

**VOCALISM IN THE CONTINENTAL RUNIC
INSCRIPTIONS**

Martin Findell, MA.

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

September 2009

Volume II: Catalogue

Notes on catalogue entries	vii
Designation of items	vii
Concordance	vii
Find-site	vii
Context.....	vii
Provenance.....	viii
Datings	viii
Readings	viii
Images.....	x
1. Aalen.....	1
2. Aquincum	2
3. †Arguel.....	4
4. Arlon	7
5. Aschheim II	9
6. Aschheim III	10
7. Bad Ems.....	12
8. Bad Krozingen A	14
9. Balingen.....	16
10. Beuchte	18
11. Bezenye I.....	20
12. Bezenye II.....	22

13. Bopfingen	24
14. Borgharen	25
15. Bülach	27
16. Charnay	29
17. Chéhéry	33
18. Dischingen I	35
19. Donzdorf	37
20. Eichstetten	39
21. Engers	42
22. Erpfting	43
23. Ferwerd	45
24. Freilaubersheim	47
25. Fréthun I	49
26. Friedberg	50
27. Gammertingen	52
28. Geltorf II	54
29. Gomadingen	56
30. Griesheim	57
31. Hailfingen I	59
32. Hailfingen II	61
33. †Hainspach	63

34. Heide.....	65
35. Heilbronn-Böckingen I.....	66
36. Hitsum	68
37. Hoogebeintum.....	70
38. Hüfingen I.....	71
39. Hüfingen II.....	74
40. Hüfingen III	76
41. Igling-Unterigling.....	77
42. †Kärlich.....	79
43. “Kent”	80
44. Kirchheim/Teck I.....	83
45. Kirchheim/Teck II	85
46. †Kleines Schulerloch.....	87
47. Lauchheim I.....	88
48. Lauchheim II.....	90
49. Liebenau	91
50. Mertingen.....	93
51. München-Aubing I.....	95
52. München-Aubing II	97
53. Neudingen-Baar I.....	98
54. Neudingen-Baar II	100

55. Niederstotzingen	102
56. Nordendorf I	104
57. Nordendorf II	108
58. Oberflacht	110
59. Oettingen.....	112
60. Osthofen.....	114
61. Pforzen I.....	116
62. Pforzen II	120
63. Pleidelsheim.....	123
64. †Rubring.....	125
65. †Rügen.....	126
66. Saint-Dizier.....	128
67. Schretzheim I.....	129
68. Schretzheim II.....	132
69. Schretzheim III	134
70. Schwangau.....	136
71. Sievern	138
72. Skodborg.....	140
73. Skonager III	142
74. Soest.....	144
75. Steindorf	146

76. Stetten	149
77. Szabadbattyán	151
78. †Trier	154
79. Weimar I	155
80. Weimar II	157
81. Weimar III	159
82. Weimar IV	161
83. Weingarten I	163
84. Weingarten II	165
85. †Weser I	167
86. †Weser II	170
87. †Weser III	172
88. Wijnaldum B	173
89. Wremen	175
90. Wurmlingen	176
Appendix 1: Handlist of Continental runic inscriptions excluded from the corpus	180
Appendix 2: Suspect inscriptions. Possible forgeries and the assessment of authenticity	184
3. †Arguel pebble	185
33. †Hainspach pendant	185

42. †Kärlich fibula.....	186
46. †Kleines Schulerloch rock inscription	189
64. †Rubring stone piece	194
65. †Rügen stone piece.....	197
78. †Trier serpentine object.....	198
85-87. †Weser I-III bones	199
General comments	201

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 ᚿ as **ī** (although the sources use a wide range of symbols, reflecting the disagreement about the original value of the rune – see text, §5.2.4); ʝ as **z**; and ᚥ 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:

] or [– physical break in the inscribed surface;

? – illegible sign (where some sources use **x** or other marks);

... – unknown amount of illegible material;

dot below – uncertain or disputed reading;

parentheses – uncertain whether a rune is present or not;

capitals – Roman letters.

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., ^x/_y.

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

Stray find (Looijenga 2003a:226; Nedoma 2004a:389).

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).

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

noru (Düwel 1987:12; 2000b:19; Kiel; Looijenga 2003a:226; Nedoma 1999a:11; 2000:24).

References

Düwel (1987; 2000b); Looijenga (2003a:226); Martin (2004:173-174); Nedoma (1999a; 2000; 2004a:389-394); Wamers (2000).

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).

500-550 (Looijenga 2003a:226; Opitz 1987:7; Roth 1981a:65).

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).

Early 6th century? (McKinnell et al. 2004:88).

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.

Readings

[A] **fuparkgw** [B] **jlain:knja** (Kiel; Krause 1966:23; McKinnell et al. 2004:88; Opitz 1987:7).

fuparkgw]?laig : kingia (Looijenga 2003a:226).

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 †.

Synthetic reading: [I] **fuparkgw** [II] **?lain:knja**

References

Antonsen (1975:76); Krause (1966:23-26); Looijenga (2003a:226-227); McKinnell et al. (2004:88); Opitz (1987:7, 181-182).

Images

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

3. †Arguel

Concordance

O Anhang.

Object

Limestone pebble.

Find-site

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 luihophang rei kim (Bizet 1964:45).

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

arbitag:wodan:luïgo(1?)hañzej: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 X at R.7 and 16, but transliterates it **h** because he believes it to represent /h/ (1964:44; see text, §3.1.1). Similarly, he reads R.15 as J, but transliterates it as **i** rather than **ī**. Bizet is not claiming that a regular l-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 R for the phoneme /r/.

Synthetic reading: [I] **arbitag** [II] **wodan** [III] **luigo^w/p^han** [IV]
zej [V] **kim**.

References

Bizet (1948; 1964); Opitz (1987:52-53). Briefly mentioned by Krause (1966:8) and Looijenga (2003a:223).

Images

Bizet (1964:43, 46) (drawings and photographs).

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).

667-700 (Nedoma 1992:1; Roth 1981a:65).

Location of inscription

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

Readings

godun : ʉlo : þes : rasuwa(.)m̄u(un, nu)d(:?)worþ(þr)op...g (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:435).

godun : xulo : þes : rasuwa m̄udworþxxx(x)x (Krause 1966:286; McKinnell et al. 2004:63; Opitz 1987:8).

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

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

godun:xulo:þes:rasuwa m̄udwoþrop[---]? (Nedoma 1992:1-2; 2004a:306).

godu(n) ' [0-1?](u)lo ' þe(0-1?)s ' rasuwa(1-2? u)d(0-1?)wo(1-2?)op[?](0-1?) (Kiel).

The suggestion that a bind-rune un/nu follows **rasuwaṃ** 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 **þr** rather than **rb** 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 : (?)ʉlo : þeṣ : rasuwaṃud(?)woþrop(...)**

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:431-438); Fischer and Lémant (2003); Krause (1966:286-287); Looijenga (2003a:227-228); McKinnell et al. (2004:63); Nedoma (1992; 2004a:306-310, 366-369, 395-397, 417-422); Opitz (1987:8, 175-176); Roosens and Alenus-Lecerf (1965).

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

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

ḵahi (Düwel 2003c:11; Kiel).

References

Düwel (2003c:11-12); Nedoma (2004a:271).

Images

Düwel (2003c:11) (drawing).

6. Aschheim III

Concordance

None.

Object

Silver S-fibula.

Find-site

See 5. Aschheim II.

Context

Female grave (no. 49) in the same graveyard 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

ḍaḍo (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

Düwel (2003c:12-13); Nedoma (2004a:271-272).

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).

600-650 (Krause and Werner 1935:329; Kühn 1981:71; Opitz 1987:18).

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

567-600 (Looijenga 2003a:228; Nedoma 2004a:369; Roth 1981a:65; Schwerdt 2000:208).

Location of inscription

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

Readings

[I]]**madali**_x [II] **ubada**[(Arntz and Zeiss 1939:194-196; Krause 1966:282; Krause and Werner 1935:330; Looijenga 2003a:228; Opitz 1987:18; Schwab 1998b:139; Schwerdt 2000:208).

[I] ?]ṃ**ada**ḷi≡ [II] **ubada**ḷ[? (Nedoma 2004a:370).
madali(1?):ubada (Kiel).

The sign here marked _x (Nedoma ≡) 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]]ṃ**ada**ḷi? [II] **ubada**ḷ[

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:193-201); Krause (1966:281-282); Krause and Werner (1935); Looijenga (2003a:228-229); Nedoma (2004a:369-375); Opitz (1978; 1987:18, 127-134); Schwab (1998b); Schwerdt (2000:208-209).

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

Bad Krozingen, Kr. Breisgau-Hochschwarzwald, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (47° 55' N, 7° 42' E).

Context

Female grave (no. 172) in a small graveyard 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

[I] **boba:leub** [II] **agirike** (Düwel 2002b:15; Fingerlin et al. 2004:235-237; Kiel; Nedoma 2004a:152).

References

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

Images

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).

567-600 (Stein in Düwel 1994b:277; Looijenga 2003a:229; Nedoma 2004a:185; Schwerdt 2000:201).

c.600 or before (Martin 2004:181).

Location of inscription

On the back, running right to left.

Readings

äikdnloam (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**.

axuđnloamīluk (Krause 1966:302).

aşuđnloamīluk (Opitz 1987:9; Schwerdt 2000:201).

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

?uđnloamīlu? (Nedoma 2004a:185)

a(suz)dnloam(1?)lu(k) (Kiel).

Synthetic reading: **ā?uđnloamīlu?**

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).

Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 6; Taf. 39)) (photographs); v. Grienberger (1908:257) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 70) (photograph); Looijenga (2003a plate 14b) (photograph); Nedoma (2004a:187) (photographs).

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 graveyard 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 graveyard better fits the Saxon

cultural model (Nedoma 2004a:261, citing Siegmund 2000). Linguistically, Antonsen (1975:78) classifies the inscription as WGmc.

Datings

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

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

6th 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 6th 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

[I] **fuparzj** [II] **buirso** (Antonsen 1975:78; Kiel; Krause 1966:26-27; Looijenga 2003a:229-230; McKinnell et al. 2004:88; Nedoma 2004a:261; Opitz 1987:10).

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

References

Antonsen (1975:78); Düwel (1991:278-279; 1992a:353-356; 2008:18-19, 57-58); Krause (1966:26-29); Looijenga (2003a:229-230); McKinnell et al. (2004:88-89); Nedoma (2004a:261-266); Opitz (1987:10, 181).

Images

Düwel (2008:58) (drawing); Krause (1966 Taf. 5) (photographs); Looijenga (2003a:230) (drawing of the inscription).

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

Bezenye, Kom. Mosony, Hungary (47° 58' N, 17° 13' E).

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).

Mid-6th century (Opitz 1987:11; Looijenga 2003a:230).

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

godahid | unja (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:323-324; Kiel; Krause 1966:308; Opitz 1987:11). (| is how Krause represents the pin-holder).

godahid unj? (Looijenga 2003a:230).

[I] **uxx^a/n (*unja?)** [II] **godahid** (Nedoma 2004a:203). Nedoma notes that complex I is badly damaged, and expresses reservations about the earlier readings.

Synthetic reading: [I] **unja** [II] **godahid**

² “...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

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:320-322); Krause (1966:308-310); Looijenga (2003a:230-231); Nedoma (2004a:202-205, 310-32); Opitz (1987:11, 183-185); Schwab (1998a:416).

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

Bezenye, Kom. Mosony, Hungary (47° 58' N, 17° 13' E).

Context

See Bezenye I.

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

karsiboda segun (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:326-329).

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

?arsiboda segun (Looijenga 2003a:230).

[I] **?arsiboda** [II] **seḡun** (Nedoma 2004a:203).

(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] **?arsibōda** [II] **seḡun**

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:320-322, 326-333); Krause (1966:308-310); Looijenga (2003a:230-231); Nedoma (2004a:202-209); Opitz (1987:11, 183-185); Schwab (1998a:416).

Images

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

13. Bopfingen

Concordance

L VII.9; Ma G1; O 7.

Object

Gilt bronze/silver(?) “four-footed” disc fibula (*Vierpaßfibel*) (Martin 2004:203; Nedoma 2004a:386).

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).

End of 6th century (Looijenga 2003a:231).

Location of inscription

On the back, running left to right.

Readings

mauo (Düwel 1994b:277; Looijenga 2003a:231; Kiel; Nedoma 2004a:386; Opitz 1987:12).

References

Düwel (1994b:277); Looijenga (2003a:231); Martin (2004:203); Nedoma (2004a:386-389); Opitz (1979:367-368; 1987:12).

Images

Opitz (1979:367; 1987:298) (photograph).

14. Borgharen

Concordance

L IX.18

Object

Bronze belt-buckle.

Find-site

Archaeological site “Op de Stein”, just outside Borgharen, Gem. Maastricht, Limburg, Netherlands (50° 53’ N, 5° 41’ E).

Context

Male grave (no. 7) in a small row-gravefield, excavated in 1999 (Dijkman 2003:216-218; Looijenga 2003a:322, 2003b:232, 2003c:389).

Provenance

Looijenga identifies the graveyard as Merovingian, and associates it with a Merovingian runic tradition (2000:12; 2003a:322; 2003b:231; 2003c:393).

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

bobo (Kiel; Looijenga 2003a:322; 2003b:233; 2003c:389; Nedoma 2004a:245).

References

Dijkman (2003); Looijenga (2000; 2003a:322; 2003b; 2003c); Nedoma (2004a:244-250).

Images

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).

567-600 (Roth 1981a:65; Stein 1987:1392-1393, cited by Düwel 1994b:277; Looijenga 2003a:234; Nedoma 2004a:297; Schwerdt 2000:203).

End of 6th century (Schweiz. Landesmus. 2006:151).

Location of inscription

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

Readings

[I] **frifridil** [II] **du** [III] **ftmīk** (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:169-170; Krause 1966:307; Klingenberg 1976b:310; Opitz 1987:14; Schwerdt 2000:202). Both Arntz and Krause note that in complex III **ī** and **k** are close together and **k** is retrograde, so they could plausibly be read as **u**. Krause and Klingenberg both see two stray **l**-runes in the vicinity of complex III (see below).

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

[I] **frifridil** [II] **dū** [III] **ift^d/_mⁱ/_u** ≡ (Nedoma 2004a:298). ≡ represents a comb-like mark above the line.

frifridil du ift mikl (Schweiz.Landesmus. 2006:151).

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 Begriffsrunen, 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] **frifridil** [II] **du** [III] **(f)tm?**

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:167-172); Klingenberg (1976a; 1976b); Krause (1966:307-308); Looijenga (2003a:234-235); Martin (1977); Nedoma (2004a:297-303); Opitz (1987:13-14, 195-197); Schweiz.Landesmus. (2006:151); Schwerdt (2000:202-205); Werner (1953).

Images

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, 𐌷); 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).

551-600 (Krause 1966:23; Antonsen 1975:77).

533-566 (Roth 1981a:65; 1981b:373; Düwel 1994b:278; Looijenga 2003a:235).

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

[headplate: top] **fuparkgwhnijpzbem** [right-hand side] : **upfnpai** : **id**
 [left-hand side] **dan:liano** [footplate: border] **īia** [below the pin-

holder] **ķ r** (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:180-188; Krause 1966:20-21; McKinnell et al. 2004:87; Opitz 1987:14).

[I] **fuparkgwhnijpzbem** [II] : **uþfapai : : id** [III] **dan :**
liano (Antonsen 1975:77).

[I] **fuparkgwhnijpzbem.:uþfnþai:id** **dan:liano** [II] **ǃ/ia** [III]
ķ r (Düwel 1981a:373-374).

[headplate] **fuparkgwhnijpzb???? :uþfnþai:id dan:liano** [footplate]
ïia (Looijenga 2003a:236).

fuparkgwhnijpzbem | ' uþf(1?)þai ' id | dan ' (I)iano | ïia | (1?)r (Kiel).

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

Synthetic reading: [I] **fuparkgwhnijpzbem(?)** [II] **:uþfnþai:id**
[III] **dan:liano** [IV] **ǃ/ia** [V] **ķ r**

References

Antonsen (1975:77-78); Arntz and Zeiss (1939:173-192); Düwel (1981a; 1994b:278-279); Krause (1966:20-23); Looijenga (2003a:235-236); McKinnell et al. (2004:87-88); Opitz (1987:14-15, 112-121); Roth (1981b).

Images

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 graveyard 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

551-600 (Düwel 1991:277; 1994b:235).

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:ditañ / sũm? (Fischer 1999:12; Fischer and Lémant 2003:249; Kiel; Looijenga 2003a:264). The strokes here represent divisions between the complexes.

[I] **DEOS : DE** [II] **ħtid : E** [III] **sumŋik** (Düwel 1994b:236).

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).

Synthetic reading: [I] **DEOS : DE** [II] **h̄tīd : E / E : dītaŋ** [III]
sūm(ŋīk)

References

Düwel (1991:277-278; 1994b:235-236); Fischer (1999:12-13); Fischer and Lémant (2003); Looijenga (2003a:264); Nedoma (2004a:280).

Images

Fischer (1999:13) (drawing); Fischer and Lémant (2003:263) (drawing); Martin (2004:183) (drawings).

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 Begriffsrunes interpretations have been proposed.

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

7th century (Krause 1966:297; Opitz 1987:16; Schwerdt 2000:205).

Mid-6th century (Looijenga 2003a:236; Roth 1981a:65).

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

wiŋka (Kiel; Krause 1966:297; Opitz 1987:16; Schwerdt 2000:205).

wigka or **winka** (Looijenga 2003a:236).

wi^g/_nka (Nedoma 2004a:415).

Synthetic reading: **wi^g/_nka**.

References

Krause (1966:297); Looijenga (2003a:236-237); Nedoma (2004a:414-417); Opitz (1987:16, 107-109); Schwerdt (2000:205-206).

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

Richly-appointed female grave (no. 78) in a row-gravefield (Düwel and Roth 1977:409; Jänichen 1967b:234). For a more detailed report on the gravefield, see Kokkotidis (1999:40-44).

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,

412; Fischer 2004:292; Jänichen 1967b:234). Peterson (1994:144) and Reichert (1987:246) classify the fibula as Jutish.

Datings

500-550 (Opitz 1987:17; Looijenga 2003a:237).

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).

526-550 (Nedoma 2004a:288).

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

eho (Düwel and Roth 1977:411; Jänichen 1967b:234; Kiel; Looijenga 2003a:237; Nedoma 2004a:289; Opitz 1987:17; Schwerdt 2000:206).

h is single-barred **h**.

References

Düwel (1994b:237); Düwel and Roth (1977); Fischer (2004:292-293); Jänichen (1967b:234); Looijenga (2003a:237); Nedoma (2004a:288-292); Neuffer (1972); Opitz (1987:17, 169-170); Peterson (1994:144-145); Schwerdt (2000:206-207).

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).

Provenance

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

Mid-6th century (Düwel 1994b:237; Looijenga 2003a:238; Schwerdt 2000:207).

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

(a)a[chi-rho]i[chi-rho] mun^t;wiwol (Opitz 1982:484-485; Sasse 2001:80-81).

?a?i? muni (or munt)wiwol (Düwel 1994b:268; Schwerdt 2000:207).

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

-ani- muniwiwol (Fischer 2007:133). Fischer offers several possible readings of the first sequence: **dani/hani/mani**.

(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 **fiaginb** 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 **f** → **ǧ** → [ǧ]) 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 **χ**. 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 **jislheard**; Westeremden A **adujislu jisuhldu** (Looijenga 2003a:238, n.2).³

Synthetic reading: **(?)?a?i [chi-rho/nb/nw] munjwiwo(??)**

References

Düwel (1994b:237, 268); Fischer (2004:308; 2007:130-133); Grünzweig (2004:126, 133-135); Looijenga (2003a:238-239); Martin (2004:184-185, 205); Opitz (1981; 1982:481-486); Sasse (2001:80-81, 206-207); Schwerdt (2000:207-208).

Images

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.

Fischer (2007:133) (drawing); Looijenga (2003a:238) (drawing); Martin (2004:185) (drawings); Opitz (1982:482-483) (drawings and photographs); Sasse (2001:81, Taf. 138.21) (drawings and photograph); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).

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

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

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

Beginning of 7th century (Opitz 1987:19; Schwerdt 2000:208).

567-600 (Looijenga 2003a:239; Nedoma 2004a:354; Roth 1981:65).

Location of inscription

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

Readings

leub (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:204; Kiel; Krause 1966:283; Looijenga 2003a:239; Nedoma 2004a:354; Opitz 1987:19; Schwab 1998a:412; Schwerdt 2000:209).

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:201-206); Fingerlin et al. (2004); Krause (1966:282-283); Looijenga (2003a:239); Nedoma (2004a:353-357); Opitz (1987:19); Schwab (1998a:412-417); Schwerdt (2000:209-210).

Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 11) (drawings); Looijenga (1999:148; 2004a:239) (reproduction of a drawing by Henning).

22. Erpfting

Concordance

None.

Object

Silver gilt bow fibula.

Find-site

Erpfting, Kr. Landsberg am Lech, Bavaria, Germany (48° 02' N, 10° 50' E).

Context

Female grave (no. 104) in a graveyard (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

Düwel (2003c:13-16); Wührer (2004).

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

6th-7th 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).

muræ (Düwel and Tempel 1968/1970:371).

me ura or **me uræ** (Looijenga 2003a:303).

The transliteration of ƒ 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

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:206-210); Düwel and Tempel (1968/1970:370-371);
Looijenga (2003a:303-304).

Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 12) (photographs); Düwel and Tempel (1968/1970:372) (photograph).

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).

550-600 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:215; Opitz 1987:19).

567-600 (Looijenga 2003a:241; Roth 1981a:65).

520-560 (Stein 1987:1395-1396. This dating is accepted by Düwel 1994b:238; Martin 2004:179; Nedoma 2004a:250; Schwerdt 2000:210).

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

[I] **boso:wraetruna** [II] **þk:ðaþīna:golida** (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:224-231).

[A] **boso : wraetruna :** [B] **þk : daþīna : goļida :** (Krause 1966:283; Opitz 1987:19; Schwerdt 2000:210).

[I] **boso:wraetruna** [II] **þkd?īna: golida** (Looijenga 2003a:241).

[I] **boso:wraetruna:** [II] **þk·ðaþīna:goļida** (Nedoma 2004a:250).

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

In some of the earlier literature, the initial **d** of **ðaþīna** 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 **ᚱ**.

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

Synthetic reading: [I] **boso:wraetruna:** [II] **þk·ðaþīna:goļida**

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:210-231); Fischer (2004:283); Krause (1966:283-284); Looijenga (2003a:241); Nedoma (2004a:250-256, 279-280); Opitz (1987:19-20, 198-199); Schwerdt (2000:210-211).

Images

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(?), ʃ]

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

Male grave (no. 11) in the “Carrière-des-Morts” graveyard, excavated in 1993 (Fischer 2007:68-70).

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.

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

Fischer (2007:68-73); Routier (1996).

Images

Fischer (2007:71) (photograph and drawing).

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

Female grave (no. 10) in a small graveyard excavated in 1886 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:232; Krause 1966:281; Nedoma 2004a:412). The fibula was lost during the Second World War (Looijenga 2003a:197; Nedoma 2004a:412).

Provenance

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

Datings

End of 6th century (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:233).

c.600 (Krause 1966:281).

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

567-600 (Roth 1981a:65; Düwel 1994b:277 (followed by Looijenga 2003a:241 and Nedoma 2004a:412)).

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

puruphild (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:233; Kiel; Krause 1966:281; Looijenga 2003a:241; Nedoma 2004a:412; Opitz 1987:21; Schwerdt 2000:212).

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:232-235); Krause (1966:281); Looijenga (2003a:241-242); Nedoma (2004a:412-413); Opitz (1987:21, 166-167); Schwerdt (2000:212).

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

600-650 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:236 (tentatively); Opitz 1987:21; Schwerdt 2000:212).

601-633 (Roth 1981a:65).

551-575 (Stein 1991:63. 58, cited by Nedoma 2004a:141).

567-600 (Stein, cited by Düwel 1994b:295).

500-550 (Looijenga 2003a:242).

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

[A] **ado** [B] **axo** (Arntz 1935a:359; Arntz and Zeiss 1939:239; Krause 1966:304; McKinnell et al. 2004:63; Opitz 1987:21; Schwerdt 2000:212).

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

[α] **adɔ** [β] **amɔ** (Nedoma 2004a:141).

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

Synthetic reading: [I] **adɔ** [II] **a^d/mɔ**

References

Arntz (1935a); Arntz and Zeiss (1939:235-240); Düwel (1994b:295); Fischer (2004:283); Krause (1966:303-304); Looijenga (2003a:242); McKinnell (2004:63); Nedoma (2004a:140-148, 180-182); Opitz (1987:21-22); Schwab (1998a:396; 1999a:13, 21); Schwerdt (2000:212); Stein (1991).

Images

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

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

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

Readings

ᵿalᵾwu (Arntz 1937:7).

laᵿᵾwu (Nowak 2003:583).

lalᵾwu [swastika] (Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:2,1:71; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941-42:493; Nielsen 1978:358).

lalᵾ(1?)u(1Z) (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: **lalᵾᵾwu** [swastika]

References

Arntz (1937:7); Clavadetscher et al. (1984-1989:2,1:71-72); Jacobsen and Moltke (1941-42:492-493); Laur (1961); Nielsen (1978:358); Nowak (2003:376, 583).

Images

Clavadetscher et al. (1984-1989:2,2:43-44) (drawing and photograph);
Nowak (2003:376, 583) (drawings).

29. Gomadingen

Concordance

L VII.52; Ma E1.

Object

Silver disc fibula with almandine inlay.

Find-site

Gomadingen, Kr. Reutlingen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany (48° 24' N, 9° 24' E).

Context

Unknown – discovered in a private collection in 1995 (Düwel 1996a:13).

Provenance

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

Datings

534-566 (Düwel 1996a:13; Looijenga 2003a:264; Nedoma 2004a:345).

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

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] **iglu**^{g/n} [III] ?...

References

Düwel (1996a:13); Looijenga (2003a:264); Nedoma (2004a:345).

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).

567-600 (Looijenga 2003a:242; 567; Roth 1981a:65; Schwerdt 2000:213).

534-566 (Düwel 2008:60).

Location of inscription

On the back.

Readings

kolo:agilaprup (Düwel 2008:60; Looijenga 2003a:242; Kiel; Opitz 1987:23; Schwerdt 2000:213).

[I] **ḱ'ol'o:** [II] **aḡil'aprup** (Nedoma 2004a:148). (**k'** = ʀ; **l'** = k).

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

Synthetic reading: [I] **ḱolo:** [II] **aḡilaprup**

References

Düwel (2008:60); Fischer (2004:292); Looijenga (2003a:242-243); Nedoma (2004a:148-151); Opitz (1987:23, 174); Schwerdt (2000:213).

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.

Mid-7th century or 651-700 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:241; Krause 1966:302).

This is based on comparison with of 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;

Grünzweig 2004:138-139; Krause 1966:301-302; Looijenga 2003a:266):

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

alīsrhlapawihu (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:245-248).

īkxr̥xkw̥iwixu (Opitz 1987:230).

?x̥k̥xr̥xkw̥iwixu (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

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:240-248); Düwel (1981b:156-157; 1991:281; 1994b:234, 270-271); Grünzweig (2004:127, 138-139); Krause (1966:301-302); Looijenga (2003a:266); Moltke and Neckel (1934); Opitz (1987:24, 229-231).

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

601-650 (Jänichen 1962:156; Opitz 1987:24).

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

[I] a... [II] (?)**adauna** (Jänichen 1962:156; Opitz 1987:256 Anm. 2).

x/// ///**daannl** (Opitz 1987:25).

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

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

Synthetic reading: [I] (**a**)????(?) [II] (?)**daun?**

References

Jänichen (1962:156-157); Looijenga (2003a:266); Martin (2004:183-184);
Opitz (1987:24-25, 112-114, 119-120).

Images

Jänichen (1962 Taf. N) (photographs); Martin (2004:183) (drawings); Opitz
(1987:299) (photograph).

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

Stray find (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:249-250; Kern 1935:110-111; Krause
1937:468). For further details, see [Appendix 2](#).

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.

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

lpsr (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

Gold B-bracteate. Now lost (Krause 1966:240).

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; Looijenga 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

alu (Antonsen 1975:70; Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:1,2:136; Kiel; Krause 1966:240; Looijenga 2003a:207; McKinnell et al. 2004:78; Nowak 2003:498).

References

Antonsen (1975:37, 70); Clavadetscher et al. (1984-1989:1,2:135-137);
 Krause (1966:240); Looijenga (2003a:207); McKinnell et al. (2004:78);
 Nowak (2003:498).

Images

Clavadetscher et al. (1984-1989:1,3:91-92) (drawing and photograph);
 Nowak 2003:498 (drawing).

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

Male grave (no. 42) in a row-gravefield, excavated in 1954 (Düwel
 1994b:264).

Provenance

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

Datings

7th century (Krause 1966:296; Opitz 1987:25).

567-600 (Düwel 1994b:238; Looijenga 2003a:243; Schwerdt 2000:213).

Late 6th century (Martin 2004:186).

Location of inscription

On the front, running right to left.

Readings

ika^r/uwi (Arntz and Jänichen 1957:124).

xarwi (Krause 1966:295). R.1 may be **I**.

karwi (Opitz 1987:26). R.1 could be **ik** (see Arntz and Jänichen, above).

lkarwi (Düwel 1994b:264, citing Pieper's examination of the original in 1992).

ikarwi (Looijenga 2003a:243).

?arwi (Nedoma 2004a:210).

(1-2?)arwi (Kiel).

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

Synthetic reading: **(?)?arwi**

References

Arntz and Jänichen (1957:124-125); Düwel (1972:139; 1994b:238, 264-265); Krause (1966:294-296); Looijenga (2003a:243-244); Nedoma (2004a:210-213); Opitz (1987:25-26, 167); Schwerdt (2000:213-214).

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

Stray find from the Hitsum *terp*, discovered in 1907 (Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:1,2:140; Düwel 1970:284; Looijenga 2003a:208).

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

[I] **fozo** [II] **g̊ola** (Düwel 1970:284, 286; Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:1,2:140).

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

fozo groba (Looijenga 2003a:208; Seebold 1996:195).

[I] **fozo** [II] **g̊oba** (Nowak 2003:500).

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

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

References

Clavadetscher et al. (1984-1989:1,2:140); Düwel (1970); Krause (1971:150); Looijenga (2003a:208); Nowak (2003:500); Seebold (1996).

Images

Clavadetscher et al. (1984-1989:1,3:95-96) (drawing and photograph); Hauck (1970 Abb. 7) (photographs); Seebold (1996:182, 185 Abb. 1-2) (drawings).

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.

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

[A] **dęd** [B] **?nl^l/u** (Düwel and Tempel 1968/1970:367-368).

?nlu ded (Looijenga 2003a:325). Looijenga describes **ded** as a triple bind-rune, 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] **(ded)**

References

Düwel and Tempel (1968/1970); Looijenga (2003a:324-325).

Images

Düwel and Tempel (1968/1970:354) (photograph).

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,

806-811, 819-821; Fischer 2004:293). 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 *Kleinbrakteaten* 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

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

Düwel (1997b:18) (photograph and drawing); Fingerlin et al. (1998:805) (photographs); Naumann (2004 Taf. 6-17) (photographs).

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

ota (Düwel 1997b:18; Heizmann 2004:372; McKinnell et al. 2004:68; Schwab 1999a:17). **a** is retrograde.

^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

Düwel and Pieper (2004:11-12).

Images

Düwel and Pieper (2004:11) (drawings).

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

6th century (Düwel 1998:17; Looijenga 2003a:264).

No firm dating available (Nedoma 2004a:221). Nedoma simply cites Martin's (2004:180) dating of rune-inscribed bow fibulae in general to the timespan c.526-600.

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] **aunrǥḍ** [II] **d** (Düwel 1998a:17; Kiel; Looijenga 2003a:264).

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

The uncertain 5th rune (Düwel – ǥ; Nedoma – x) is damaged – only the lower part remains, which could be the lower half of ʁ, or conceivably of ʃ.

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] **aunr?ḍ** [II] **d**

References

Düwel (1998a:17); Looijenga (2003a:264); Nedoma (2004a:221-224).

Images

Düwel (1998a:17) (drawing).

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

If genuine, 601-650 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:267; Opitz 1987:53).

Location of inscription

On the back of the headplate.

Readings

wodana : hailag (Henning, cited without full reference by Arntz and Zeiss 1939:272, and by Düwel 1994c:105).

wodani : hailag (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:272-273; Opitz 1987:53).

h is the “star-rune” †, which is the *hagall*-rune in the Scandinavian Younger Futhork. 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

Arntz (1944:96); Arntz and Zeiss (1939:266-273); Düwel (1994c:105; 2001:214); Opitz (1987:53-54, 64).

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 ʃ; 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 Futhork 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?fa**

In complex I, the third rune seems to be a clear **m**. If it were an English **d** (**ᚩ**), 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 **ʃ**, 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

Hawkes and Page (1967:18-20); Looijenga (2003a:65-66, 244); Page (1995:158, 172-173); Parsons (1999:70-71).

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).

Context

Female grave (no. 85)⁶ in the “Rauner” graveyard, 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

6th century (Opitz 1987:29).

Mid-6th 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

badahxali (Opitz 1979:365; 1987:29, 129; Schwerdt 2000:214).

badagihiali dmiu (Looijenga 2003a:245).

badahxalx (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 **bada(?)h?ali**

References

Däcke (2001); Looijenga (2003a:245); Martin (2004:176-179, 192-193); Nedoma (2004a:375-376); Opitz (1979:365-366; 1987:29, 127-134); Schwerdt (2000:214).

Images

Looijenga (2003a:245) (drawing); Martin (2004:177) (drawing); Opitz (1979:366) (photograph).

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

551-600 (Däcke 2001:105; Düwel 1996a:13; Looijenga 2003a:264; Nedoma 2004a:209).

Location of inscription

On the back.

Readings

arugis (Düwel 1996a:13; Kiel; Nedoma 2004a:209).

arugis (Looijenga 2003a:264).

ar(1?)gis (Kiel).

Synthetic reading: **arugis**

References

Däcke (2001); Düwel (1996a:13); Looijenga (2003a:264); Nedoma (2004a:209-210).

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

birg : leub : selbrade (Düwel 2006:320, 326; Krause 1966:291; Nedoma 2003:489; 2004a:238; 2006b:347; Opitz 1987:54; Rosenfeld 1984:164).

References

Düwel (2006); Eichner (2006); Krause (1966:290-292); Nedoma (2003:489-492; 2004a:237-240, 407-408; 2006b); Opitz (1987:54); Pieper (2006); Rosenfeld (1984); Waxenberger (2006); Züchner (2006).

Images

Düwel (2006:335-343) (photographs and drawings); Eichner 2006:371 (photograph); Pieper 2006:389 (photograph of a plaster cast); Rosenfeld (1984:160) (drawing).

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

551-600 (Düwel 1997b:19; Looijenga 2003a:264; Nedoma 2004a:194).

Location of inscription

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

Readings

aonofada (Bammesberger 1999c:203; Düwel 1997b:19; Kiel; Looijenga 2003a:264; Schwab 1998a:420).

aonofada (Nedoma 2004a:194).

Synthetic reading: **aonofada**

References

Bammesberger (1999c); Düwel (1997b:19); Fischer (2004:278-279); Looijenga (2003a:264); Nedoma (2004a:194-196); Schwab (1998a:420); Stork (2001).

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

Mid-6th century (Düwel 1998a:16; Nedoma 2004a:272).

Location of inscription

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

Readings

gdag (Düwel 1998a:16; Looijenga 2003a:265).

odag (Schwab 1999a:20).

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

Synthetic reading: **?dag**

References

Düwel (1998a:16-17); Looijenga (2003a:265); Nedoma (2004a:272); Schwab (1999a:20-25).

Images

Düwel (1998a:16) (drawing); Schwab (1999:27) (photograph); Waldspühl (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

Richly appointed male grave (no. M8/A2), excavated in 1957 (Nedoma 2004a:397).

Provenance

The graveyard 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 Cherusian (1966:315).

Datings

Beginning of 5th century (Krause 1966:279).

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

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

4th 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

raḵxẏwi (Bohnsack and Schöttler 1965:252).

ra...ṃ (ar) (Krause 1966:279).

ra?ẏwi (Düwel 1972:138; 2001:353).

razẏwi (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

Bohnsack and Schöttler (1965); Cosack (1982); Düwel (1972; 1994b:268; 2001); Grünzweig (2004:100-101); Häßler (1985); Krause (1966:279); Looijenga (2003a:245-246); Nedoma (2004a:397-399).

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).

ieo^k/₁ 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 **I** is not impossible, **k** in the “roof” form [^] is more plausible.

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

References

Babucke and Düwel (2001); Düwel (2000a:14); Looijenga 2003a:266; Nedoma 2004a:224-225.

Images

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.

526-550 (Martin 2004:178).

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 the footplate (both running left to right) (Opitz 1987:172).

Readings

[I] **segalo** [II] **sigila** (Düwel 1998b:75-76; Looijenga 2003a:246; Nedoma 2004a:400; Opitz 1987:30). Opitz gives the sequences in the opposite order, **sigila segalo**.

References

Dannheimer (1998); Düwel (1998b:75-77); Looijenga (2003a:246-247); Nedoma (2004a:399-407, 409-410); Opitz (1987:30, 172-174).

Images

Dannheimer (1998:II Taf. 34, 95, 118-119) (drawings and photographs); Düwel (1998b:75, 76) (drawings); Martin (2004:174) (drawings).

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).

bđ (Nedoma 2004a:399).

Synthetic reading: **bđ**

References

Dannheimer (1998); Düwel (1998b:77-78); Looijenga (2003a:266);
Nedoma (2004a:399); Opitz (1987:30).

Images

Dannheimer (1998:II Taf. 34, 95, 118-119) (drawings and photographs);
Düwel (1998b:75, 76) (drawings).

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).

c.600 (Martin 2004:179; Nedoma 2004a:243).

Location of inscription

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

Readings

[I] **udim̃** [II] **midu** [III] **ḳlefiḷp** (or perhaps **ḳlefiḥ**) (Düwel 1990:8; Fingerlin and Düwel 2002:110).

[I] **?ud??** [II] **midu** [III] **klefilpa** (Looijenga 2003a:247).

[I] **udim̃** [II] **midu** [III] **ḳlefiḷp** (Nedoma 2004a:243).

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] **(?)udim̃** [II] **midu** [III] **ḳlefi??**

References

Düwel (1990:8); Fingerlin and Düwel (2002:110-111); Fischer (2004:293); Looijenga (2003a:247); Martin (2004:177, 179, 202); Nedoma (2004a:243-244).

Images

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

6th century (Düwel 1994b:295; Fingerlin 1981:187; Looijenga 2003a:248; Opitz 1982:486; Schwerdt 2000:215).

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

lbi·imuba:hamale:blipgup:uraitruna (Düwel 1989a:45; 2002c:27-28; Fingerlin and Düwel 2002:110; Looijenga 2003a:248; Nedoma 2004a:241; Opitz 1982:486; Scardigli 1986:353; Schwerdt 2000:215).

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

Düwel (1989a; 2002c); Fingerlin (1981); Fingerlin and Düwel (2002:110); Looijenga (2003a:248); Nedoma (2004a:240-243, 321-324, 345-348; 2006a:145); Opitz (1981; 1982:486-490); Roth (1994:309); Scardigli (1986:351-354); Schwab (1998a:416); Schwerdt (2000:215-217).

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

Rich male grave (no. 3a) in a row-gravefield, excavated in 1963 (Düwel 2002a:194; Grünzweig 2004:127-128; Jänichen 1967b:234).

Provenance

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

Datings

601-650 (Opitz 1987:32; Looijenga 2003a:248).

601-633 (Roth 1981a:65).

c.600 (Düwel 1994b:264; 2002a:194; Nedoma 2004a:343).

601-620 (Koch 1997:404, cited by Nedoma 2004a:343).

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

[I] **bigwsiliub** [II] **didun d u e u** (Jänichen 1967a:45-46, 235-236).

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).

[I] **bigws:?liub** [II] **ueul** (rivet hole) **didu?** (Düwel 2002a:194).

big?s: ?liub ?ud?d bre?u (Looijenga 2003a:248).

[I] **bigws?liub** [II] **uer?** (or **?rue**) **diigu?** (or **didu?**) (Nedoma 2004a:343).

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).

Synthetic reading: [I] **bigws(:)?liub** [II] **uę??d^{igu}/du/ud?**

References

Düwel (1992b:55; 1994b:264; 2002a); Fischer (2004:280); Grünzweig (2004:127-129); Jänichen (1967a; 1967b:234-236); Looijenga (2003a:248-249); Martin (2004:185-186); Nedoma (2004a:343-345); Opitz (1987:32, 232-234); Paulsen (1967); Schwab (1998a:412-417).

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

Both Zeiss and Krause identify the fibula as probably Alamannic (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:276; Krause 1966:294), though it belongs to a type of square-headed bow fibula imitative of Scandinavian models (Düwel 1982:78; Fischer 2004:295).

Datings

Beginning of the 7th century (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:276; Kabell 1970:1; Krause 1966:294).

601-650 (Opitz 1987:33).

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

Mid- to late 6th century (Düwel 1982:78; 1994b:275; Grønvik 1987:111; Schwerdt 2000:217). Grønvik infers a date-range of c.550-570.

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

[a] **logapore** [b] **wodan** [c] **wigip¹onar** [d] **awaleubwinii** (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:281; Düwel 1982:78; 2002d:276; Klingenberg 1976d:167-168; Opitz 1987:33 (the designation of the complexes by letters a-d is Opitz'); Schwerdt 2000:217-218).

[A] [I] **logapore** [II] **wodan** [III] **wigiponar** [B] **awaleubwinix**
(Krause 1966:292).

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

[A] [I] **logapore** [II] **wodan** [III] **wigiponar** [B] **awaleubwini**†
 (Grønvik 1987:112).

[A] **logapore wodan wiguponar??** [B] **awa (l)eubwini??** (Looijenga 2003a:249).

[A] **logapore** [B] **wodan** [C] **wigiponar** or **wiguponar** [D]
awaleubwini? (McKinnell et al. 2004:48).

[α] [I] **logapore** [II] **wodan** [III] **wig^l/_uponar** [β] **awaleubwini≡**
 (Nedoma 2004a:225).

loga(1?)ore | wodan(0-1?) | wig(1-2?)p(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 **awal** (Kabell 1970:11).

The mark following **leubwini** (transliterated **é** by Arntz and Opitz, **ï** 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.

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

wigⁱ/u_hponar [B] **awajleubwini?**

References

Arntz (1939b); Arntz and Zeiss (1939:274-300); Bammesberger (1989); Düwel (1982; 1991:278; 1992a:356-359; 2002d); Fischer (2004:295); Grønvik (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); Schwab (1981; 1998a:412-417); Schwerdt (2000:217-219); Shaw (2002:106-111); 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

600-650 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:276; Opitz 1987:34).

c.600 (Krause 1966:295).

Mid-6th century (Düwel 2002d:276; Looijenga 2003a:251; Roth 1981a:66).

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/}_{l**̥**} ^{ir/}_{hr!} ^{n/}_! [!]_! [!]_! [!]_! [!]_! (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:303-305).

birlxioelx (Krause 1966:294; Düwel 2002d:276).

airlxioelx (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 ʃ, a form resembling the **k** of the Younger Futhork. 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 Futhork **n** † (Düwel 2002a:276).

Synthetic reading: **þirl?ioel?**

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:274-277, 300-307); Düwel (2002d:276); Fischer (2004:292); Krause (1966:294-295); Looijenga (2003a:251); Martin (2004:178, 200); Opitz (1987:34, 234-236); Schwab (1998a:392, 404).

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 graveyard (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).

567-600 (Düwel 1994b:244; 2002e:479; Looijenga 2003a:251; Schwerdt 2000:220).

Location of inscription

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

Readings

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

gþa'duþafd (Klingenberg 1974:84; Düwel 2002e:479).

gba:dulpafd (Opitz 1987:34; Looijenga 2003a:251; Schwerdt 2000:220).

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: **ḡbaʼ_idulpafd**

References

Düwel (1994b:244-245; 2002e); Jänichen (1967b:237); Klingenberg (1974); Looijenga (2003a:251-252); Opitz (1987:34-35, 123-126); Schiek (1992); Schwerdt (2000:220-221).

Images

Jänichen (1967b Taf 46) (drawings and photograph); Klingenberg (1974) (photograph); Schiek (1992 Taf. 56) (drawings).

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).

Context

Relatively rich female grave (no. 13) in a row-gravefield discovered during canal works in 1972 and excavated in 1975 (Betz 1979:241-242; Nedoma 2004a:137).

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

551-600 (dating of the burial) (Betz 1979:241-242; Looijenga 2003a:252; Nedoma 2004a:137).

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

ajjabirg (Betz 1979:242).

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

ajjabrg or **aisabrg** (Looijenga 2003a:252).

xx^jabrg (Nedoma 2004a:137).

(1-2?)ijabirg (Kiel).

The rune transliterated **j** resembles a reversed h_1 , 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: **??j|abrg**

References

Betz (1979); Düwel (1991:280); Looijenga (2003a:252); Martin (2004:182, 202); Nedoma (2004a:137-140; 2004b:350).

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

7th century (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:308; Jungandreas 1972:85).

651-700 (Krause 1966:285; Looijenga 2003a:252; Opitz 1987:35; Roth 1981a:66; Schwerdt 2000:221).

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

gox:furadxḥdxofilex (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:315; Krause 1966:285; Opitz 1987:35; Schwerdt 2000:221).

go furadi di le+ (Looijenga 2003a:253).

go[1?] ' furad[1?](h)d(e)o(f)ile(1Z) (Kiel).

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

Synthetic reading: **go?:furad?ḥdeofile?**

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:307-319); Düwel (1994b:276); Jungandreas (1972); Krause (1966:285); Looijenga (2003a:252-253); Martin (2004:181-182, 194); McKinnell et al. (2004:49-50); Opitz (1987:35-36, 122-123); Schwerdt (2000:221-222).

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

Male grave (no. 239) in a large row-gravefield, excavated in 1991. The grave is very richly supplied with goods and weapons (Babucke 1999a:15, 20; 2003:114-115; Christlein 1973; Nedoma 2004a:166; 2004b:342).

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 graveyard 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

Mid 6th century or 551-600 (Düwel 1993:10, 1994b:290; Grønvik 2003:174; Nedoma 1999b:98; Schwerdt 2000:222; Wagner 1999a:91).

567-600 (Babucke 1999a:22; Düwel 2003a:116; Nedoma 2004a:158, 2004b:342).

c.550 (Schwab 1999b:55).

551-600 (Düwel 1997c:281; Looijenga 1999:81).

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

[I] **aigilandiaïlrun** [II] **Itahugasokun** (or **elahugasokun**) (Düwel 1993:10; 1994b:290; 1997c:281; 1999b:37-43; 2003a:116-117; Grønvik 2003:174-175;

Looijenga 1999:81; McKinnell et al. 2004:57; Schwab 1999b:56; Schwerdt 2000:222).

[I] **ai·gil·andi·all·run** [II] **elahu·gasokun** (Pieper 1999:27-35).

[I] **aigil andi halrun** [II] **l t ahu gasokun** (Seebold 1999:88-89).

[I] **aigilandiailrunani** [II] **Itahugasokun** (Wagner 1999a:91-93).

[I] **.aigil.andi.ailrun** [II] **l.tahu:gasokun** (Looijenga 2003a:253).

[I] **aigil·andi·ailrun'≡** [II] **Itahu·gasokun≡** (Nedoma 1999b:99-100; 2004a:158).

[I] **aigil andi all(u)run** [II] **elahu gasokun** (Marold 2004:227).

aigilandiailrun ' (?-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 **It**, 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 \equiv 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·aⁱ/lrun?(...)** [II] **l̥ṭahu·gasokun?**

References

Babucke (1993; 1999a; 2003); Bammesberger (1999a); Düwel (1993; 1994b:290-291; 1997c; 1999b; 2003a:116-117); Eichner (1999); Fischer (2004:285); Grønvik (2003); Looijenga (1999; 2003a:253-255); Marold (2004); Martin (2004:186, 206); McKinnell et al. (2004:57-59); Nedoma (1999b; 2004a:158-171; 2004b; 2006a:111-113); Pieper (1999); Schwab (1999b); Schwerdt (2000:222-224); Seebold (1999); Wagner (1995; 1999a; 1999b).

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

[outside] **gisali** [inside] **]ne:aodlip:urait:runa** (Düwel 1997b:19; 2002c:33; Looijenga 2003a:265).

[inside] **](:)ķę:aodlip:urait:runa:[outside] ?lų?ұлgisali?[** (Düwel 1999c:127-130).

[inside] **?e:aodlip:urait:runa** [outside] **?lų?ұлgisali?** (Düwel 2003a:117)⁷.

[α] **---?]xę:aodlip:urait:runa** [β] **xlųxұлgisal'i[---?** (Nedoma 2004a:189; 2004b:341).

[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).

Synthetic reading: [I] **?lų?ұлgisali[** [II] **]?ę:aodlip:urait:runa**

References

Babucke (1999b); Düwel (1997b:19; 1999c; 2003a:117-118); Looijenga (2003a:256); Nedoma (2004a:189-193, 304-306; 2004b:340-342); Schwab (1999a:19-20).

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 graveyard (no further details available at the time of writing).

Provenance

The graveyard 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 6th century (Looijenga 2003a:265).

526-550 (Martin 2004:178).

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: **iiha**

References

Düwel (1999a:15); Fischer (2004:282); Koch (2001); Looijenga (2003a:265); Martin (2004:178, 199); Nedoma (2004a:349-350).

Images

Düwel (1999a:15) (drawing); Koch (2001 Taf. 12b) (drawing); Martin (2004:174) (drawing); Nedoma (2004a:349) (photograph).

64. †Rubring

Concordance

O 37.

Object

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

Find-site

Rubring a.d. Enns, Bez. Amstetten, Niederösterreich, Austria (48° 10' N, 14° 29' E).

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

[I] rīnald [II] IDIO[.] [III] PP (Haas 1958:73).

ķīndō(ī) iriņg wþ (Steinhauser 1968a:4-6).

ķīndo /// iriņ wþ (Opitz 1987:37).

[I] ?wīndx[--- [II] ?riņg[--- [III] wþ (Nedoma 2003:486).

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

Synthetic reading: [I] ?īndō? [II] (?)riņ[(...)] [III] w(?)

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).

Find-site

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

Context

Discovered in 1935 in the Museum für Vorpommern und Rügen, Stralsund (Arntz 1937:6-7). See Appendix 2.

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: ^f/agi^u/t.

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

Male grave (no. 11) in “La Tuilerie”, a small graveyard excavated in 2001-2002 (Fischer 2007:102).

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

[a]lu (or [æ]lu) (Fischer 2007:107).

Synthetic reading: **alu**

References

Fischer (2007:102-108); Fischer and Soulat (forthcoming).

Images

Fischer (2007:105) (photographs).

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

Rich female grave (no. 26) in a row-gravefield, excavated in 1892 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:334; Düwel 1994b:294; Nedoma 2004a:171; Opitz 1987:37). The inscription was not discovered until 1931 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:335).

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

c.600 (Klingenberg 1976c:337; Krause 1966:300; Looijenga 2003a:255; Roth 1981a:66).

c.565-590/600 (Koch 1977:35; Nedoma 2004a:172).

551-600 (Opitz 1987:37; Düwel 1994b:294; Schwerdt 2000:224).

Mid 6th century or 551-575 (Martin 2004:179).

7th century (McKinnell et al. 2004:63).

Medallions based on coins of Justinian I (527-565) were found in the grave and give us a *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

[B] **alagup:leuba:d?dun** [A] **arogisd** (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:336-338). I have reversed the order of the complexes for ease of comparison with other readings.

[A] **alagup:leuba:dedun** [B] **arogisd** (Klingenberg 1976c:337; Krause 1966:299; Opitz 1987:37; Schwerdt 2000:224).

[bottom] **alagupleuba: dedun** [lid] **arogisd** (Looijenga 2003a:255).

[A] **alagup:leuba:dedun** [B] **arogisd** (McKinnell et al. 2004:63).

[I] **alagup:leuba:dędun** [II] **arogisd** (Nedoma 2004a:172).

alagup ' leuba ' de(d)un | arog(i)sd (Kiel).

The **ę** of **dędun** is irregular and could conceivably be a bind-rune **ek/ke** (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:337-338). The inscription as a whole is very faint.

Synthetic reading: [I] **alagup:leuba:dędun** [II] **arogisd**

References

Arntz (1935b); Arntz and Zeiss (1939:333-344); Düwel (1994b:294-295); Klingenberg (1976c:337-355); Krause (1966:298-300); Koch (1977); Looijenga (2003a:255); McKinnell et al. (2004:63); Nedoma (2004a:171-175, 199-202, 358-359); Opitz (1987:37-38, 101-111); Schwab (1998a:417); Schwerdt (2000:224-225).

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).

565-590/600 (Koch 1977:45; Düwel 1994b:277; Nedoma 2004a:359).

551-600 (Opitz 1987:38; Looijenga 2003a:256; Roth 1981a:66; Schwerdt 2000:226).

526-550, up to c.600 (Martin 2004:180-181). This is a time-span for the “pomegranate” disc fibulae (*Granatscheibenfibeln*) 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

[I] **ƿidagalpis** [II] **leubo** (Jänichen 1951:226-227; Koch 1977:164).

[I] **siþwagadin** [II] **leubo** (Krause 1966:298; Kiel; Looijenga 2003a:256; Nedoma 2004a:359; Opitz 1987:39; Schwerdt 2000:226).

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

References

Jänichen (1951); Koch (1977); Krause (1966:297-298); Looijenga (2003a:256); Nedoma (2004a:359-361, 410-412); Opitz (1987:38-39, 80-83); Schwerdt (2000:226-227).

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

Iron spatha with silver ring (Düwel 1981b:159; Klingenberg and Koch 1974:118; Koch 1977:96-97; Looijenga 2003a:256). The inscription is inlaid with silver.

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 graveyard 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.

565-590/600 (Grünzweig 2004:126; Koch 1977:38; Martin 2004:185 n.65; Nedoma 2004a:197).

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).

ʁ/raþa (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

Düwel (1981b:159-160; 1994b:267-268); Fischer (2004:285, 294); Grünzweig (2004:125-126, 131-133); Jänichen (1974); Klingenberg and Koch (1974); Koch (1977); Looijenga (2003a:256-257); Martin (2004:184-185, 193, 195, 197, 205); Menghin (1983:256); Nedoma (2004a:196-198); Opitz (1987:39-40, 194-195, 211-212); Schwab (1998a:376-378); Schwerdt (2000:227-228).

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

c.600 (Düwel 1994b:277 (following Bachran 1993:98); Looijenga 2003a:257; Schwerdt 2000:228).

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

Location of inscription

On the back, running left to right.

Readings

leob (Meli 1988:162, cited by Düwel 1994b:277; Schwab 1998a:412; Schwerdt 2000:228).

aeþi (Fingerlin et al. 2004:247; Looijenga 2003a:257; Nedoma 2004a:147).

aebi (Kiel).

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

Synthetic reading: **aeþi**

References

Bachran (1993); Düwel (1994b:277); Fingerlin et al. (2004:247); Looijenga (2003a:257); Martin (2004:181, 204); Nedoma (2004a:147-148); Schwab (1998a:412-417); Schwerdt (2000:228).

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. 1984-1989:1,1:21-22). Seebold (1996:183), referring to 36. Hitsum, gives a 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

rwril (Krause 1966:270; Hauck 1970:135).

rwril (Krause 1971:163; Looijenga 2003a:215).

rwritu (Antonsen 1975:65).

rwril (Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:1,2:271; Nowak 2003:537).

(1? w)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: **rwril**

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 (2003a:215); Nowak (2003:537).

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

aujaalawinaujaalawinaujaalawinjalawid (Antonsen 1975:76; Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:1,2:279; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941-1942:498; Kiel; Krause 1966:241; 1971:163; McKinnell et al. 2004:77; Looijenga 2003a:215; Nowak 2003:540).

References

Antonsen (1975:76-77; 1987:24); Clavadetscher et al. (1984-1989:1,2:278-280); Jacobsen and Moltke 1941-1942:497-498; Krause (1966:241-242; 1971:163); Looijenga (2003a:215-216); McKinnell et al. (2004:77); Nowak (2003:540-541 *et passim*); Stiles (1984:29-33).

Images

Clavadetscher et al. (1984-1989:1,3:207-208) (drawing and photograph);
Krause (1966 Taf. 53) (photograph); Nowak (2003:540) (drawing).

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 exemplars 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

[I] **niuwila** [II] **lpu** (Krause 1966:254; Kiel; McKinnell et al. 2004:75).

[I] **niuwila** [II] **lpu** (Antonsen 1975:76; Clavadetscher et al. 1984-1989:1,2:283; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941-1942:505; Krause 1971:163; Nowak 2003:544).

[I] **niuwila** [II] **lpl** or **lwl** (Looijenga 2003a:216).

Synthetic reading: [I] **niuwila** [II] **lpu**

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

601-650 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:345).

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

567-600 (Looijenga 2003a:257; Martin 2004:180; Roth 1981a:66).

551-600 (Opitz 1987:40).

The grave contains coins of Justinian I, probably minted in Ravenna 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

[I] **rada:dapa** [II] “a monogram composed of the the rune *O* and the bind-runes *NT* and *AA*”⁸ (Holthausen 1931:304).

[I] **rada:dapa** [II (rune-cross)] **atano** (Krause 1966:280; Nedoma 2004a:215).

rada:dapa gatano (Opitz 1987:40).

rada:dapa gatano (Looijenga 2003a:257).

rada ' dapa | (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:daba** [II] **atano** or **gatano**

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:344-350); Fischer (2004:294); Hermann (1989); Holthausen (1931:304); Klingenberg and Koch (1974:124-126); Krause (1966:279-281); Looijenga (2003a:257-258); Nedoma (2004a:213-221, 276-279, 394-395); Opitz (1987:40-41, 194-195).

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

Male grave (no. 8 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:350) / no. 10 (Martin 2004:206)) in a row-gravefield, excavated in 1934 (Bammesberger 1969:7).

Provenance

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 31. 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 (Bammesberger 1969:7).

601-650 (Opitz 1987:41; Roth 1981a:66).

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).

husibald/// (Krause 1966:300).

husibaldxxx (Opitz 1987:41; Schwerdt 2000:228) / **husiwald** (Opitz 1987:167; Schwerdt 2000:229).

husibaldxx? (Düwel 1981b:158).

h^uisi?ald (Looijenga 2003a:258).

≡**husjald**xxx[--- (Grünzweig 2004:136; Nedoma 2004a:335).

(1Z)**hus(i 1?)al(d 2-3?)**[0-?] (Kiel).

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: **?husj?ald??(?)**

References

Arntz (1936a); Arntz and Zeiss (1939:350-355); Bammesberger (1969); Düwel (1981b:158-159; 1994b:271); Grünzweig (2004:126-127, 136-137); Krause (1966:300-301); Looijenga (2003a:258-259); Nedoma (2004a:335-340); Opitz (1987:41-42, 167); Schwerdt (2000:228-229).

Images

Arntz (1936 Taf. 29) (photographs); Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 29, 41) (photographs); Bammesberger (1969:7) (drawing); Krause (1966 Taf. 69) (photograph); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (close-up photographs).

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

Mid-7th century (Pieper 1990:7, 1993:83).

c.680/690 (Düwel 1994b:292; 2002c:29 Anm. 31 (following Frauke Stein); Nedoma 2004a:182; 2006a:137).

Location of inscription

On the outside, running left to right.

Readings

afmelkud (Pieper 1990:7, 1993:81; Düwel 2002c:30; Nedoma 2006a:137; Schwerdt 2000:229; Weis et al. 1991:313).

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: **ṁmelkuḍ f**

References

Düwel (1994b:292; 2002c); Looijenga (2003a:22-23); Nedoma (2004a:182-184; 2006a:137); Pieper (1990; 1993); Schwerdt (2000:229-230); Weis (1999); Weis et al. (1991).

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

The Hungarian National Museum acquired the item in 1927. Its earlier history is unclear (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:357; Kiss 1980:107-108; Nedoma 2004a:376-377).

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.

On archaeological grounds, Martin (2004:168) favours an “East Germanic” origin. Antonsen (1975:75) identifies the dialect as EGmc.

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

Datings

401-450 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:357; Klingenberg 1976c:364; Looijenga 2003a:174; Opitz 1987:42).

401-425 (Krause 1966:311; Antonsen 1975:74).

450-475 (Düwel 1994b:289 n.83, following Kiss 1980:111).

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 sđ (Krause 1966:310).

marŋs (Antonsen 1975:74). Antonsen actually transliterates **marings**, with **ing** representing the \diamond -rune.

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

marŋs \equiv (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 **d**, Opitz as a bind-rune **sd** and Nedoma as \equiv) 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 **ŋ** and **s**.

Synthetic reading: **marŋs?**

References

Antonsen (1975:74-75); Arntz and Zeiss (1939:355-359); Düwel (1994b:289 n.83); Kiss (1980); Klingenberg (1976c:364-368); Krause (1966:310-311); Looijenga (2003a:174-175); Nedoma (2004a:376-386; 2006a:113); Opitz (1987:42-43, 109).

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

[I] **wilsa** [II] **wairwai** (Schneider 1980:194-195; Kiel; Opitz 1987:56).

References

Düwel (2003b:518; 2008:214); Opitz (1987:56); Schneider (1980).

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).

Context

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 (Siegmond 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

501-550 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:361; Krause 1966:287; Looijenga 2003a:260; Opitz 1987:45; Roth 1981a:66; Schwerdt 2000:232).

526-550 or c.550 (Martin 2004:186; Nedoma 2004a:257).

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

[I] **haribrig**[II] **hiḡa:** [III] **liubi:** [IV] **leob**· (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:367; Kiel; Krause 1966:287-288; Nedoma 2004a:258; Opitz 1987:46; Schwerdt 2000:232).

haribrig liub leob (Looijenga 2003a:260).

Only 3 of the original 7 knobs are still attached to the fibula. The **hiḃa** knob is now missing (which is why it is absent from Looijenga's reading). The **liub(i)**: 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 **hiḃa** knob and of the final **i** in complex III. I therefore adhere to the majority reading.

Synthetic reading: [I] **haribrig** [II] **hiḃa:** [III] **liub(i):** [IV] **leob·**

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:360-368); Götze (1912); Krause (1966:287-288); Looijenga (2003a:260, 269); Martin (2004:176, 186-187, 200); Nedoma (2004a:257-258, 330-332, 332-334, 365-366); Opitz (1987:45-46, 185-190); Schwab (1998a:412-417); Schwerdt (2000:232-233).

Images

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

80. Weimar II

Concordance

AZ 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] **siḡ///** [knob a] **bubo:** [knob b] **hiba:** (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:368; Kiel; Krause 1966:288; Opitz 1987:46; Schwerdt 2000:232).

sigib^l/_ad hiba bubo (Looijenga 2003a:261).

[I] **siḡ/_n** (or: **ḡ/_nis**) [II] **bubo:** [III] **hiba:** (Nedoma 2004a:258).

Synthetic reading: [I] **siḡ/_n (...)** [II] **bubo:** [III] **hiba:**

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:360-363, 368-369); Götze (1912); Krause (1966:287, 288-289); Looijenga (2003a:261); Martin (2004:176, 186-187, 200); Nedoma (2004a:257-260, 332-334, 408-409); Opitz (1987:45-46, 185-190); Schwerdt (2000:232-233).

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 graveyard as 79-80. Weimar I-II.

Provenance

See Weimar I.

Datings

501-550 (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:361, 370; Düwel 1994b:290; Klingenberg 1976c:369; Looijenga 2003a:261; Opitz 1987:47; Roth 1981a:66; Schwerdt 2000:230).

c.550 (Martin 2004:186; Nedoma 2004a:314).

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

ida:bigina hahwar :awimund:isd(:)r!eob idunx (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:370-372, 374).

[a] **ida:bigina:hahwar: [b] :awimund:isd:leob idun:** (Krause 1966:289; Nedoma 2004a:228; Opitz 1987:47; Schwerdt 2000:230).

[I] **ida:bigina:hahwar [II] :awimund:isd:leob [III] iduni** (i? or :) (Düwel 1994b:290).

[I] **ida:bigina:hahwar: [II] :awimund:isd:??eo?? [III] iduni** (Looijenga 2003a:261 (my numbering of complexes)).

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

Synthetic reading: [I] **ida:bigina:hahwar [II] :awimund:isd:leob**

[III] **idunⁱ:**

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:360-363, 370-375); Düwel (1994b:290); Götze (1912); Klingenberg (1976c:369-371); Krause (1966:289-290); Looijenga (2003a:261-262); Nedoma (2004a:227-233, 233-237, 312-321); Opitz (1987:47-48, 110, 190-194); Schwab (1998a:412-417); Schwerdt (2000:230-231).

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

ida : leḡb : iḏa hahwar : wiu ḡ (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:377).

ḡiup:ida:xexxxa:hahwar: (Kiel; Krause 1966:290).

ḡiup:ida:xexxa:hahwar: (Opitz 1987:48; Schwerdt 2000:233).

:ḡiuw:ida:??a:hahwar (Looijenga 2003a:262). Looijenga notes that her reading is based on the photographs in Arntz and Zeiss 1939, which have been doctored.

ḡiup : ida : leḡb : iḏa : hahwar : (McKinnell et al. 2004:62).

ḡ¹iup:ida:x(x?)exxxa:hahwar: (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/_wiu^b/_w:ida:????a:hahwar:**

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:360-363, 375-380); Düwel (1994b:295); Krause (1966:290); Looijenga (2003a:262); McKinnell et al. (2004:62); Nedoma (2004a:312-321); Opitz (1987:48, 190-194); Schwab (1998a:412-417); Schwerdt (2000:233).

Images

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).

6th century (Opitz 1987:49; Schwerdt 2000:233).

560-600 (Stein 1987:1394-1395. Also Düwel 1989a:43; Martin 2004:184

Anm. 60; Nedoma 2004a:176).

Beginning of 6th century (Roth 1994:310).

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] **alirgub**x(x)x [b] **feha:writ**/// (Arntz and Jänichen 1957:127; Düwel 2002c:26; Krause 1966:306).

[a] **alirgub:ik** [b] **feha:writ:la** (Bammesberger 2002:119; Beck 2001:309; Opitz 1987:49; Schwerdt 2000:233).

aergub:? feha:writ: ia (Looijenga 2003a:262).

[I] **alirgub:??** [II] **feha:writ'[x(x)]ia** (Nedoma 2004a:176).

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

Following **gub** 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 staff 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 staff 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^h/_ergup:?(?) [II] feha:writ?...ⁱ/₁a

References

Arntz and Jänichen (1957:126-128); Bammesberger (2002); Beck (2001); Düwel (1989a; 2002c); Krause (1966:306); Looijenga (2003a:262-263); Nedoma (2004a:176-180, 292-297); Opitz (1987:49, 199-201); Roth (1998); Roth and Theune (1995:79-80); Schwab (1998a:418-419; 1999a:13-14); Schwerdt (2000:233-235); Wagner (1994/95); Wein (1957).

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 graveyard, excavated in the 1950s (see [83. Weingarten I](#)).

Provenance

See Weingarten I.

Datings

7th century (Krause 1966:307).

6th century (Opitz 1987:50; Schwerdt 2000:235).

Mid 6th century (Looijenga 2003a:263; Roth 1981a:66).

Beginning of the 6th century (Roth 1994:310).

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

c.550 (Nedoma 2004a:267, citing Roth 1981a).

Location of inscription

On the back, running left to right.

Readings

dado (Arntz and Jänichen 1957:128; Krause 1966:306; Opitz 1987:50; Looijenga 2003a:263; Roth and Theune 1995:54; Schwerdt 2000:235).

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: **d̥ado**

References

Arntz and Jänichen (1957:128); Krause (1966:306-307); Looijenga (2003a:263); Martin (2004:183-184, 186-187); Nedoma (2004a:266-272); Opitz (1987:50, 168-169); Roth (1994:310; 1998); Roth and Theune (1995:54); Schwab (1998a:396-397); Schwerdt (2000:235-236).

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

Saxon? (Pieper 1989). Nedoma (2004a:326) identifies the dialect as pre-OS, Seebold as OLG (Seebold et al. 2001:16).

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 ⚡-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 : hari kunni : we hagal (Holthausen 1931:304; Antonsen 2002:325; Opitz 1987:55).

latam : ing : hari | kunni : ing : we | hagal (Pieper 1989:153-154 (cited by Antonsen 2002:318; Looijenga 2003a:267)).

[I] **latam?hari** [II] **kunni?xe** [III] **hagal** (Nedoma 2004a:325).

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 **ŋ**-rune ǰ . Opitz and Nedoma read the ǰ -like signs as separators rather than runes (on the difficulties with Pieper's proposed development of forms $|\diamond| > \text{ǰ}$ (Pieper 1989:153, 166-177) – i.e., as a ligature of a regular **ŋ**-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 **w** in line II resembles a Roman **Y**. It is discussed in more detail in the thesis text (§4.1).

h is single-barred in all three Weser inscriptions.

Synthetic reading: [I] **latam(ŋ)hari** [II] **kunni(ŋ)?e** [III] **hagal**

References

Antonsen (1993; 2002:315-328); von Buttel-Reepen (1930); Düwel (2008:65-66); Ellmers (1994); Holthausen (1931:304-305); Karsten (1930); Looijenga (2003a:267-268); Nedoma (2004a:325-330); Pieper (1987; 1989; 1991); Schneider (1969); Seebold (1991a:501-502).

Images

Pieper (1987:223) (drawings); Pieper (1989:75-79, 113) (photographs and drawings).

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

Subfossile 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 ¹⁴C 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

lok om : her (Antonsen 2002:325; Ellmers 1994:126; Holthausen 1931:305;
Kiel; Nedoma 2004a:325; Opitz 1987:55; Pieper 1989:184 (cited by Antonsen
2002:319; Looijenga 2003a:267)).

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

References

See Weser I.

Images

Pieper (1987:223) (drawings); Pieper (1989:75-79, 117) (photographs and drawings).

87. †Weser III

[On the numbering, see [85. †Weser I](#)]

Concordance

O Anhang. Catalogued in the Oldenburg Museum as OL4991.

Object

Subfossile 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 ¹⁴C dating.

Location of inscription

Along one side, running left to right.

Readings

ulu:hari dede (Antonsen 2002:326; Holthausen 1931:305; Nedoma 2004a:325; Opitz 1987:55; Pieper 1989:184 (cited by Antonsen 2002:319; Looijenga 2003a:268)).

References

See Weser I.

Images

Pieper (1987:223) (drawings); Pieper (1989:71, 79, 119) (photographs and drawings).

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

Wijnaldum, Gem. Harlingen, Friesland, Netherlands (53°12' N, 5° 28' E).

Context

Stray find, discovered by an amateur on the Wijnaldum *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 \mathfrak{H} , 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

Looijenga (1991; 1996; 2003a:323-324).

Images

Looijenga (1991:12) (drawings).

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

Male boat grave in a 5th-century graveyard, excavated in 1994 (Düwel 1994e:14; Schön et al. 2006:318).

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).

431 (Düwel 1999b:49; Nedoma 2004a:240; Theune-Großkopf and Nedoma 2006:52), based on dendrochronology. Martin gives the dendrochronological dating as “shortly after 421” (typographical error?) (2004:167).

Location of inscription

On the edge, running right to left, in two complexes with a substantial gap between them.

Readings

[I] **ksamella** [II] **Iguskapi** (Düwel 1994e:14; Kiel; Looijenga 2003a:240; Schön et al. 2006:322-323; Theune-Großkopf and Nedoma 2006:53).

References

Düwel (1994e); Looijenga (2003a:239-241); Schön et al. (2006); Theune-Großkopf and Nedoma (2006:53-59).

Images

Looijenga (2003a plate 17a-b) (photographs); Schön et al. (2006:317, 319) (photographs); Theune-Großkopf and Nedoma (2006:54-55) (photographs).

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

Alamannic (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:418; Krause 1966:305).

Datings

Beginning of 7th century (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:418-419; Krause 1966:305; Opitz 1987:51; Roth 1981a:66; Schwerdt 2000:236).

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).

550/560-600/620 (Nedoma 2004a:281).

Location of inscription

On one side, running left to right.

Readings

?;id^orih (Arntz and Zeiss 1939:419).

?idorih (Krause 1966:304).

?:dorih (Opitz 1987:51; Düwel 1981b:157; Grünzweig 2004:130; Looijenga 2003a:263; Nedoma 2004a:281; Schwerdt 2000:236).

(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”⁹ (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) **aaaaaaaazzznnn?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 **Y** on Anglo-Saxon **beonna** coins, standing for Lat. *rex*.

Synthetic reading: **?:dorih**

References

Arntz and Zeiss (1939:418-421); Düwel (1981b:157-158); Grünzweig (2004:125, 129-131); Krause (1966:304-305); Looijenga (2003a:263); Martin (2004:185, 205); Nedoma (2004a:281-288); Opitz 1987:51, 84-96; Schwerdt (2000:236-238).

Images

Arntz and Zeiss (1939 Taf. 36) (photographs); Krause (1966 Taf. 69) (photographs); Nedoma (2004a:282) (photographs); Waldispühl (pers.comm.) (photographs).

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 postively 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

Illerup III shield grip (L V.3. Stoklund 1985).

Sedschütz pot (AZ 5. Raschke 1934).

Værløse 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).

Schweindorf solidus (L IX.8. Düwel and Tempel 1968/70:380-383).

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).

Basel-Kleinhüningen bow fibula (Ma A2. Giesler-Müller 1992).

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).

München-Sendling strap end (Düwel 1994b:247-248).

Osterrönfeld ceramic fragment (Dietz et al. 1996; Marold 1994; 1995).

Peigen disc fibula (L VII.69; Ma E4).

Rungholt bone (Düwel and Pieper 2004).

Appendix 1: Inscriptions excluded from the corpus

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).

Gräfelting 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).

Appendix 1: Inscriptions excluded from the corpus

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) fuparks

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)

Bergakker scabbard mount (Gr F1; L IX.7. Bammesberger 1999b; Bosman and Looijenga 1996; Malzahn 1998; Mees 2002; Odenstedt 1999; Quak 1997; 1999; Seebold 1999; Vennemann 1999).

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.

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 **zsfnm**) (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

makes a slightly stronger argument from the carving technique: the first part of the text (**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 **wodan**; and **hailag** appears on the Pietroassa ring (AZ 4; An 97; KJ 41). In the latter inscription, **hailag** is preceded by **gutaniowi**, which was interpreted as a dat. form of a pers.n. and so could have provided a grammatical model for **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 Futhork **h** for **h**. This form of **h** appears only in Scandinavian inscriptions, and not before c.800 (the form does appear in 7th-century inscriptions with the value [a], conventionally transliterated **A**, making it a precursor to the Younger Futhork **h**; and it also appears as a form of **j** in English and Frisian inscriptions), but the chronology of the futhorks 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 **h** of Pietroassa (which Arntz believes was the model for **hailag**). Neckel's claim (cited by Arntz) that **h** 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 20th-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 *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 **awajleubwini**, if interpreted as *Awa leub Wini* (see text, §3.1.1); and with the Opedal stone (KJ 76) (**birnggubqroswestarminu liubumezwage**), 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..¹¹ 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: Ęepo 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.

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 ð 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)¹² as **rīnald** (taken as a reference to Raynald Schmalbaug) and the second **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” (*frühalthochdeutsch*), it must be genuine; a forger might easily reproduce a fupark 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

¹² Steinhauser’s statement that Haas regarded the script as Venetic some other “North Italic” script (Steinhauser 1968a:3) is incorrect.

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. Pittioni) 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 **ŋ**-rune here is \diamond with full height (i.e., \diamond), which has no parallels in Older Futhork 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).

suspicions 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 **ulu:hari** 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.n.s., *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

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.¹⁴ These two characteristics mark the suspect items

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).

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.