretable as a bind-rune in (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:358; Nedoma 2004a:377); compare 2. Aquincum.

The final sign (which Krause transcribes δ, Opitz as a bind-rune sd and Nedoma as ≡) is described by Antonsen as “a malformed swastika” (1975:74). Arntz is non-committal on the identification of this sign, noting that it resembles a rather odd form of d rotated through 45° (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:358).

There is a noticeable gap between Ń and s.

Synthetic reading: marŋs?

References


Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 30) (photographs); Kiss (1980:131) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 72) (photographs).
78. †Trier

Concordance

O 44a.

Object

Small (3 x 2.3 x 0.7 cm) rectangular serpentine object of unknown function (Düwel 2003b:518). Schneider describes the object and a small serpentine hare found at the same site as the two parts of an amulet. Both are pierced by holes, apparently to allow them to be threaded onto something (Schneider 1980:196, 198).

Find-site

Trier, Rheinland-Pfalz, Germany (49° 45’ N, 6° 38’ E).

Context

Apparently a stray find (with the hare close by), discovered in the town during sewer construction in 1978 (Schneider 1980:193).

Provenance

Schneider (1980:195-196) argues on linguistic grounds that the inscription was produced locally. I do not consider his linguistic analysis reliable, however (see text, §3.2.1; §4.1).

Datings
5th or early 6th century (Schneider 1980:196). Schneider (assuming that the item is genuine) infers this dating from aspects of his (dubious) linguistic analysis (see text, §3.1.1; §4.1).

**Location of inscription**

Complexes I and II on the edges of the shorter sides of the object, both running right to left.

**Readings**


**References**


**Images**

Schneider (1980 Abb. 3-4) (photographs).

---

**79. Weimar I**

**Concordance**

AZ 33; KJ 147; L VII.44; Ma B2a; O 49; Sch Z.

**Object**

Silver gilt bow fibula, one of a pair with 80. Weimar II.

**Find-site**

Weimar, Thüringen, Germany (50° 59’ N, 11° 19’ E).
Female grave (no. 57) in a row-gravefield on the northeast side of the town. The grave belongs to a section of the gravefield excavated between 1895 and 1902 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:360).

**Provenance**

The gravefield in general is usually classified as Thuringian. Zeiss (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:360-361) applies this also to the occupants of graves 56 and 57, where the runic inscriptions were found. Seebold likewise classifies the inscription as linguistically Thuringian (Seebold et al. 2001:16). According to more recent studies (Siegmund 2000, cited by Nedoma 2004a:228), the gravefield more closely fits an “Alamannic cultural model”.

Based on the decorative style, Krause (1966:280-281) argues that the fibula is of Frankish manufacture.

**Datings**


**Location of inscription**

On the back, complex I on the footplate and complexes II-IV on 3 of the knobs. All are read left to right.

**Readings**


**haribrig liub leob** (Looijenga 2003a:260).
Only 3 of the original 7 knobs are still attached to the fibula. The **hiḥa** knob is now missing (which is why it is absent from Looijenga’s reading). The **liub(j)**: knob is very badly corroded.

Looijenga’s is the only transliteration which differs from those of Arntz and Krause; the only differences are the absence of the **hiba** knob and of the final ḫ in complex III. I therefore adhere to the majority reading.

Synthetic reading: [I] **haribrig** [II] **hiḥa:** [III] **liub(j):** [IV] **leob-**

**References**


**Images**

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 31, 41-42) (photographs); Martin (2004:176) (drawing).

---

**80. Weimar II**

**Concordance**
34; KJ 147; L VII.45; Ma B2b; O 50; Sch Z.

Object
Silver gilt bow fibula, the pair of 79. Weimar I.

Find-site
Weimar, Thüringen, Germany (50° 59’ N, 11° 19’ E).

Context
See Weimar I.

Provenance
See Weimar I.

Datings
See Weimar I.

Location of inscription
On the back, complex I on the footplate and complexes II-III on 2 of the
knobs. All are read left to right.

Readings
[footplate] sig/// [knob a] bubo: [knob b] hiba: (Arntz and Zeiss

sigib\d hiba budo (Looijenga 2003a:261).

[I] si\ (or: \is) [II] budo: [III] hiba: (Nedoma 2004a:258).

Synthetic reading: [I] si\ (…) [II] budo: [III] hiba:

References
80. Weimar II


**Images**

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 32, 42) (photographs); Martin (2004:176) (drawing).

81. Weimar III

**Concordance**

AZ 35; KJ 148; L VII.46; Ma Gü3; O 51; Sch Y.

**Object**

Bronze belt buckle.

**Find-site**

Weimar, Thüringen, Germany (50° 59’ N, 11° 19’ E).

**Context**

emale grave (no. 56) in the same gravefield as 79-80. Weimar I-II.

**Provenance**

See Weimar I.

**Datings**


**Location of inscription**

Complex I on the middle of the “front” (it is actually not certain which side of the buckle is the front); complex II on the middle of the “back”; complex III on the edge of the “back” surface, apparently following on from complex II.

All 3 complexes are read left to right.

**Readings**


(Düwel 1994b:290).


(Looijenga 2003a:261 (my numbering of complexes)).

ida ' b(1?)igina ' hahwar ' | ' awimund ' isd ' (le)0(b) | idun ' (Kiel).


[III] idun'/:
81. Weimar III


Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 33, 43) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 63) (photographs).

82. Weimar IV

Concordance

AZ 36; KJ 149; L VII.47; O 52; RMR D5; Sch AA.

Object

Cylindrical amber bead, now lost (Looijenga 2003a:262; Nedoma 2004a:313).

Find-site

Weimar, Thüringen, Germany (50° 59’ N, 11° 19’ E).

Context

The same grave (no. 56) as 81. Weimar III.

Provenance

See Weimar I.

Datings
See Weimar III.

**Location of inscription**

Around the outside edge, running left to right.

**Readings**

\[ \text{ida} : \text{Leod} : \text{idâ} \text{hahwar} : \text{wi}u \text{þ} \] (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:377).

\[ \text{þiup:ida:xxxxa:jahwar} : \] (Kiel; Krause 1966:290).


\[ \text{þiuw:ida?:e??a:jahwar} \] (Looijenga 2003a:262). Looijenga notes that her reading is based on the photographs in Arntz and Zeiss 1939, which have been doctored.

\[ \text{þiup} : \text{ida} : \text{Leod} : \text{ida} : \text{hahwar} : \] (McKinnell et al. 2004:62).

\[ \text{'p'iup:ida:x(x?)exxxa:jahwar} : \] (Nedoma 2004a:314).

As Krause notes (1966:290), the inscription runs all the way around the edge with no clear indication of where it begins and ends. In my synthetic reading I have followed the majority.

Synthetic reading: \[ b/w \text{iu}b/w:ida?:e??a:jahwar \]

**References**


**Images**
82. Weimar IV

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 33, 43) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 63) (photograph of a plaster cast).

83. Weingarten I

Concordance

KJ 164; L VII.48; Ma I3; O 53; Sch AB.

Object

Silver gilt S-fibula.

Find-site

Weingarten, Kr. Ravensburg, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (47° 48’ N, 9° 38’ E).

Context

Girl’s grave (no. 272) in a row-gravefield on the western edge of the present-day town, excavated in 1955 (Düwel 1989a:43; 2002c:25; Kokkotidis 1999:151; Wein 1957:142). For further details, see Roth and Theune 1995:10-12; Wein (op.cit.).

Provenance

Wein (1957:142) identifies the gravefield as Alamannic.

Datings

7th century (Krause 1966:307).

Mid-6th century (Looijenga 2003a:262; Roth 1981a:66).


Mid-6th century or 550-600 (Düwel 2002c:25).

**Location of inscription**

On the back, complexes I and II either side of the pin-holder, reading left to right.

**Readings**


a(1-2?)rguþ(' 1-?) | feha ' writ(1-2? a) (Kiel).

Following guþ there appear to be two staves with faint marks between them which could conceivably be the twigs of m, but could equally be incidental abrasions. After the second stave is what might be a sign made up of two curves, possibly with a stem. I cannot guess what it might be.

In complex II, the twigs of t are discernible, but very faint. Following it is a partial stave with what may be a side-twig. There is a substantial gap (sufficient for 1-2 additional runes, though I can see no trace of carving)
between this and the following signs – an observation which in my view casts doubt on the reading *writila*, proposed by Bammesberger (2002:120).

Synthetic reading: [I] a'/{ɛ}rgup?:? (??)  [II] feha:writ?...'{ɛ}a

**References**


**Images**

Arntz and Jänichen (1957 Taf. 65) (photographs); Düwel (1997a:494) (drawings); Krause (1966 Taf. 70) (photographs); Roth (1998:184) (drawings); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).

---

**84. Weingarten II**

**Concordance**

KJ 164; L VII.49; Ma I2; O 54; Sch AC.

**Object**

Silver gilt S-fibula.

**Find-site**
Weingarten, Kr. Ravensburg, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (47° 48’ N, 9° 38’ E).

**Context**

Female grave (no. 179) in the Weingarten gravefield, excavated in the 1950s (see 83. Weingarten I).

**Provenance**

See Weingarten I.

**Datings**

7th century (Krause 1966:307).


526-575 (Martin 2004:184). This is a dating for the earlier S-fibulae (including this item and 32. Hailfingen II) as a group.


**Location of inscription**

On the back, running left to right.

**Readings**


*dando* (Opitz 1987:168 (alternative reading); Schwerdt 2000:236).

*da(0-1?)do* (Kiel).
The second rune is rather cramped, with very small twigs. The mark that Opitz regards as the cross-piece of n is higher on the stem than would be expected (Opitz 1987:168; Nedoma 2004a:267).

Synthetic reading: dądo

References


Images

Düwel (1997a:493) (drawings); Krause (1966 Taf. 70) (photograph); Martin (2004:183) (drawings); Roth (1998:183) (drawings); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).

85. †Weser I

[My numbering. In the literature on the Weser bones, they are either unnumbered, or referred to by their museum catalogue numbers (see Concordance).]

Concordance

O Anhang. Catalogued in the Oldenburg Museum as OL4988.

Object
Subfossile bone (distal end of horse tibia).

**Find-site**

According to Ahrens’ report (see Context, below), the find-spot is Sandstedt, Kr. Cuxhaven, Niedersachsen, Germany (53° 22’ N, 8° 32’ E).

**Context**

One of a number of bones with carvings, sold to the Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde und Vorgeschichte Oldenburg by Ludwig Ahrens in 1927-28. According to Ahrens, the bones had been turned up by dredging in the lower Weser (Antonsen 2002:315). Although they were brought to the museum as separate finds, Pieper (1989:152, 154) speculates that Ahrens found them together and sold them individually in order to raise the price (see also Appendix 2).

**Provenance**


**Datings**

6th century (Opitz 1987:54).

560-690 (Pieper 1987:232). This dating is based on amino acid analysis. Pieper speculates that it might be too recent, without going into detail about why.

380-500 (Pieper 1989:105, 241). This is the result of 14C dating.

5th century, probably 401-450 (Pieper 1989:244; Düwel 2008:56; Nedoma 2004a:325). This dating takes into account the chemical analyses. Pieper also refers to the ß-like sign as a “missing link” form of ŋ (see Readings, below),
and a comparison of the pictorial carvings on the bones with iconography on other objects from the period as evidence for this dating.

c.400 or earlier (Antonsen 1993:4-5).

**Location of inscription**

Along the bone in three rows, all read left to right.

**Readings**


latam(1-3?)hari | kunni(1-3? w)e | hagal | (0-2?) (Kiel).

Where Pieper has ing, he is transliterating a sign which resembles the English η-rune 𝕋. Opitz and Nedoma read the 𝕋-like signs as separators rather than runes (on the difficulties with Pieper’s proposed development of forms |.undefined| > 𝕋 (Pieper 1989:153, 166-177) – i.e., as a ligature of a regular η-rune with two dividers – see Nedoma 2004a:326). In defence of his interpretation of the sign as a rune, Pieper (1987:237) – working on the assumption that all three inscriptions form a single text – observes that each of the others (nos. 86-87, below) contains a divider of the more common type made up of two points.

The u-rune in complex II has a peculiar, angular shape. The same form is found on 87, †Weser III, but has no parallels elsewhere (Nedoma 2004a:325).
The sign which most sources transliterate as \textit{w} in line II resembles a Roman Y. It is discussed in more detail in the thesis text (§4.1).

\textit{h} is single-barred in all three Weser inscriptions.

Synthetic reading: [I] \textit{latam(ŋ)hari} [II] \textit{kunni(ŋ)?e} [III] \textit{hagal}

References


Images


Pieper’s drawings are reproduced in a number of other places.

86. †Weser II

[On the numbering, see 85. †Weser I]

Concordance

O Anhang. Catalogued in the Oldenburg Museum as OL4990.

Object

Subfossil bone (distal end of cow tibia).

Find-site
(According to Ahrens) Hammelwarden, Brake (Unterweser), Kr. Wesermarsch, Niedersachsen, Germany (53° 20’ N, 8° 29’ E).

**Context**

See Weser I.

**Provenance**

See Weser I.

**Datings**

675-795 (Pieper 1987:232). This dating is based on amino acid analysis.

350-450 (Pieper 1987:241). This is a $^{14}$C dating.

**Location of inscription**

Along one side, running left to right, towards the natural end of the bone (the other end of the object has been cut and shaped artificially).

**Readings**


$k$ has the shape of the “standard” Older Futhark $<$, but full line height (a form attested only here and on the Belland stone (KJ 83)) (Nedoma 2004a:325).

**References**

See Weser I.

**Images**
86. †Weser II


---

87. †Weser III

[On the numbering, see 85. †Weser I]

Concordance

O Anhang. Catalogued in the Oldenburg Museum as OL4991.

Object

Subfossil bone (cow metatarsus), pierced at one end for threading onto something.

Find-site

(According to Ahrens) Hammelwarden, Brake (Unterweser), Kr. Wesermarsch, Niedersachsen, Germany (53° 20’ N, 8° 29’ E).

Context

See Weser I.

Provenance

See Weser I.

Datings

550-690 (Pieper 1987:232). This dating is based on amino acid analysis. Pieper implies that it may be too recent and that the bone is actually older (see Weser I).

380-500 (Pieper 1989:105, 241). This a $^{14}$C dating.
87. †Weser III

**Location of inscription**

Along one side, running left to right.

**Readings**


**References**

See Weser I.

**Images**


---

88. Wijnaldum B

[Wijnaldum A is a bone or antler object bearing an obscure runic inscription(?)]; see Appendix I]

**Concordance**

L IX.19.

**Object**

Gold pendant.

**Find-site**


**Context**
Stray find, discovered by an amateur on the Wijernaldum terp in 1990.

**Provenance**

The pendant belongs to a type found in a number of women’s graves in Mittelfranken (a district of Bavaria), and Lombardy. Looijenga identifies the style as Langobardic (Looijenga 1991:12, 2003a:323).

**Datings**

c.600 (Looijenga 2003a:323).

**Location of inscription**

On the back, running left to right.

**Readings**

hiwi (Looijenga 2003a:323).

The h in this inscription is single-barred ḥ, which Looijenga (2003a:323) says is unique among the Continental inscriptions. In fact, it does have parallels on the Bergakker sheath fitting (see Appendix 1 for references); 19. Donzdorf; and 85-87. †Weser I-III. The Donzdorf example is generally believed to be of Scandinavian origin.

**References**


**Images**

89. Wremen

[aka Fallward].

Concordance

L VII.17.

Object

Wooden footstool (Looijenga 2003a:231). Schön identifies the wood as alder (Schön et al. 2006:318). Düwel (1994e:14) describes the object as a rectangular wooden board decorated with geometric designs on the top and a hunting scene on the underside. He is noncommittal about its function.

Find-site

In the Fallward marsh near Wremen, Kr. Cuxhaven, Niedersachsen, Germany (53° 39’ N, 8° 31’ E).

Context


Provenance

Saxon (Martin 2004:167). Schön speculates (based on the quality and style of the grave-finds) that the occupant of the grave had been a soldier serving in the Roman army (Schön et al. 2006:318).

Datings

c.425 (Looijenga 2003a:239).

**Location of inscription**

On the edge, running right to left, in two complexes with a substantial gap between them.

**Readings**


**References**


**Images**


Note that these authors are all reproducing the same set of photographs.

---

90. Wurmlingen

**Concordance**

AZ 40; Gr H1; KJ 162; L VII.50; Ma Wa1; O 56; Sch AD.

**Object**
Iron spearhead.

**Find-site**

Wurmlingen, Kr. Tuttlingen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 0’ N, 8° 47’ E).

**Context**

Male grave (no. 2) in a row-gravefield at the southwestern edge of the modern town, excavated in 1929 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:418).

**Provenance**


**Datings**


7th century (Düwel 1981b:157).

c.600 (Looijenga 2003a:263).

567-600 (Grünzweig 2004:125).

550/560-early 7th century (Martin 2004:185 Anm. 66).


**Location of inscription**

On one side, running left to right.

**Readings**

?/\textit{idorih} (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:419).

?\textit{idorih} (Krause 1966:304).

(1Z 1?)dorih (Kiel).

Closer inspections of the second sign in 1975 and again in 2003 indicated that there was no continuous groove and that the reading i is not possible (Düwel 1981b:157; Nedoma 2004a:281; Opitz 1987:85). This is clearly visible on Waldispühl’s photographs (see Images).

The symbol here transcribed ? is a fork-shaped sign like an inverted Y, which Krause describes as “presumably an old symbol of unknown meaning” (1966:304). The decorative pattern on the other side of the spearhead appears to consist of same sign repeated several times. In spite of its resemblance to a form of k found on two Frisian inscriptions (Hantum ivory plate (AZ 20; L IX.15); “Skanomodu” solidus (L IX.9)), the runological community seems to share Arntz’ confidence (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:419) that the sign in the Wurmlingen inscription is not a rune. Arntz points to the recurrence of the sign on the other side of the spearhead as the reason for this – the sequence *kkkkk(…) makes no overt linguistic sense. I would add that although repetitions of the same rune occur in early Scandinavian inscriptions (the most famous case being the Lindholm bone object (amulet?) (KJ 29)

aaaaaaaazzzzn?bmuttt), no parallels are known on the Continent.

9 “vermutlich ein altes Symbol von unbekannter Bedeutung”
Similar fork-shaped signs appear on two other spearheads found in southwestern Germany, and are quite common on various objects in Scandinavia (Grünzweig 2004:129).

Opitz proposes that the sign represents a sprig of mistletoe and that the spear’s decoration therefore alludes to the myth of Baldr’s death (Gylfaginning 49) (Opitz 1987:91-96). This interpretation can at best be described as arbitrary.

Looijenga (2003a:263) notes the presence of a similar sign on Anglo-Saxon beonna coins, standing for Lat. rex.

Synthetic reading: ?:dorih
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Appendix 1: Handlist of Continental runic inscriptions excluded from the corpus

Inscriptions with find-sites in the study area, but dated before c.400 AD

Dahmsdorf spearhead (An 7; AZ 1; KJ 32; RMR A2).

Meldorf fibula (Düwel 1981c; Düwel and Gebühr 1981; Kabell 1988; Mees 1997; 2006; Odenstedt 1983; 1989) (also excluded due to doubtful runic character)

Inscriptions with find-sites in the study area, but positively identifiable as non-WGmc

Nebenstedt I-B bracteate (An 63; IK 128; KJ 133; L VI.29; RMR E27; SUR 62).

Inscriptions outside the study area, possibly classified as WGmc, but excluded due to early date


Sedschütz pot (AZ 5. Raschke 1934).

Værlose rosette fibula (An 100; KJ 11; RMR G6; SUR 121).

Vimose buckle (An 99; L V.10; KJ 24; RMR B2; SUR 118).

Frisian inscriptions excluded due to use of additional runes

Amay(?) comb (AZ 43; L IX.1).

Harlingen solidus (AZ 21; L IX.6).
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**Inscriptions (or rune-like carvings) with find-sites in the study area,**

**but of doubtful runic character**

Arbedo clay vessel (Kiel).

Asch (Aš) sandstone piece (Gierach 1925).


Bopfingen finger-ring (O 7a).

Bopfingen sheath fitting (Ma Wa4).

Chaouilley sword pommel (IRF 3).

†Coburg stone piece (Arntz 1956; Düwel 2008:214).

Elstertrebnitz-A bracteate (IK 239).

Geltorf I-A bracteate (IK 254).

Hamburg-B bracteate (IK 71).

Hamburg-Fuhlsbüttel urn (Tischler 1937).

Heilbronn-Böckingen II fitting (O 24).

Hohenstadt bow fibula (L VII.65; Ma A4 O 26).

Kaltbrunn strap ends(?) (L VII.66. Düwel 1998:17)

Krefeld-Gellep disc fibula (Arntz 1937a; Düwel 2008:67).

Liebenau tweezers (Düwel 1988; Pieper 1990b:10).

München-Aubing IV disc fibula (Ma K2; O 30).


Osterrönfeld ceramic fragment (Dietz et al. 1996; Marold 1994; 1995).

Peigen disc fibula (L VII.69; Ma E4).

Rungholt bone (Düwel and Pieper 2004).
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Saint-Brice bow fibula (Düwel 1986).
Sirnau disc fibula (Düwel 1994b:276).
Sorcy-Bauthemont buckle (Fischer 1999).
Trossingen I-B strap end (KJ 163; Ma C5b; O 46).
Wehden urn (Düwel 2008:67; Waller 1961).
Weißenburg disc fibula (Ma F2; O 55).

Inscriptions with find-sites in the area which are positively identified as runic, but have no linguistic interpretation

Aschheim I bow fibula (Ma D3. Düwel 2002b; Reimann et al. 1999).
Bad Krozingen B disc fibula (Düwel 2002b).
Dischingen II bow fibula (KJ 155; L VII.60; Ma C1b; O 12).
Dittigheim disc fibula (Düwel 2002b:13-14).
Eckernförde-C bracteate (IK 237).
Gräfelfing sax (L VII.61; Ma Wa5; O 19).
Herbrechtingen bow fibula (AZ 22; KJ 154; L VII.64; Ma C3; O 25).
Kantens comb case (L IX.21).
Kirchheim disc fibula (Düwel 2002b).
Maisach strap end (Düwel 2002b:12-13; Reimann and Düwel 2001).
München-Aubing III disc fibula (L VII.68; Ma K3; O 31).
Nebenstedt II-B bracteate (IK 129,1; KJ 115).
Nebenstedt III-F bracteate (IK 309).
Schretzheim IV bow fibula (Ma B3).
Tannheim hinge (L VII.70; O 44).
Trossingen I-A bow fibula (KJ 163; L VII.71; Ma C5a; O 45).
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Trossingen II-A strap end (KJ 163; L VII.72; Ma Gü5b; O 48).

Trossingen II-B strap end (KJ 163; L VII.73; Ma Gü5a; O 47).

Vörstetten-Schupfholz finger-ring (Bücker 2001).

Weingarten III amber bead (L VII.74. Düwel 1989b).

Wijnaldum A bone/antler object (AZ 39; L IX.23).

†Zirchow limestone piece (Arntz 1939a; Eggers 1968:7).

Inscriptions found in the area but consisting only of (partial) fubarks

Breza column (AZ 8; KJ 5; L VII.10; O 8).

Trossingen chair (Düwel 2008:70; Theune-Großkopf and Nedoma 2006).

Items known to be modern forgeries

Maria Saaler Berg bone (Düwel 1994c:104-105).

Additional exclusion (see text, §1.2.2)

Appendix 2: Suspect inscriptions. Possible forgeries and the assessment of authenticity

The corpus contains ten items whose authenticity has been called into doubt at one time or another. It is rare for a forgery to be proven beyond all doubt, as in the case of the bone from the Maria Saaler Berg, which was exposed as a fake by chemical analysis and by the confession of the forger (Düwel 1994c:104-105). Naturally, this item is excluded from my corpus. Those items which are included (and marked with a dagger † in both the text and the catalogue) remain suspect to a greater or lesser degree, and for a wide range of reasons. For the sake of clarity, it is appropriate to consider more closely the arguments for and against the authenticity of a particular item.

Attempts have been made to re-examine and to rehabilitate some of these items. Following Pieper’s analysis, the Weser bones are widely (though not universally) accepted as genuine. The Kleines Schulerloch cave inscription has also acquired new proponents in recent years. While I remain suspicious of this item, the case against it is by no means proven.

Most of the items marked as suspect have received very little attention in the literature. In the handlists and corpora they are either dismissed altogether or receive only cursory treatment. The result of this scholarly disinterest is that the reasons for rejecting them are not entirely clear, and in some cases are less than satisfactory.
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3. †Arguel pebble

This item is dismissed without further discussion by both Krause (1966:8) and Looijenga (2003a:223). Opitz (1987:53) makes no comment, and offers no interpretations beyond that of the sequence wodan as the theonym Wōdan.

Bizet (1964:41) cites (without references or further details) a microscopic examination confirming that the inscription is of considerable age. The suspicion of a forgery stems chiefly from the circumstances of the find: that an inscribed stone should happen to be lying loose on the ground after such a long time was enough for von Friesen to express misgivings. Bizet argues against this that the find-site is at the bottom of a steep slope, and the stone may have been exposed after a landslip or by water erosion.

33. †Hainspach pendant

This object was reportedly discovered at the side of a road by Alfred Rabenstein, a local dentist, in 1932. After cleaning it, he presented it the following year to Emanuel Gattermann, a bookseller in Prague, who passed it on to Dr. Josef Stern in Leitmeritz. Together with the miniature axe, Rabenstein also found a decorative bronze disc (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:249-250; Kern 1935:110-111).

Zeiss notes that the object has no close parallels, although miniature weapons have been found in women’s graves from the Merovingian period (Arntz and Zeiss, loc.cit.). Bronze axes apparently serving as amulets, some inscribed with the names of Roman gods or with simple shapes such as triangles, are also known from the Roman period (several examples appear in Schweiz.Landesmus. 2006:219-220). While the account of the circumstances
of the find and the chemical cleaning processes used by the dentist (see above) would serve the purposes of a forger, they do not by themselves indicate a forgery. There is no known model which a forger might have used in creating the inscription. As both Arntz (*loc.cit.*) and Krause (1935b:126-127) point out, the Sedschütz pot (AZ 5) cannot be such a model: although there are certain textual similarities (notably the bind-rune *lb*)/bl*, it was not found until later (the pot was actually found in 1931, but not published until later (Krause 1934; Raschke 1934; see also Arntz and Zeiss 1939:98)).

Both of the Hainspach items remain suspect (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:250). Krause was at one stage confident of the find’s authenticity (1935a:38; 1935b:127), although his chief argument is that a forger would have created a text made up of whole words, rather than an apparently sequence of runes making no obvious sense. It is perhaps worth noting that in his early publications, Krause refers to the Maria Saaler Berg inscription as a parallel; this item, which consists of the apparently nonsensical sequence *mknfsz* (or *zsfnkmm*) (and for which Marstrander (1929) proposed an interpretation by inserting omitted vowels), was later exposed as a fake (see introduction).

Krause does not explain the reasons for the change in his assessment of the Hainspach pendant, but he dismisses it as a fake in later publications (1937:468; 1966:8). It is disregarded in the later literature.

42. †*Kärlich fibula*

Henning (cited by Arntz and Zeiss 1939:267) argues for a forgery on the grounds that the inscription was inexpertly executed – an objection which later scholars (rightly, in my view) reject (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:267-268). Arntz
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makes a slightly stronger argument from the carving technique: the first part of the text (\textit{wodan}) is more lightly cut. In Arntz’ opinion, this is a result of the forger attempting to cut the runes through the patina before the fibula was cleaned. Finding the process too difficult, he or she cleaned away some of the rust before continuing (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:268).

Arntz is sceptical about the supposed appearance of a heathen dedication appearing on a Frankish object of relatively late date. He regards the very concept of dedicating a profane object to the gods as “un-Germanic” (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:269). While the latter argument is based on a questionable conception of “Germanic” culture, the argument of anachronism is more convincing (although it depends on the speculative dating of an object whose archaeological context and provenance are not known).

Both of the words in the Kärlich text are found on runic inscriptions known at the time of its discovery: 57. Nordendorf I has \textit{wodan}; and \textit{hailag} appears on the Pietroassa ring (AZ 4; An 97; KJ 41). In the latter inscription, \textit{hailag} is preceded by \textit{gutaniowi}, which was interpreted as a dat. form of a pers.n. and so could have provided a grammatical model for \textit{wodani}, albeit one written in an EGmc dialect. The separator is similar to the one on 25. Freilaubersheim.

The most obvious and (to my mind) persuasive feature indicating a forgery is the use of the Younger Füþark for \textit{h}. This form of \textit{h} appears only in Scandinavian inscriptions, and not before c.800 (the form does appear in \textit{7th}-century inscriptions with the value [a], conventionally transliterated \textit{A}, making it a precursor to the Younger Füþark \textit{a}; and it also appears as a form of \textit{j} in English and Frisian inscriptions), but the chronology of the füþarks was not well understood in Germany until the publication of the German edition of
Wimmer’s study of the runic script (Wimmer 1887). Arntz suggests that the forger was trying to cover his tracks by using an alternative form of $h$ rather than the normal $\text{h}$ of Pietroassa (which Arntz believes was the model for $\text{hailag}$). Neckel’s claim (cited by Arntz) that $\dagger$ is actually an alternative old form (or even the original form?) of $h$ has no basis whatsoever (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:270; Arntz 1944:96).\(^{10}\) A similar form may be present in 21. Eichstetten, though this is questionable, and the sequence to which it belongs is uninterpretable.

Concluding his discussion on the authenticity of the inscription, Arntz admits that a forgery is not proven beyond doubt, but he does not accept the Kärlich inscription as genuine (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:272).

In later literature, Kärlich is mentioned only briefly as a fake or suspect inscription, with little or no discussion of the grounds for suspicion (Düwel 1994c:105, 2001:214; Krause 1966:8). Opitz (1987:53-54) notes Arntz’ main objections.

\(^{10}\) I note in passing that early 20\textsuperscript{th}-century rune-occultists regarded this form of $h$ as the original one, and ascribed special mystical significance to it (Goodrick-Clarke 1992:157-160. Primary sources include Gorsleben 1930:251-280; List 1912:1, 12; 1914:102-110). Modern rune-occultist Edred Thorsson describes it as “the primal snowflake pattern” and “the rune-mother…” All the runic forms may be derived from the sixfold $\text{hagalaz}$” (Thorsson 1984:35-36).
46. †Kleines Schulerloch rock inscription

This inscription is one of the few suspect items which has received a substantial amount of attention in the literature; it therefore warrants more thorough treatment here. The following comments are based on the interdisciplinary discussion of the problems of Kleines Schulerloch (KS) at Eichstätt in 2003 (Bammesberger and Waxenberger 2006:315-393).

1. Internal evidence

The best-known case against the authenticity of the inscription was advanced by Rosenfeld (1984). Rosenfeld points out the structural similarities with 57. Nordendorf I ayaleubwini, if interpreted as Awa leub Wini (see text, §3.1.1); and with the Opedal stone (KJ 76) (birgŋubŋorangswestarminu ljubumezwage), although he expresses reservations about Krause’s interpretation (Rosenfeld 1984:165-169). He suggests that one or both of these might have provided a forger with a model. As Nedoma (2006b:348-439) points out, the preferred interpretation of Nordendorf at the time, as today, was Awa Leubwini (i.e., leubwini is treated as a dithematic pers.n.); but this does not preclude the possibility of a forger latching onto the alternative.

Düwel (2006) rejects this, making reference to 8. Bad Krozingen A: since we have a new inscription which is structurally parallel to KS and the authenticity of which is not disputed –yet which would not have been available to a hypothetical modern forger – Rosenfeld’s inference from the Opedal and/or Nordendorf parallels does not licence his conclusion that KS is a forgery.
Nedoma (2003:491-492, 2006b:350-353) offers a powerful text-internal argument against KS: *Birg* is not a plausible pers.n.. It is assumed to be a shortened form of a dithematic name, but such forms are always weakly inflected – the correct form should be *Birga/Berga → *birga/*berga*. The only place where we find a name parallel to *Birg* without an overt suffix is a ghost-form in Carl Meichelbeck’s (1792/1794) edition of the *Historia Frisingensis*, which contains a pair of names *Æepolant Piric* (recte: *Éepo Lantpiric*). An OHG *piric* would be derivable, phonologically, from a pre-OHG *birg* through anaptyxis and the Second Consonant Shift (see text, §2.3.5; §2.5.1), but it is not morphologically plausible. More suspicious still is the fact that on the same page as this unique ghost-form *Piric* is the name *Selbraat*. As Eichner (2006:374) points out, the case against KS is considerably strengthened by the fact that it not only contains names appearing on the same page of the *Historia Frisingensis*, but that it apparently preserves an error unique to Meichelbeck’s edition.

2. External evidence

The circumstances of the discovery of the carvings also give us reason for caution. The date of the discovery (1937) is not without significance. During the NS period, excavations were being carried out under the auspices of the *Ahnenerbe* with the express hope of finding prehistoric remains which could be advanced as evidence of the German *Volk’s* great antiquity. Himmler is

11 Krause’s interpretation of *birg* as an imperative verb-form (see entry in §5.1) is rejected by all the participants in the debate.
known to have taken a personal interest in such excavations as those at the nearby Weinberghöhlen (Düwel 2006:324). The apparent discovery of a prehistoric animal carving with an associated runic inscription would doubtless have pleased him greatly. The appearance of a runic inscription on a rock wall would also suggest a link with inscriptions on large stones and on rock walls in Scandinavia, which would appeal to pan-Germanists eager to appropriate Norse mythology and runic tradition.

This is not to say that the NS authorities were entirely naïve in their approach to archaeological discoveries: the publication of the discovery at KS was delayed for six months so that a thorough investigation could be undertaken. The authorities were well aware of the possibility that the carvings might turn out to be a modern forgery, particularly as the KS carvings came to light shortly after the embarrassing affair of “Attila’s grave” (Eichner 2006:359, 362). It should be noted that at this stage the concern was with the animal-carving; the runic inscription had not yet been discovered. Eichner wonders whether the runes might have been added after the original discovery, but his examination of the several pictures and plaster-casts produced prior to its publication indicates that this is not the case (2006:361).

If it was the carver’s intention to manufacture evidence for the pan-German/Aryan myth or to curry favour with the Party, it would seem that the job was rather too well done, since the runes were apparently not discovered (or at least, not remarked on in print) until the 1950s.

If KS is a forgery, it seems to me that the creator’s purpose would have been not simply to indulge the fantasies of Himmler and his cohorts, but to fool the academic community. As far as I am aware, no-one has claimed that
the KS runes are of especially early date (i.e., before the normally accepted period of the Continental runic inscriptions). The possibility presents itself that the animal carving is contemporaneous with the runic inscription and that the whole complex is genuine but not prehistoric. This was the theory advanced by Friedrich Herrmann in 1952 (Düwel 2006:325-326; Eichner 2006:365), a theory which Eichner dismisses on the grounds that the animal carving is clearly similar to prehistoric depictions of animals from elsewhere – i.e., either it is genuinely prehistoric, or it is a modern forgery. There cannot (so Eichner) be any “middle ground”. Pieper (2006) points out that the animal carving and the runes were made using different tools and techniques, and infers that roughly contemporary (but pre-modern) dates cannot be ruled out.

A second reason for doubt is the involvement of Otto Rieger. Düwel (2006:324-325) mentions one Assien Bohmers, who is known to have been involved in the production of fake inscriptions in Friesland during the 1960s. In 1939 Bohmers published a report on a supposedly prehistoric carving at the Kastlhänghöhle very near to Schulerloch. This carving has since been discredited, and it – like the KS inscription – was discovered by Rieger (cf. Bohmers 1939; Zotz and Freund 1951/1952:102). Furthermore, excavations had previously been undertaken at KS in 1919 and earlier; and Rieger himself had examined the cave in 1935 (Eichner 2006:363). That the carvings had not been noticed during any of these excavations is not necessarily suspicious in itself, but the fact that Rieger had been at the site only two years prior to the discovery is suggestive. Against the culpability of Rieger is the testimony of Dr. Walter Boll (interviewed by Eichner in 1984), who dealt with Rieger at the
time of the discovery. In Boll’s opinion, Rieger had neither the intelligence nor the specialist knowledge required to execute a sophisticated hoax (interview quoted by Eichner 2006:358). I would add that Ludwig Ahrens, the “discoverer” of the Weser bones (see below), produced several items known to be forgeries; yet the current opinion of the academic community is that the rune-inscribed bones are genuine.

A further consideration is that the carvings are in an ideal place to be discovered, being situated immediately above a stone “seat” in the cave, where a passage branches off from the entrance chamber. This construction was carved in the nineteenth century (Düwel 2006:334; Rosenfeld 1984:170). The designation “seat” is not entirely accurate – the construction appears to be a pair of indentations either side of the entrance to the side passage, perhaps intended to accommodate a gate (Eichner 2006:369). Eichner is certain that the carvings show signs of having been made after this stonework; and that the layer of sinter into which the carvings are made partly covers the worked stone, strongly suggesting that it postdates the workings. Eichner concludes that the creation of the “seat” in the nineteenth or perhaps early twentieth century gives us a solid *terminus post quem* for the KS inscription (2006:370).

Züchner (2006) disputes this evidence, arguing that the inscription actually follows a natural bulge in the rock, not the worked edge of the “seat”. He also discusses the characteristics of the sinter which covers the “seat” but not the runes, as well as the regrowth of the lichens and algae which were cleaned from the rock surface in 1937. He concludes from this evidence that that the inscription predates the stonework.
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A bead of sinter covering one of the cuts which make up the runic inscriptions was carbon-dated by a geologist named Muhl and assigned an age of c.800 years, but this finding has not been verified and cannot be considered reliable (Züchner 2006:382). Potentially more promising is the thorium-uranium dating of samples taken by Augusto Mangini in 2005, the results of which have yet to be published (Pieper 2006:390-392).

Conclusion

I am not persuaded by any of the evidence for or against KS, but I am cautiously inclined to suspect foul play. Notwithstanding the problems of the geological sequence (which is in doubt, at least until the publication of Mangini’s results), there seem to be good reasons for suspecting that the carvings might have been produced sometime between Oberneder’s excavations in 1919 and the “discovery” in 1937. There remains the question of the model(s) or exemplar(s) used by the forger. Either he/she had enough specialist knowledge to use Continental rune-forms (such as with a gap between the loops) and to reconstruct a name-form Selbrad without Second Consonant Shift, or else was using local finds (such as Nordendorf) as exemplars. Nedoma makes a strong case for the use of Meichelbeck’s Historia Frisingensis as a source for the names.

64. †Rubring stone piece

This object was reportedly discovered in a bomb-crater by two schoolchildren in 1943 or 1946/47 (the site was close to a tank factory known as the Nibelungenwerk (“Ni-Werk”) and was the target of heavy bombing in
the war). The children showed it to their teacher Elisabeth Schmalbaug, who handed it over some time later (precisely when is not clear) to her brother, Pater Raynald Schmalbaug. In 1955 Schmalbaug sent it to the Niederösterreichisches Museum in Vienna (Haas 1958:71-72; Nedoma 2003:481-482; Steinhauser 1968a:1-2).

Haas (1958) reports that he was at first suspicious when he transliterated the first part of the inscription (which he regards as a mixture of runes and Roman letters)\textsuperscript{12} as \textit{rinald} (taken as a reference to Raynald Schmalbaug) and the second \textit{IDIO[.]} → “idiot”. Haas considers and rejects the notion that the inscription was created by the children to mock Schmalbaug. It certainly seems unlikely that this was the work of the children: to begin with, the schoolmistress’ brother lived in Stift Zwettl, about 90km away from Rubring, and was not known to the children. Secondly, it is doubtful whether children would have had a working knowledge of the runic script, although it was available in popular literature from 1938 on (Haas 1958:72-73). Steinhauser (1968a) argues that since, when read as runic, the inscription contains an intelligible sentence in “early Old High German” (früalthochdeutsch), it must be genuine; a forger might easily reproduce a fulpark or a few meaningless runes, but could not (in Steinhauser’s opinion) produce a coherent text. The problems with this argument are obvious: firstly, it is patently absurd to argue that intelligibility is evidence for authenticity (compare Krause’s defence of

\textsuperscript{12} Steinhauser’s statement that Haas regarded the script as Venetic some other “North Italic” script (Steinhauser 1968a:3) is incorrect.
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33. *Hainspach,* which rests on exactly the opposite assertion). Secondly, although it is hard to believe that the inscription was the work of children, it is entirely possible (given the time between the alleged discovery and the remittance of the object to the museum) that the inscription and perhaps the story of its discovery were fabricated by Schmalbaug or by someone else. Whether or not Schmalbaug had the skill to produce such a forgery is not known.

At the time of Steinhauser’s article on the piece, it was generally regarded as a fake, partly due to Haas’ publication (although Haas appears quite neutral on the matter) and partly because an examination of the stone undertaken in the 1950s indicated that the carvings had been made only a few years earlier. Haas himself objects to this finding (1958:72-73), arguing that the stone may not have been lying on the surface but could have been buried in a container which was destroyed by the bomb-blast. There are obviously no grounds for this speculation, but it does leave the case for a forgery unproven. Haas also cites another professional opinion (that of Prof. R. Pittoni) that crystallisation in the cuts rules out recent manufacture.

The inscription is accepted as genuine by Klingenberg (1976c:373; 1976d:186) and Opitz (1987:36-37, 179), and is interpreted as a text referring to a hero named *Iring.* Opitz adds no comments of his own, referring the reader to Steinhauser and Klingenberg.

Nedoma (2003:486-487) sees the uncertain circumstances of the find (reported only at second or third hand) and the long period between the item’s discovery and its presentation to the museum as cause for caution, if not outright suspicion. The boys who are supposed to have found the object have
not been identified; and Elisabeth and Raynald Schmalbaug gave conflicting dates for the find. Elisabeth Schmalbaug (as reported by Steinhauser) explained that local children were in the habit of searching for interesting or valuable pieces of debris after air-raids, which implies that the find occurred during the war. According to Nedoma (2003:487), the first such raid against the “Ni-werk” factory took place in 1944.

As for the inscription itself, Nedoma (2003:488-489) regards it as suspicious on two points: firstly, the form of the ƞ-rune here is ◻ with full height (i.e., ◻), which has no parallels in Older Fuþark inscriptions (but which would be an understandable error for a modern forger, especially since enlarged forms sometimes appear in non-specialist literature on runes published in the 1930s-1940s). Secondly, in authentic inscriptions the phonological sequence /ing/ is normally represented by the “lantern”-rune. On the other hand, the lack of similar inscriptions which might have served a forger as models would appear to be a point in its favour.

65. †Rügen stone piece

This object is generally regarded as a forgery and is almost entirely ignored in the literature. It merits no mention at all from Krause (1966), Looijenga (2003a), or Opitz (1987). Düwel (2008:214) mentions it only to state that it is disregarded as a fake (he does not give details of the evidence). The object is not mentioned in the RGA entry on Rügen (Leube 2003; Udolph 2003).

The original circumstances of the find are not known. The object was discovered in 1935 by Dr. H. Piesker-Hermannsburg among an assortment of mostly Neolithic objects in the Museum für Vorpommern und Rügen,
Stralsund. The collection was accompanied by a note stating that the finds were from Rügen (Arntz 1937:6-7).

Arntz (1937) is convinced of the object’s authenticity. He does not, however, include it in his corpus of Continental inscriptions, only giving it a brief mention (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:256), presumably because he considers it Scandinavian in origin. Eggers (1968:7) remarks that the circumstances of the find, while fortuitous and unhelpful to the interpreter, are not by themselves grounds for doubting its authenticity.

I find it puzzling that this item is so widely condemned with so little discussion in the literature. To be sure, a stray find of a small loose stone gives us grounds for caution; but the nature of the object and its uncertain history are not by themselves damning evidence. The context and find-circumstances of the Kleines Schulerloch and Weser inscriptions are at least as suspicious, yet these items have attracted far more attention even from those who remain sceptical about their authenticity.

78. †Trier serpentine object

Where it is mentioned in the runological literature, this object is generally dismissed as a fake with little or no comment (Düwel 2003b:518; 2008:214). Opitz (1987:56) records the find and gives the transliteration of the inscription, referring the reader to Schneider. He does not offer any commentary.

Düwel (2003b:518) is understandably dismissive of Schneider’s interpretation (see text, §3.2.1; §4.1; §5.1), but has nothing to say on the question of authenticity. It is likely that the item has fallen under suspicion partly due to its lack of archaeological context or parallels, and partly due to
the fantastical nature of Schneider’s interpretation of the text. Neither of these seems to me to be satisfactory grounds for rejecting it as a fake, though the contextual factors certainly give us cause for suspicion.

85-87. †Weser I-III bones

These items are among numerous bones with carvings sold by Ludwig Ahrens in 1927-28 to the Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde und Vorgeschichte in Oldenburg.¹³ According to Ahrens, the bones had been turned up by dredging in the lower Weser (Antonsen 2002:315). Although they were brought to the museum as separate finds, Pieper (1989:152, 154) speculates that Ahrens found them together and sold them individually in order to raise the price.

Soon after their discovery, the Weser inscriptions were rejected by the runological community as fakes: Krause (1966:8) mentions them only in a list of items to be excluded from his corpus because of doubts about their authenticity. In a letter to Karl Fissen in 1949 (reproduced in Pieper 1989:65), he is more equivocal, stating his view that, on balance, the inscriptions are forgeries, but that the case against them is not certain. Antonsen (2002:315) cites as reasons for their rejection the circumstances of the find, the unique character of the objects, the determination that several of the uninscribed bones were forgeries (Pieper 1987:225-233), and the atmosphere of suspicion surrounding the revelation in 1937 that the Maria Saaler Berg inscription was a fake (on which see Düwel 1994c:104-105). Pieper observes that in 1928, after

¹³ For biographical details on Ahrens, see Pieper (1989:140-144).
suspensions were aroused, Ahrens’ talent for finding artefacts declined rapidly (Pieper 1987:222).

The scientific analysis conducted by Pieper (1987; 1989) has rehabilitated the rune-inscribed bones, although it has not eliminated suspicion. Some of the bones presented by Ahrens were found to be forgeries, but the rune-inscribed items are not among them.

Looijenga (2003a:268) remarks that the name **uluhari** on 89. †Weser III looks like a shortened form of Ludwig Ahrens (Ulli being a common hypocoristic form of Ludwig). She also argues that all of the words in the text can be found in Gallée’s (1910) grammar of Old Saxon (2003a:23). *Hagal* “hail” does not in fact appear in Gallée, but as the name of the h-rune it might well be familiar to a forger. As for the pers.ns., *Ingwe* is well attested. *Inghari* does not appear in Förstemann (1900) in this precise form, but there is a similar (and presumably equivalent) *Inguheri* with i-umlaut and an expressed compositional vowel. Pieper (1987:239) also mentions *Inchar, Ingalhar* and *Inglehar* as possible related names (see text, §5.1). As a parallel for *Uluhari*, Pieper (1987:240) notes an *Uliaris* mentioned by Procopius (Förstemann 1900:1476), which may be related (see text, §4.1).

Further cause for suspicion, in Looijenga’s view, is “the way the runes were carved and the childlike drawings on the bones” (2003a:23). To this rather impressionistic point I might add another, which is that the Weser inscriptions form a syntactically complete and coherent text spread across several objects. If genuine, the Weser inscriptions are not only among the oldest runic finds on the Continent, but also comprise the longest text in the corpus. Linguistically, I find them a little too good to be true. Nevertheless, Pieper presents strong
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evidence in favour of their authenticity: although it would not be technically impossible to age and mineralise the bones artificially, it would be extremely difficult and time-consuming even using modern techniques (Pieper 1987:226-227). Given that the uninscribed forgeries are quite poorly executed and relatively easy for Pieper’s methods to discover, it seems very unlikely that the inscribed bones could have been produced by the same person.

General comments

Several of the items under discussion here (Arguel, Rügen and Trier) are dismissed by the runological community for reasons that are not obvious. Each of these three items is reported in a single article (respectively Bizet 1964; Arntz 1937; Schneider 1980), the author of which is convinced of their authenticity. They merit little or no subsequent mention, and where they appear in the later literature they are rejected as forgeries with very little discussion.

Of the ten suspect items in the corpus, seven (Arguel, Rubring, Rügen, Trier, Weser I-III) are on loose pieces of stone or bone with no identifiable function (and all of which are assigned an amuletic or magical function by those who regard them as authentic). All ten items (except the Kleines Schulerloch inscription, which is not on a portable object) are stray finds discovered by amateurs.\textsuperscript{14} These two characteristics mark the suspect items

\textsuperscript{14} The same applies to a small stone found at Coburg in Bavaria, excluded from the corpus as its carvings are not thought to be runic; and if they are runes, they do not comprise an intelligible text (Düwel 2008:214; see Appendix 1).
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out from the bulk of the material in the corpus, which consists of identifiable objects (mainly items of jewellery or decoration – fibulae, buckles, fittings) found in graves. They need not be diagnostic, however: we have, for example, an inscription ga on a piece of sandstone found at Aš in the Czech republic (Gierach 1925). This is a stray find and a loose piece of stone, the runic character of which is open to question; but its authenticity has not been questioned.